

# **Marine Protected Areas**

**Policy Statement and Implementation Plan**

## **SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS**

**31 March 2005**

## Summary of MPA Submissions – 31 March 2005

### Table of Contents

1.	Introduction .....	1
2.	Submissions received.....	1
3.	Overview.....	1
4.	Cross sector themes.....	3
4.1	Support for a more strategic approach to marine biodiversity protection.....	3
4.2	Critical gaps in marine policy impede progress of MPAs .....	3
4.3	Treaty Obligations and Customary Management.....	5
4.4	Inadequate provision for participation .....	6
4.5	Key agencies and tools excluded.....	8
4.6	Inadequate implementation processes.....	10
4.7	Need for more robust analysis and risk assessment .....	12
4.8	Concern with the scope of the proposed policy .....	12
4.9	Consultation document unclear and difficult to follow .....	13
5.	Comments on specific aspects of policy proposals.....	13
5.1	NZBS and other national and international commitments.....	13
5.2	10% protection target .....	15
5.3	MPA Objective, Definition and Policy Scope.....	15
5.4	Implementation Principles .....	19
5.5	Protection Tools.....	22
5.6	MPA Implementation Plan.....	23
5.7	MPA Operational Plan .....	25
6.	Requests to be heard .....	25
7.	List of submitters .....	26

## 1. Introduction

The Department of Conservation (DOC) and the Ministry of Fisheries (MFish) jointly released the *Marine Protected Areas (MPA) Policy Statement and Implementation Plan* for consultation on the 8<sup>th</sup> November 2004. Submissions on the consultation document closed on 28<sup>th</sup> February 2005.

DOC and MFish then commissioned Enfocus Consulting Ltd to prepare an independent summary of submissions, which is presented here.

This summary identifies and summarises the key cross sector themes to emerge from the submissions. It also summarises comments on specific aspects of the draft policy. Every effort has been made to accurately reflect the views of the submitters, as far as is possible in presenting a summary of diverse and broad ranging viewpoints. Direct quotations from submitters are used where they reflect a widely held viewpoint or add clarity to this summary.

## 2. Submissions received

A total of 68 submissions were received by DOC and MFish and are summarised here. Submissions were received from the following groups/sectors:

- Community groups – 4
- Conservation Authority and Boards – 7
- Environmental NGOs submitters – 7
- Government (Central) – 3 submissions
- Government (Local) – 8
- Government (Australian) – 1
- Individual – 9
- Industry (seafood, aquaculture, energy, oil and gas) – 9
- Recreational Fishing – 3
- Recreational Diving NGO – 1
- Science – 3
- Tangata whenua – 13

18 of these submissions were made by national bodies representing their national membership. 10 submissions were received from the Auckland region, two from Bay of Plenty, six from Canterbury, four from Hawkes Bay, two from Manawatu-Wanganui, five from Nelson/Tasman, five from Northland, six from Waikato, four from Wellington and one each from Gisborne, Southland, Tarankai, Tauranga, and the West Coast. One submission was received from Australia.

## 3. Overview

As might be expected sector groups vigorously represent their particular interests in relation to MPAs with most groups reiterating positions previously expressed in relation to other recent marine policy initiatives.

## Summary of MPA Submissions – 31 March 2005

Tangata whenua submitters restate their philosophical opposition to ‘lock up’ marine reserves and other generic exclusions of customary sustainable resource management. Tangata whenua submitters also stress that the current proposals have the potential to undermine the Crown’s ability to meet its obligations in relation to the Treaty of Waitangi Fisheries Claims Settlement Act 1992 (the ‘Fisheries Settlement’).

The seafood, aquaculture, energy, and oil and gas industries call for the policy to be developed in the context of sustainable development and to acknowledge the role of existing sustainable management regimes in protecting marine biodiversity.

Tangata whenua and industry submitters also seek greater clarity around what is being protected and why it is being protected. In their view a robust MPA policy needs to include a clear assessment of the threats or risks to biodiversity. This view is supported by recreational fishing groups.

In almost direct opposition to these views, environmental NGOs, conservation boards, and some individuals and community groups want a core network of marine reserves that do not allow for any extractive use. These submitters also call for the scope of the proposed policy to be expanded to protect a broader range of sites for a broader range of purposes.

Just over half (53%) of submitters say they see merit biodiversity protection and express a desire for a more strategic approach to protecting marine biodiversity. These submitters seek a clear framework for biodiversity protection; however, few consider that is provided in the draft MPA policy and implementation plan.

Nearly half of submitters (48%) from across all sector groups say they have not been given sufficient opportunity to participate in the development of the draft policy and implementation plan thus far. Even more important to them is the lack of opportunities provided in the current proposals for stakeholder, tangata whenua and public participation in the future. These submitters insist that meaningful opportunities must be provided for them to participate in all stages of MPA policy development and implementation – and they say the current proposals do not provide this.

Tangata whenua, industry, government, recreational fishing submitters, along with some environmental NGOs and conservation boards (40% of submitters in total) reject all or part of the proposed MPA implementation plan. They are particularly opposed to the proposed parallel implementation processes for DOC and MFish. Instead, these submitters call for a single, participative and coordinated approach to discussing the location and level of protection of particular marine habitats.

Not surprisingly, sector groups reject the use of tools that they have had no involvement in developing. For example, non-fisheries stakeholders are not happy that stock strategies will play a key role in MPA policy and implementation because they don't know what they are and have not had any involvement in their development. Equally, the seafood industry and tangata whenua submitters do not support the use of INMARC because they have not been involved in or consulted on its development.

## **4. Cross sector themes**

Nine key cross sector themes were identified and are discussed in this section. These are:

- Support for a more strategic approach to biodiversity protection
- Critical gaps in marine policy impede progress of MPAs
- Potential to undermine Treaty obligations and failure to recognise customary management practices
- Inadequate provision for stakeholder, tangata whenua and public participation in policy development and implementation
- Exclusion of key central and local government agencies (and associated tools)
- Inadequate implementation processes
- Need for more robust analysis and risk assessment
- Concern with the scope of the policy
- Discussion document unclear, vague and difficult to follow.

### **4.1 Support for a more strategic approach to marine biodiversity protection**

Just over half of submitters see merit biodiversity protection and call for a more a more strategic approach to protecting marine biodiversity. These submitters:

- Support the need to develop an integrated approach to marine protection
- Seek a clear framework for biodiversity protection
- Call for improved coordination between the agencies responsible for biodiversity protection
- Desire a more inclusive approach to biodiversity protection.

However, while submitters from all sector groups are generally supportive of biodiversity protection, few consider that draft MPA policy and implementation plan will deliver a more strategic and effective approach to managing New Zealand's marine biodiversity.

### **4.2 Critical gaps in marine policy impede progress of MPAs**

Submitters across almost all sector groups are concerned that the MPA policy is being developed out of context in the absence of the proposed Oceans Policy. Many (35%) submitters say that critical policy gaps mean that current approach to developing marine legislation and policy is *ad hoc* and will contribute to further fragmentation of marine management and uncertainty for stakeholders and the public.

## Summary of MPA Submissions – 31 March 2005

There is a strongly and widely held view that MPA policy should not be developed before the national Oceans Policy is completed because this will set the strategic direction and frame the high level principles for marine management in New Zealand. More than a quarter of submitters (28%) specifically say MPA policy should not go ahead in the absence of an agreed Oceans Policy with more saying that they are frustrated that the Oceans Policy has not been completed.

These submitters specifically ask what has happened to one or more of the following policy initiatives:

- Oceans Policy
- The Marine Reserves Bill
- The review of the New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement
- Draft Strategy for Managing the Environmental Effects of Fishing (SMEEF)
- Fisheries Plans.

These submitters ask the Government to clarify the current status and proposed timeframes for all of these policy initiatives. A number of submitters express concern that they have formally sought information on these policies but had no response from Government. There is a widely shared view that the draft MPA policy needs to be much better integrated with all of these policies.

Nearly all tangata whenua submitters are concerned that there is a danger that the MPA policy could inadvertently allocate or reallocate rights if it is not developed within the correct strategic scope (i.e. in the context of an agreed Oceans Policy).

Tangata whenua submitters draw parallels between the current raft of overlapping marine policy initiatives and the “foreshore and seabed saga.” They reiterate their grievances regarding the passage of the foreshore and seabed legislation and go on to express strong disenchantment with government initiatives in the marine environment. A number of tangata whenua submitters also note that they have had “no constructive response” to their earlier submissions on the Marine Reserves Bill and therefore find it difficult to have confidence in the current draft policy.

The Treaty Tribes Coalition (TTC) notes that the Government’s desire to adopt a consistent approach to biodiversity protection is undermined by a range of different statutory tests. TTC “reiterates its position that the current Marine Reserves Bill should be recast as a Marine Protected Areas Bill to provide for statutory co-ordination of a range of [marine] management options”.

Te Puni Kokiri also notes that “it is not clear how any conflicts between the MPA policy and the legislative functions of departments will be managed” and says that giving some form of statutory definition to marine protected areas “may assist to manage this risk”.

Two submitters call for a moratorium on the MPA policy statement.

- Ngai Tahu seeks a moratorium “to ensure that applications for marine protected areas are made in a coordinated, planned and systematic fashion under the overarching framework of an operational Oceans Policy”.
- The NZ Recreational Fishing Council notes that the lack of an overall national plan for MPAs will perpetuate the current “ad hoc” nature of MPAs. It submits that a moratorium preventing further MPAs being created should be implemented until the draft MPA policy statement is [able to be implemented in full] and the Oceans Policy implemented.

Not all submitters share this point of view. WWF-NZ supports the rapid progression of the MPA policy despite the delay in developing the Oceans Policy and urges the Government to take all necessary steps to ensuring the passing of the Marine Reserves Bill. Other environmental NGOs also seek faster progress in establishing marine reserves.

Several submitters seek clarification on the legal status of the MPA Policy Statement and Implementation. They also seek clarification on the legal relationship between this policy and other marine legislative and policy tools, particularly the Marine Reserves Bill.

#### **4.3 Treaty Obligations and Customary Management**

Tangata whenua submitters are very concerned that the draft policy does not address the implications of the Treaty on both customary and commercial fishery rights or recognise their kaitiaki role. They are very concerned that the draft policy will impact adversely on their kaitiakitanga and rangatiratanga obligations. Most tangata whenua submitters also say they are very concerned that the proposals (as currently drafted) will force iwi into further conflict with the Crown over rights in the coastal marine area.

A number of submitters from other sector groups are also concerned that the draft policy may impact on the Crown’s Treaty obligations; inadequately recognises customary management practices; and, does not provide for adequate consultation with tangata whenua. The NZ Conservation Authority (NZCA), WWF-NZ, various conservation boards, some community groups and Te Puni Kokiri (TPK) all express concern in relation to these matters.

##### **Potential impacts on Crown’s Treaty Obligations**

Tangata whenua point out that continued access and control over customary fisheries and traditional sites and resources is part of the Crown’s obligation to uphold Treaty guarantees to Maori of rangatiratanga over their fisheries.

They strongly express their fundamental concern that the draft policy (in conjunction with the Marine Reserves Bill) has the potential to impact on the capacity of the Crown to honour the commercial and customary fisheries settlements made with Maori through the *Treaty of Waitangi (Fisheries Claims) Settlement Act 1992*, along with “unextinguished customary rights and aboriginal

title in respect of coastal and marine space”. Reassurance is sought from Government that Treaty fisheries settlements will be safeguarded, rather than undermined, by the draft MPA policy (and other marine policy initiatives).

Te Ohu Kai Moana notes that preliminary analysis (undertaken as part of its work on the Marine Reserves Bill submission) of the potential economic impact on Maori/Iwi quota holdings that were delivered through the fisheries Settlement is has estimated a reduction in value in the order of \$100 million.

Tangata whenua submitters also point out that the Crown’s Treaty obligations in relation to customary management of fisheries include the obligation to consult and involve iwi from an early stage in any process that could involve rangitiratanga over their fisheries.

#### **Inadequate recognition of customary sustainable management practices**

There is disappointment that the policy does not recognise and provide for existing customary rights of tangata whenua in relation to the coastal marine area and the role they play in sustaining biodiversity. Tangata whenua submitters believe that customary management tools offer greater flexibility than other tools promoted in the MPA because they promote “a balanced and holistic approach to fisheries management”.

Ngati Kahungunu reminds the government that tangata whenua are *“philosophically opposed to marine reserves as a tool of preferred choice ... it should be the least preferred option [because marine reserves do not allow for customary sustainable management practices].”*

TPK note that the draft policy does not provide for sufficient consideration of mataitai reserves and taiapure; and, there is a risk that the draft policy will lack credibility with Maori unless it is clear that marine protection regimes based on tikanga and customary resource management practices are recognised. Tangata whenua submitters support this view.

#### **4.4 Inadequate provision for participation**

Building local public support for marine protection is seen as essential by most submitters and the implementation plan is seen as providing little meaningful collaboration between local communities, tangata whenua and the agencies responsible for implementing an MPA programme. There appears to be little confidence that the proposed process will overcome localized tensions and result in an effective MPA programme.

Nearly half of the submissions specifically say that the policy and implementation plan needs to provide for increased stakeholder, tangata whenua and public involvement in key aspects of MPA policy development and implementation.

## Summary of MPA Submissions – 31 March 2005

*“A high level of transparency and stakeholder, tangata whenua, and public participation are critical to the successful development of a representative MPA network ... In order to lend legitimacy to the formation of [the network] the Government should invite greater participation ... WWF-NZ believes that thus far such participation has been inadequate.” (WWF-NZ)*

Northland Regional Council notes that none of the guiding principles in the draft policy recognise “the legitimate role and importance of local community participation in the creation of MPAs”. Several regional councils point out that the list of ‘key players’ in the section on the MPA objective need to be expanded to include recreational fishers – as do recreational fishers themselves.

Tangata whenua, along with a number of submitters from other sectors, are very concerned that there are no clear provisions for incorporating cultural/iwi values and technical expertise into the process.

Ngai Tahu calls for a community led process to develop the policy and establish MPAs.

Environmental and conservations groups cite relationship break downs as the major reason hindering progress in establishing marine reserves and see little in the draft policy to foster improved participation of local communities and tangata whenua.

Some community groups express disappointment with consultation to date noting that DOC’s public presentations allowed “insufficient time for serious consideration of questions”. These groups also express disappointment that MFish was not involved in this phase of consultation.

### **Consultation with Tangata whenua**

TPK and all tangata whenua submitters strongly make the point that the special relationship between the Crown and Maori requires/necessitates on-going consultation with Maori on *all* aspects of MPA policy development and implementation. They are adamant that they “don’t want others making decisions for us”.

Processes to date and the proposed policy development and implementation processes are seen as excluding the role and contributions of whanua, hapu, and iwi in marine biodiversity protection.

*“The process to date has seemed only to engage the government in dialogue with themselves.” (Hauraki Maori Trust Board)*

Some tangata whenua submitters question the intent of the government to take on board their contributions saying that the apparent failure to consult with tangata

whenua prior to developing an implementation and annual operating plan has left them suspicious that the policy is a *fait accompli*.

TPK suggests that a mechanism to mediate any conflicts between Maori interests and those of other marine users may be useful.

#### **Use of Expert Groups**

Environmental NGO, industry, other industry groups, tangata whenua and recreational fishing submitters strongly reject the use of expert groups, which they see as exclusive decision-making fora. These submitters say that they wish to be involved in *all* aspects of MPA policy development and policy.

Industry and tangata whenua submitters consider that the matters that the proposed expert groups are to consider are not just technical (as suggested by Government) but involve substantive policy matters that require the exercise of judgment. They are adamant that such issues should not be determined by ‘expert groups’ as they are “not properly mandated” to make such decisions.

Some environmental NGOs say that expert groups should not be used to determine what constitutes ‘sufficient’ protection under the policy. WWF-NZ considers that stakeholders must be more proactively consulted on protection standards, as this is a key component of the MPA policy.

ECO does not share this view and says that a classification system “needs simply to be approved by marine and conservation experts” and believes that requiring wider agreement is “simply a mechanism for delay and for holding back protection”.

Te Ohu Kai Moana say that if Government continues with its intention to use experts for workshops on protection standards and marine classification systems then that information needs to be made available for further consultation on the underlying policy matters. It is clear though that this is seen as an unsatisfactory and second best option.

### **4.5 Key agencies and tools excluded**

#### **Involvement of central government agencies**

Submitters from central and local government, industry, and environmental NGOs say other agencies need to have a role in MPA policy and implementation – beyond just DOC and the MFish. They say that key government departments should be involved in the same way as they are included, for example, in New Zealand Biodiversity Strategy implementation and Oceans Policy development; i.e. there should be a far clearer role for such departments as MfE, TPK, and MSA, etc.

In particular, the Maritime Safety Authority (MSA) notes that it can make an important contribution to MPAs, particularly through its work relating to the

Maritime Transport Act and with the International Maritime Organisation (IMO). MSA believes its ability to contribute has been overlooked in the draft policy.

**Failure to provide a clear role for regional councils**

Regional councils and a number of submitters from other sectors point out the draft policy fails to provide for regional council involvement in the implementation and management of MPAs. Regional councils express strong disappointment that they are seen to have little role in the proposed regime and are firmly of the view that they should have a role in implementing and managing MPAs, and in representing the local community perspective. Regional councils wish to be seen as a *partner* in the MPA process – not excluded from it.

Regional councils consider that a ‘whole of region’ approach is needed to define MPAs and to provide certainty so that communities can assess the degree to which their use of the coastal marine area will be affected in this context. A whole of region approach is also considered important in terms of determining research and monitoring requirements.

*“In terms of consultation processes and integration with wider environmental management the identification of MPAs would be best undertaken in the context of planning for use, development and protection of the coastal environment as a whole. ... There needs to be further discussion between local, regional and central government agencies to enable the MPA programme to tap into and contribute to this process.”*  
(Environment Waikato)

Regional councils also note that there is no provision to integrate MPAs with Regional Coastal Plans and that there appears to be little understanding of how such plans can contribute. In their view the draft policy needs to recognise the functions of regional councils under s30 of the RMA in regard to the maintenance and enhancement of ecosystems in the coastal marine environment and maintaining indigenous biodiversity.

They are concerned that the failure to take account of regional planning already in place could lead to duplication of processes. Clear reference should be made to the research and monitoring work that regional councils have and are undertaking in respect of their RMA functions.

Tangata whenua submitters also call for a clear role for regional councils, arguing that:

- Regional councils (along with MFish and DOC) need to be held accountable for the MPA policy
- There needs to be satisfactory links to regional councils control of land use to mitigate the adverse effects of land use on coastal biodiversity
- MPA work should be aligned with existing local coastal planning initiatives to avoid duplicating costs for hapu/iwi

- Existing local fora (e.g. Hauraki Gulf Forum and other coastal planning initiatives) should be expanded to include DOC and MFish rather than effort, process and outcomes duplicated.

Industry groups also consider that regional councils need to have a defined role.

#### **4.6 Inadequate implementation processes**

Separate implementation processes and especially separate consultation processes are seen as inefficient and not helpful by a large number of submitters (40%). There is very little support for the proposed parallel implementation process which is variously seen by submitters from all sectors as “patch protection”, “dichotomous and unworkable”, “self-serving” and “business as usual.” The parallel process is generally seen as providing “almost no hope” of an integrated approach to MPAs and there is a widespread call for a single, coordinated process.

Again, tangata whenua submitters are strongly opposed to the proposed implementation processes with some calling for the implementation and operational plans to be deferred pending appropriate and meaningful consultation with hapu/iwi and others seeking a genuine community led process that actively involves tangata whenua and all local stakeholders.

*“The implementation and operating plans need to be deferred until such time as the MPA policy re-alignments are made as a result of iwi and stakeholder feedback.” (Hauraki Maori Trust Board)*

A number of submitters note that there is a lack of clear accountability for delivery of the MPA process. TPK and industry submitters note that it is not at all clear how any conflicts between the MPA policy and the legislative functions of the MFish and DOC will be managed.

Some submitters ask how DOC’s regionally based initiatives and processes will be coordinated with MFish’s nationally developed stock strategies. There is also some concern that there are inconsistencies between DOC conservancies in the process and managerial practices and that these will impede coordination with MFish. Clarification is also sought as to how MFish proposes to address area based protection through stock strategies – see further comment below in section 5.6.

Submitters from all sector groups seek commitment from DOC and MFish to minimize separate consultation process in order to maximize efficiencies and minimize costs to stakeholders. There are calls from various sectors for DOC and MFish to undertake joint regional consultation on the appropriate objectives and mix of tools for MPAs, before implementing the tools for which they have legislative responsibility.

## Summary of MPA Submissions – 31 March 2005

*“We believe it is neither efficient nor effective to carry out two separate sets of consultation processes, given the duplication of costs and the imposition of additional time on key stakeholders.” (Te Ohu Kai Moana)*

The Seafood Industry Council (SeaFIC) believes that the implementation plan is a “business as usual approach to implementation at the operational level, with a thin veneer of overarching principles that are only weakly linked to implementation processes.” They call for the officials group to be led by a “neutral” agency such as the Ministry of the Environment or the Department of Prime Minister and Cabinet.

*“The Implementation Plan proposes a dichotomous approach to implementation, with both agencies (MFish and DoC) essentially carrying out their standard processes. No single agency is clearly accountable for providing an independent, co-ordinated approach at a national level.” (SeaFIC)*

Some environmental NGOs say they have no confidence that MFish is an appropriate agency to be overseeing the development and implementation of MPA policy.

### **Suggestions for Change**

Many submitters suggest changes to various parts of the process; however, two submitters suggest the entire process should be changed. These are Te Ohu Kai Moana and SeaFIC. Their suggestions for substantial change to the proposed implementation process are expressly supported by the other tangata whenua and commercial fishing submitters respectively.

Te Ohu Kai Moana recommends that a “properly considered process” should include:

- An inclusive inventory of what marine protection exists
- A threat analysis (i.e. what needs to be protected from what) and a risk evaluation (i.e. what priority of risk should be addressed first, second, etc.)
- A tool selection analysis including the costs and benefits of using different types of tools (i.e. what option would minimize the threat at least cost to all other legitimate operations and uses)
- An overarching national strategy setting out how this type of analysis should be consistently applied at the national level.

SeaFIC propose an alternative implementation model, characterised by:

- A national co-ordination function with clear single-agency accountability
- Greater emphasis on strategic planning functions undertaken at a national level
- Operational implementation by responsible departments only once biodiversity protection objectives have been identified and the best location(s) and protection tool(s) for a particular habitat type identified.

#### **4.7 Need for more robust analysis and risk assessment**

Tangata whenua, industry and recreational fishing submitters believe that the draft policy needs to incorporate a risk based approach to biodiversity protection.

Tangata whenua submitters criticise the draft policy as “protection for the sake of protection” and seek a clearer analysis of what the biodiversity is being protected from (i.e. what are the threats/risks to biodiversity). They also seek a clear explanation of how MPAs would benefit Maori and why hapu/iwi should support them.

Seafood industry submitters call for a risk based approach to biodiversity protection whereby threats or risks to biodiversity are assessed against clearly defined protection objectives *before* protection mechanisms are selected and put in place. The draft policy statement is found wanting because it “views protection through MPAs as being necessary or desirable regardless of the presence of any actual or potential threat to marine biodiversity”.

The NZ Recreational Fishing council criticises the “ad hoc” nature of the policy and its failure to provide a clear framework for (1) identifying the biodiversity that is at risk (2) identifying what is causing the problem/risk; and (3) choosing the most appropriate protection tool. It says that the lack of a risk based approach will result in MPAs “being in the wrong place for the wrong reasons”.

Meridian Energy also considers that more robust analysis is needed to demonstrate that the risks to biodiversity and the benefits of MPAs clearly outweigh the potentially significant economic and social costs associated with the draft policy. It is very concerned that there is no provision for a rigorous analysis and assessment of the relative costs and benefits of the draft policy statement and implementation plan.

*“Balancing protection and use will not compromise protection objectives ... rather it will ensure that areas are robustly selected and afforded the appropriate level of protection by the most appropriate management tool or mechanism.” (Meridian Energy)*

#### **4.8 Concern with the scope of the proposed policy**

Not surprisingly there are wide ranging views expressed on the appropriate scope of the policy. Broadly speaking there are two camps.

Environmental and other NGOs, science submitters, the NZCA, some conservation boards, and some community groups wish to see the scope of the policy and proposed MPA network expanded to include a broader range of protection purposes (i.e. to include sites with a wide range of other ‘non-biodiversity’ values such as historic, cultural, archaeological, scientific, tourism, recreational, amenity significance, etc).

Tangata whenua and industry submitters say that the MPA policy should recognise customary sustainable management practices and sustainable development concepts so that it provides for (rather than restricts) sustainable utilisation of marine resources.

A small group of individual and community group submitters, along with some regional environmental NGOs are happy with the proposed scope of the policy.

Additionally, a number of submitters from across all the sector groups are concerned that land based impacts and other non fishing threats are not addressed.

These views are discussed in more detail in section 5.3 below.

#### **4.9 Consultation document unclear and difficult to follow**

A number of submitters say that the consultation document is overly complicated and difficult to interpret. They are clearly frustrated (and even angered) by the way in which the policy statement is written and the apparent “lack of logical flow”. Some even suggest the document is deliberately confusing and misleading. The NZCA, tangata whenua and industry submitters, and some environmental NGOs ask that the document be revised and edited for greater clarity.

These submitters also say that the draft policy is very high level and vague, providing little indication of how things will be done in practice.

*“The process in the document leaps from statement of principles to implementation without an adequate explanation of the process in between [and there are] no clear explanations of how key analysis will be incorporated or applied consistently – across the country and across agencies.” (Te Ohu Kai Moana)*

Additionally, there are many statements along the following lines.

- Terms such as ‘network’, ‘fisheries complexes’, ‘best fit tools’, etc. would be more useful if clearly defined.
- Terms such as ‘amount’ [of the marine environment], ‘adequate protection’ ‘sufficient [standard]’ are ambiguous/unclear.
- What is meant by ‘officials group’, ‘inter-agency group’ and ‘technical group’?

## **5. Comments on specific aspects of policy proposals**

### **5.1 NZBS and other national and international commitments**

There is a general call from environmental NGOs, industry, central and local government and some tangata whenua submitters for the definition to be better aligned with (and to reference) international and national umbrella biodiversity documents and commitments such as the CBD, NZBS, IUCN, ANZECC, WSSD, and UNCLOS. While each sector group tends to point to different aspects of

## Summary of MPA Submissions – 31 March 2005

these international instruments/agreements, all agree that they are inadequately referenced and reflected in the draft MPA policy, and many appear genuinely surprised by their omission.

### **New Zealand Biodiversity Strategy (NZBS)**

Industry and tangata whenua submitters remind the government that the NZBS demands the reconciliation of the dual objectives of conserving biodiversity and sustainable use and management of that biodiversity. They say the MPA is too biased towards the first of these objectives and fails to address the second.

Tangata whenua submitters say that the MPA policy cannot be seen as a bicultural approach to biodiversity management and therefore fails to meet the objectives of the NZBS.

Several submitters seek clarification on the current status of the NZBS, noting that there are rumours that MfE and DOC are reviewing the NZBS.

### **Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD)**

A number of submitters are concerned that reference to the CBD is not included in the draft MPA policy. WWF-NZ says that the policy needs to be better aligned with the CBD. Tangata whenua submitters note that the CBD contains both the dual conservation and sustainable use; and, most importantly in their perspective, it also includes specific requirements on how indigenous peoples should be treated in relation to natural resource management and use. SeaFIC also considers that sustainable development context of the CBD needs to be addressed.

### **Australia New Zealand Environment and Conservation Council (ANZECC) and the World Conservation Union (IUCN)**

Environmental NGOs say MPA policy needs to be clearly aligned with and make explicit reference to key ANZECC and IUCN documents and resolutions, including IUCN definition of MPAs as noted above.

### **United Nations Law of the Sea (UNCLOS)**

SeaFIC recommends that a discussion of New Zealand's obligations under UNCLOS be added to the policy statement. These relate to the obligation of coastal states to promote optimum utilization of marine resources, providing access to other States and using best scientific advice in assessing conservation and management measures, maintaining populations at levels allowing for maximum sustainable yield, etc.

### **International Maritime Organisation (IMO)**

MSA notes that the regulation of shipping is a complex area of international law and cannot be taken lightly. It notes that (following lengthy negotiations through the IMO) the area around the Poor Knights Islands is provided with a high level of protection from the impacts of shipping that is internationally recognized. MSA points out that any concerns relating to shipping in the EEZ must be

addressed through the IMO because New Zealand does not have jurisdictional competence to address these at a domestic level.

## **5.2 10% protection target**

Many submitters comment that the 10% is unclear, ambiguous and poorly defined. “10% of what?” is a common question – i.e. is it 10% by area, by region/coastline, of the inshore zone, of EEZ, of habitat type, etc? Some submitters also call for clarity on the percentage of the marine environment that government seeks to protect within the EEZ (in comparison to the coastal marine area).

Some submitters note that the use of the 10% figure has created divisions among stakeholders and find this unhelpful, especially when it is not clear what a “seemingly random 10% figure will achieve in comparison to anything else” (NZ Underwater Association). One submitter says that “as it [10%] has no real defense it undermines the integrity of the rest of the policy” (NZ Marine Sciences Society).

Submitters then split into three camps, those that:

- Support a protection target of 10% (generally individual and community groups, and some conservation boards)
- Seek a target greater than 10% (environmental NGOs)
- Oppose the 10% target (tangata whenua, recreational fishers, and industry submitters).

WWF-NZ, ECO and Forest Bird’s national office call for an increase in the 10% target. They argue that key international initiatives (e.g. 2003 Durban World Parks Congress, 2004 World Conservation Congress) support the protection of areas amounting to 20 - 30% of each marine habitat and that 10% target should therefore be substantially increased.

ECO believes that the proposed policy “aspires to too little conservation” and “debases the meaning and effectiveness” of MPAs. ECOs asserts that at least 30% of each environment type should be designated ‘no take’ and further areas should be managed in accordance with the ICUN categories of marine protected areas. This view is supported by Forest and Bird Central Office.

One conservation board says that marine reserves should be the mechanism of choice and calls for the 10% target to be met through marine reserves saying that other mechanisms should be additional to this.

## **5.3 MPA Objective, Definition and Policy Scope**

Again, there are two broad views – those that seek a broader policy scope and those that want the policy to be developed within the context of sustainable development. Each view is discussed separately.

**Environmental, conservation and NGO view - policy scope should be broadened**

All environmental NGOs express concern with the proposed definition and scope of the policy. They say the current scope is too narrow and they wish to see the definition and scope of the policy amended to reflect “international understanding of the key features of an MPA.”

The following wording from the central office of Forest and Bird generally reflects the characteristics sought by environmental NGOs; that is, MPAs should be:

- *Specially dedicated to protection and maintenance of biological diversity and of natural and associated cultural heritage*
- *Reserved by law*
- *Reserved in perpetuity which can only be revoked by Act of Parliament*
- *Monitored and enforced*
- *Where mining is prohibited*
- *Where ocean dumping and dredging is prohibited*
- *Protected effectively*
- *Include areas protected for biodiversity, amenity, cultural reasons, landscape or just their beauty.*

In general the conservation boards, environmental NGOs, the NZCA and science submitters reject the proposed purpose of protection and maintenance of biodiversity at the marine community, habit and ecosystem level. They consider it is too “narrow” and believe that the scope of the policy should be broadened to include a wider range of purposes for MPAs; e.g. sites of cultural and historic significance, areas set aside for scientific or educational use, areas of high scenic/recreational/tourism value, and areas associated with customary use and the management of fisheries stocks.

The NZ Underwater association also supports broadening the scope of the policy, while the NZCA argue that protection aimed at a wider range of purposes would better reflect local aspirations for marine protection.

ECO strongly disagree that the protection of species and genetic stock should be omitted from the policy scope. ECO argues that this omission means the paper should be renamed the ‘Ecosystems MPA Policy’ because it does not adequately reflect IUCN categories of MPAs (i.e. it only encompasses IUCN category 2). Forest and Bird Central Office also believe that the policy scope should be expanded to include protection of species and genetic stock.

WWF-NZ believes that the basis of the MPA network must be a core of marine reserves, if the network is to achieve its goals. It also believes that biodiversity and other biological criteria must be the primary criteria for identifying areas for protection by marine reserves. ECO and Forest and Bird submitters also support marine reserves as a fundamental part of the MPA policy. The Friends of Banks

## Summary of MPA Submissions – 31 March 2005

Peninsula group “wishes to see a network of marine reserves around the Banks Peninsula coastline protecting a range of representative and special areas”.

Some regional environmental NGOs would like to see an equivalent provision in the policy to that in the National Parks Act that allows the NZCA and conservation boards to initiate proposals to add to or establish national parks.

All environmental NGOs seek greater alignment of the definition with the IUCN definition.

ECO and Forest and Bird Central Office want the words “especially dedicated to the protection *and* maintenance of biological diversity” inserted into the definition as in the IUCN MPA definition (i.e. they want the word “or” changed to “and”).

Forest and Bird Central Office say that the network should apply the principles of “comprehensiveness, adequacy and representativeness, and be designed to be resilient”. It also notes that the draft policy fails to consider the many benefits of MPAs and recommends that these are included.

### **Tangata whenua and industry view – the policy should be developed within the context of customary sustainable management/sustainable development**

Tangata whenua submitters strongly disagree with proposed definition and policy saying it appears geared towards the establishment of marine reserves and the *exclusion* of biodiversity maintenance and protection within a sustainable utilisation model. They call for a more balanced and holistic approach to managing marine biodiversity.

As noted above tangata whenua submitters believe that customary management tools play a key role in sustaining biodiversity. They seek clear recognition of these tools and of the principles of Maori resource management that promote the sustainable utilisation of biodiversity.

Tangata whenua submitters consider that places of cultural heritage can also be places of high biodiversity and disagree that the scope of the policy does not directly address protection of cultural heritage.

Seafood industry submitters recommend that the MPA policy be developed within the context of sustainable development consistent with the CBD. SeaFIC and other seafood industry submitters argue that MPA policy should clearly recognise the role of underlying management regimes and other non-area based mechanisms for protecting marine biodiversity.

*“The seafood industry would rather see sustainable utilisation practices (which do not have an adverse effect on biodiversity) across the whole marine environment than a restricted and narrow interpretation of*

## Summary of MPA Submissions – 31 March 2005

*“protection” to refer only to highly protected island-like biodiversity zoos.” (SeaFIC)*

SeaFIC and other seafood industry submitters also point to the importance of adopting a least-cost approach to biodiversity protection – in selecting appropriate protection tools and in locating MPAs. Reference is made to the Government’s Code of Good Regulatory Practice which stipulates that any Government intervention should adopt the minimum required and least distorting regulatory measures to achieve desired outcomes. Costs associated with the draft policy and implementation plan are seen largely as opportunities forgone (e.g. a lower level of support and legitimacy for MPAs and excessive levels of government expenditure).

Meridian Energy is concerned that the draft policy may adversely impact the existing and future development of New Zealand’s renewable energy resources. It is particularly concerned that the long term ability to operate (and improve the efficiency and utilization of) the Manapouri Power Station may be prejudicially affected.

The aquaculture industry council is concerned that the policy makes no reference to aquaculture and seeks explicit recognition of existing and new marine farming in the MPA policy and implementation plan.

### **MPAs in the NZ EEZ**

Environmental NGOs support the establishment of MPAs in the EEZ. ECO and Forest and Bird Central Office believe that the scope should further be expanded to the continental shelf – ECO also wants to see internal waters included.

The NZCA is “pleased that the policy statement covers the entire EEZ”.

However, industry submitters believe that inadequate consideration has been given to the implications of extend the scope of the policy into the EEZ and say this may be inconsistent with international law and inconsistent with New Zealand’s obligations under UNCLOS. The Petroleum Association of New Zealand (PEANZ) has provided Government with a legal opinion that suggests establishing MPAs in the EEZ may not be within New Zealand’s domestic jurisdiction. PEANZ, SeaFIC and other seafood industry submitters recommend that the proposal to apply the policy to the EEZ is reconsidered in the light of international law.

The NZ Marine Sciences Society also says that any attempt to establish MPAs outside the EEZ would need to be consistent with New Zealand’s obligations under UNCLOS, but notes that Australia and the USA have successfully taken this approach.

**Land based impacts and non-fishing threats not addressed**

A number of submitters are concerned that land based impacts and other non-fishing threats such as those caused by shipping/transport are not addressed.

MSA note that the draft policy is very focused on fisheries conservation and damage associated with fishing activities, rather than a more comprehensive biodiversity conservation focus. It notes that the disposal of waste at sea and the management of discharges into the sea from offshore oil and gas activities are not addressed. MSA is responsible for the regulation of these activities and seeks discussion on how these issues will be managed.

Industry and tangata whenua submitters would also like to see land based impacts addressed.

*“A desired outcome would be government and communities, Maori included, working co-operatively to ameliorate, diminish and eventually reverse land-based pollution of our oceans and waterways.” (Ngati Kahungunu)*

Some submitters (mainly regional environmental NGOs) go further and call for the land adjacent to the marine area to be protected as part of the MPA policy, although this is not a widely held position.

**5.4 Implementation Principles**

There is mixed support for these principles and comments here generally reflect points made in relation to the key cross-sector themes identified above. A number of submitters do not even bother to comment on the network and site selection principles (or make comments on only one or two of them), saying they cannot comment meaningfully because the policy statement is too high level with little detail on how it will be implemented.

Many say the principles themselves are not clear, too vague, not easy to interpret and difficult to relate to the rest of the document. One submitter describes the “extensive list of principles” as “a mixture of statements, proposed actions and some principles.”

**Generic Principle 1 – national priorities**

Several submitters say national priorities need to be established over a longer timeframe (than the proposed annual process) to provide certainty for marine users and set the strategic direction for the network.

For example, the NZ Big Game Fishing Council questions the need for annual priority setting saying the policy should provide a more strategic approach and greater long term certainty for selection and establishment of MPAs.

## Summary of MPA Submissions – 31 March 2005

Meridian Energy suggests that national priorities should have a life of at least three years – consistent with the life of the implementation plan.

### **Generic Principle 3 – level of protection**

Submitters from all sector groups question how key aspects such as “national priorities” and “sufficient protection” will be determined and say this needs to be the subject of a robust process of consultation. Some tangata whenua submitters are concerned that protection will be interpreted as purely western based science and say that the ‘standard’ should include Māori based environmental concepts and indicators.

### **Generic Principle 4 – property rights**

Comments here largely reflect the now established positions of submitters regarding property rights.

The seafood industry want to ensure that existing property rights are not undermined and reiterate that secure property rights play a vital role in contributing to sustainable management of marine resources. Meridian Energy says it is “essential that existing marine environment economic rights are recognised and protected”. All industry groups want the MPA policy to include a clearer explanation of what constitutes a legal property right and why property rights need to be recognised.

Tangata whenua submitters insist that commercial and customary property rights should not be undermined by the MPA policy – and clearly believe that the draft policy has the potential to undermine these rights.

Environmental NGOs point out that private property rights should not impede progress toward establishing a network of MPAs. ECO says that “public rights should take priority over private rights”. WWF-NZ says that “the long-term viability of the network [should] be favoured over the benefits of short-term economic activities”.

Recreational fishers ask for their rights (along with the rights of the public) to be clearly defined and recognised in the policy.

Community groups and individual submitters are generally unclear about the use of property rights terminology, as are many other submitters. Typical questions include:

- Is the term ‘property rights’ used to refer only to rights in relation to the Fisheries Act or does it extend to other users of the marine environment?
- Is it intended that ‘property rights’ take precedence over other rights?
- What is meant by terms such as ‘will be respected’ and ‘where appropriate recognition will be given’?

**Generic Principle 5 – relationship between the Crown and Maori**

Nearly all tangata whenua submitters say that the principle does not reflect the statutory protection or recognition afforded to hapu/iwi and point out that it needs to be reworded to reflect these provisions exactly. There is disappointment that the Crown does not say more explicitly how it will accord with the principle and implement it in planning and establishing MPAs. WWF-NZ also shares this concern.

**Generic Principle 10 – input and participation**

A number of submitters suggest that the principle should be reworded so that it does not imply that only those ‘interested in biodiversity protection’ will be involved.

Auckland Regional Council’s suggested rewording of the principle captures this view well:

*“MPA implementation will be undertaken in a transparent manner that constructively engages the public, tangata whenua, regional councils and particular interest groups whose use of the coastal marine area will be affected by MPAs, in addition to groups with and interest in marine biodiversity.”*

**Compensation**

The Treaty Tribes Coalition *“reiterate to Government” the principle that, “where a choice is made to protect a public interest such as biodiversity in a manner that adversely impacts on private property rights (including the customary, common law and Treaty rights of Maori) cannot be avoided, that should occur by negotiation with the holder(s) of the rights affected and proper compensation should be paid.”*

SeaFIC emphasises that “fishers and commercial rights holders are not generally in favour of compensation and view it as an option of last resort”, saying that they would “prefer to see a biodiversity protection regime that uses scientifically justified, least cost mechanisms and provides for sustainable extractive uses”.

The NZ Recreational Fishing Council considers that compensation must be paid where there are adverse effects on resource users but note that, where there are such adverse effects “MPAs should not be created in the first place”, thereby removing the need for compensation.

**Displaced fishing effort**

The New Zealand Marine Sciences Society (NZMSS) notes that the policy does not address issues relating to displaced fishing effort resulting from the establishment of MPAs; and, this is also raised by some seafood industry submitters.

It is suggested that effort displacement may lead to increased fishing pressure on, and risk to, populations, areas and biodiversity outside MPAs. The NZMSS suggests that the evaluation of the effects of establishing MPAs/marine reserves needs to take account of the likely short-term negative effects resulting from the displacement of fishing activity, as well as the longer-term positive effects through spillover into adjacent fisheries.

## **5.5 Protection Tools**

A number of submitters seek greater clarification on how the government intends to integrate the proposed protection tools at a strategic and operational level. Others simply say that it is not clear how the tools described in this section of the document will be operationalised and do not comment further.

Industry and tangata whenua submitters say that any new protection tools need to be justified in light of existing tools and their ability to address risks to biodiversity at least cost.

PEANZ notes that the following tools are omitted: exclusion zones around offshore installations under the Continental Shelf Act, voluntary routeing codes under the Maritime Transport Act, vessel exclusion zones under the IMO framework; and agreed industry codes of practice. PEANZ suggest these tools may be appropriate to provide protection in the EEZ.

ECO says that the draft policy “debases the meaning and currency of MPAs” by proposing that such wide range of management tools be recognised as protection. ECO points out that Fisheries Act closures are not permanent and should not therefore qualify as MPAs.

Forest and Bird Central Office says that many of the areas/tools proposed by officials could be described as “paper parks” (i.e. areas which exist on maps but are not reserved in law to protect biodiversity or the natural environment). It compares the areas/tools proposed for MPAs in NZ against international MPA criteria to demonstrate that only marine reserves, marine mammal sanctuaries and wildlife refuges or sanctuaries could be described as meeting the IUCN or ANZECC criteria for MPAs.

Forest and Bird Central Office sees fishing as an “unreasonable activity” in a MPA, “just as mining has been accepted as an unreasonable activity”.

Local government, central government and many other submitters note the document shows an inadequate understanding of potential for RMA tools and processes to contribute to MPAs.

Others support the view that many of the proposed tools are not appropriate for MPAs because they have been developed for a different purpose.

## Summary of MPA Submissions – 31 March 2005

*Only non-extractive management tools can protect marine biodiversity – tools that promote sustainable management should be removed as they are for a completely different purpose. (Northland Regional Council)*

### **Cable protection zones**

There appears to be little support for including cable protection zones as MPAs. The few submitters who do comment on them say that cable protection zones are not appropriate tools for MPAs because they are designed for another purpose (e.g. some environmental NGOs and conservation boards, and the NZ Underwater Association).

One submitter says that “they should only be considered if robust scientific evidence shows that they effectively protect biodiversity”.

### **Fisheries Stock Strategies**

There is considerable uncertainty as to how stock strategies will contribute to MPAs. Non-fisheries stakeholders do not know what stock strategies are and are very unclear about how they will be used in the MPA implementation. They do not want something they don't understand and have not been involved in developing used a core plank of the MPA policy.

Seafood industry and tangata whenua submitters are also uncertain as to how they will be used. Many comment that MFish is already behind schedule in implementing these strategies.

Several submitters (e.g. ECO and Ngai Tahu) point out that stock strategies are too single stock focused to provide effective area based protection.

A number of regional councils ask to be included as ‘stakeholders’ in terms of fisheries stock strategies. Auckland Regional Council notes that regional council functions under section 30 of the RMA overlap with MFish functions in respect of the “effects of fishing on the aquatic environment”.

## **5.6 MPA Implementation Plan**

General comments on the implementation plan are covered in section 4 above. More detailed comments are presented here.

### **Classification system**

Submitters from all sector groups are adamant that they want to be closely involved in the development of the classification system and reject the concept of leaving the further refinement of MEC and INMARC (or any other classification system) to an expert group. They are angry that government proposes to use such groups and that they have not been consulted on this issue. Submitters also question the membership of such a group and want to know who is on it, how it has been selected, what are its terms of reference, etc.

## Summary of MPA Submissions – 31 March 2005

However, submitters generally support the need for a classification system and a number support the use of the MEC and INMARC as a starting point but most note the need for further refinement of these systems. Tangata whenua and commercial fishers do not support the use of INMARC at all because they have had no involvement in its development.

Submitters from across almost all the sector groups want the IUCN principles on marine protected areas to be taken into account in developing a classification framework and associated management units or regions.

### **Monitoring and review**

Many submitters note that this section is very vague with little information on the actual detail of the proposed monitoring programme. Several submitters say that this section needs to incorporate a process for assessing whether an MPA tool is still required to protect biodiversity and to specify how it might be removed and/or replaced it with a more suitable tool.

Environment Waikato and many other submitters comment that little information is provided on how proposed monitoring will be carried out to ascertain that individual MPAs are meeting their objectives. They seek more clarity on what research and monitoring will be done and how it will be done.

*“It is critical to ensure that research is carried out to determine the best design for MPAs, the social and economic impact of MPAs, the impact of displaced fishing effort on stock status and whether the stated policy goals or particular MPAs are in fact effective.” (NZ Marine Sciences Society)*

The NZMSS also submit that “sufficient departmental and/or FRST funding must be available to support monitoring and research before and after the establishment of an MPA”.

WWF-NZ say that there needs to be greater clarity as to who will fund and oversee monitoring of the network and that such monitoring should occur over long time periods. WWF-NZ also recommends that the implementation plan specify who will undertake and fund monitoring of MPA implementation.

### **Timeline too ambitious**

Many submitters note that the proposed timeline is unrealistic and unworkable. A number say they have no confidence that the timeline will be achieved because MFish’s target of developing the majority of stock strategies by August 2005 is “completely unrealistic”. These submitters call for the Government to be more realistic about what needs to be done to develop and implement MPAs.

### **Regional prioritisation**

Several regional councils question how regions have prioritized and note that there appears to be no particular reasons as to why they are prioritized in this way.

Almost every regional council wishes to discuss these priorities with central government.

#### **Safety issues**

MSA note that requiring ships to navigate around large MPAs may present safety concerns for vessels at sea that would need to be addressed in the policy.

### **5.7 MPA Operational Plan**

Many submitters do not bother to comment on the operational plan saying that policy and implementation approach requires substantial revision/improvement before a work plan can be developed. Tangata whenua and industry submitters in particular have little faith in the operating plan and do not support it.

Other submitters (particularly those from the science and environmental sectors) note that the policy has substantial budget implications and wish to see explicit quantification of resourcing requirements and adequate resources provided.

*“An implementation plan without realistic appraisal of costs and the likelihood of resources being made available is groundless.”  
(Nelson/Marlborough Conservation Board)*

## **6. Requests to be heard**

Four submitters request a meeting with the government and/or an opportunity to make an oral submission. These are:

- Te Runanga A Iwi O Ngapuhi
- The Ngatiwai Trust Board – the Board is concerned that planned discussions with the Minister of Conservation have not occurred and seek full discussions on all aspects of marine policy before any further work is progressed in relation to the rohe of Ngatiwai.
- Ngati Kahungunu Iwi
- Meridian Energy.

The Nelson/Tasman branch of Forest and Bird say that, if there are to be oral submissions, then they would like to speak further to the matters raised in their submission.

## 7. List of submitters

<b>Submission Number</b>	<b>Submitter</b>	<b>Organisation</b>
1	Dr Mike Patrick	Petroleum Exploration Association of NZ
2	Julian Roberts	Maritime Safety Authority
3	Rangi Spooner	Kaitiaki A Moremore
4	Ian Skins	
5	Malcolm Todd	
6	David MacClement	
7	John Mandemaker	Environment Bay of Plenty Regional Council
8	B & S Williams	
9	Ross Garrett	East Coast Bays Coastal Protection Society Inc
10	Geoff Vincent	Parks Victoria, Australia
11	Alan Armitage	Tauranga Forest & Bird
12	R A (Bob) Meikle	Akaroa Harbour Recreational Fishing Club Inc
13	Dr Alison MacDiamid	New Zealand Marine Sciences Society (NZMSS)
14	Alison Stilwell	Auckland Regional Council (ARC)
15	Danielle Keil-Lambert	Ngati Kahungunu Iwi Inc
46	Submission not received	Local Government New Zealand (LGNZ)
17	Chris Ingle	West Coast Regional Council
18	Ken Catt	Royal Forest & Bird Protection Society (Waitakere Branch)
19	Lloyd Beech	East Coast Hawkes Bay Conservation Board
20	Kerry Marshall	New Zealand Conservation Authority
21	Reid Quinlan	
22	Andrew Dennis (Dr)	Royal Forest & Bird Protection Society (Nelson/Tasman Branch)
23	Vijaya Vaidyanath	Rodney District Council
24	Kevin O'Sullivan	Environment Southland
25	Bruce Galloway	Guardians of Mimiwhangata's Fisheries and Marine Environmental Inc
26	Blair Dickie	Environment Waikato
27	Liane Ngamane	Hauraki Maori Trust Board
28	Paddy Stafford-Bush	Auckland Conservation Board
29	Alan Vaughan	Friends of Golden Bay Society Inc
30	Peter Crabb	New Zealand Underwater
31	Anshuman Chakraborty	Victoria Law School
32	Chris Thomson	Meridian Energy Ltd
33	Tom Hollings	NZ Acquaculture Council
34	Nicholas Westwood	Ministry of Tourism
35	Tony Seymour	Northland Regional Council
36	Roger Fagg	Canterbury Aoraki Conservation Board
37	Fiona Gordon	Horizons Regional Council

## Summary of MPA Submissions – 31 March 2005

<b>Submission Number</b>	<b>Submitter</b>	<b>Organisation</b>
38	Andrew Bond	Sanford Limited
39	Addie Smith	Ngatiwai Trust Board
40	Jeremy Cooper	Paua Industry Council Ltd
41	Jeff Romeril	New Zealand Big Game Fishing Council Inc
42	Max Hetherington	N Z Recreational Fishing Council
43	Carol Scott	Challenger Finfisheries Management Co Ltd
44	Nici Gibbs	The New Zealand Seafood Industry Council
45	Ed Arron	PAUA 2
46	Jo-Anne Vaughan	Forest & Bird Golden Bay Branch
47	Ropata Taylor	Nelson/Marlborough Conservation Board
48	Hally Toia	Te Runanga o Ngati Whatua
49	Veronica Friedlander	
50	Dr Mark Costello	Leigh Marine Laboratory
51	Kate Batram	The Pagrus Auraturs Company Ltd
52	Keren Spong	
53	Teresa Tepania-Ashton	Te Runanga A Iwi O Ngapuhi
54	Dawn Pomana	Treaty Tribes Coalition
55	Miria Pomare	Te Runanga o Toa Rangatira Inc
56	Kelly O'Hara	Taranaki/Whanganui Conservation Board
57	Timothy Langlois	Leigh Marine Laboratory
58	Barbara Ware	Northland Conservation Board
59	Allison Arnold	WWF - New Zealand
60	Tania McPherson	Te Ohu Kai Moana
61	Nigel Scott	Ngai Tahu Development
62	Jane West	Ngati Whatua
63	D Brailsford & J Cook	The Friends of Banks Peninsula
64	Meredith Stewart	
65	Peter Galvin	Te Puni Kokiri
66	Cath Wallace	Environment and Conservation Organisations of NZ Inc
67	Barry Weeber	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society
68	Tu Williams	Bay of Plenty
69	Hone Taumaunu	Ngati Konohi Authority Inc