WARO REGIONAL FEEDBACK/CONSULTATION & LAND ASSESSMENT

REGION: Easter South Island
DIRECTOR: [redacted]
WARO COORDINATOR: [redacted]

Also refer ESI Regional Communications Plan: DOC-5486285

1. Treaty Partners
2. Conservation Board
3. Consultation with stakeholders & WARO industry

SECTION A: Treaty Settlement implications
If you have any questions about Treaty Settlement implications of an application, contact [redacted] *Treaty Negotiations Team, and he will advise you who to talk to in the Treaty Negotiations Team.*

- Is any site subject to the application due to be transferred to whānau, hapū, or iwi?
  If no, go to question 4. If yes, identify the site.

  No.

- Has a Treaty settlement disclosure form been completed for the site? Were any existing encumbrances noted on that form?

  N/A

- Who is leading the negotiations process for DOC in the Policy Negotiations Team?

  N/A

- If your Treaty Partners have settlement legislation in place already, are there any specific post-settlement implementation obligations that relate to the site or proposed activity?

  Nothing specific – genuine consultation/partnership.

SECTION B: Marine and Coastal (Takutai Moana) Area Act 2011
If you have any questions about the Marine and Coastal (Takutai Moana) Area Act or the consultation required by this Act, firstly check the Concessions Guidance Document, and secondly, contact [redacted] *(agilby@doc.govt.nz).*

- Is the location subject to any applications or approvals for customary marine title or protected marine rights under the Marine and Coastal (Takutai Moana) Act 2011? If yes, identify the Treaty Partners who have either applied for or had approved customary marine title or protected marine rights at the location.

  N/A

- If yes, has the Applicant provided evidence of consultation with these Treaty Partners? *The Applicant has a requirement to consult with anyone who has an application under the Act that is additional to DOC's consultation with Treaty Partners. See the Concessions Guidance Document for more information).*

  N/A

SECTION C: Whānau, hapū, and iwi consulted

Complete the Consultation Summary table – copy this table if more columns are required.

Consultation Summary			
Treaty Partner consulted with	**TRONT**	**Te Ngai Tuahuriri**	**Te Hapu o Ngati Wheke**
Date consultation was sent out	15 June 2018	9 May 2018	9 May 2018
Consultation time frame end date	N/A	N/A	N/A
Consultation method (email, phone, face to face etc)	Phone, e-mail.	Phone call, followed by letter	Phone call, followed by letter
How many attempts made to consult?	Multiple phone conversations and the formal e-mail on 15 June.	Two	Two
DOC-CM link to any consultation emails received	DOC-5545441 30 July 2018 (advised to work with Papatipu Runaka)	N/A	N/A

Treaty Partner consulted with	**Te Runanga o Koukourarata**	**Onuku Runanga**	**Wairewa Runanga**
Date consultation was sent out	9 May 2018	9 May 2018	9 May 2018
Consultation time frame end date	N/A	N/A	N/A
Consultation method (email, phone, face to face etc)	Phone call, followed by letter	Phone call, followed by letter	Phone call, followed by letter
How many attempts made to consult?	Two	Two	Two
DOC-CM link to any consultation emails received	N/A	N/A	N/A

Treaty Partner consulted with	**Te Taumutu Runanga**	**Te Runanga o Arowhenua**	**Te Runanga o Waihao**
Date consultation was sent out	9 May 2018	N/A	N/A

Consultation time frame end date	N/A	N/A	N/A
Consultation method (email, phone, face to face etc)	Phone call, followed by letter	Phone call	Phone call
How many attempts made to consult?	Two	One	One
DOC-CM link to any consultation emails received	N/A	N/A	N/A

Note: The Southern South Island Region consulted with Te Runanga o Moeraki, Kai Huirapa Runaka ki Puketraki, and Te Runanga o Otakou as the majority of the WARO activity occurring in the rohe of these papatipu runaka occur in the SSI Region.

SECTION D: Consultation with Ngai Tahu

- Does this application activate any agreed triggers for consultation with Treaty Partners? *[Delete answers that do not apply*]

  Yes – Answer remaining questions.

  No – Note that triggers are not met, provide a doc-CM link to the agreed triggers document. Do not complete the remaining questions unless consultation is undertaken.

  There are no agreed triggers – Answer remaining questions.

- **Did the whānau, hapū, or iwi engage in consultation on this application?**

Yes, at TRONT level we received a letter advising to work with papatipu runaka. All papatipu runaka were consulted with, but no requests received to be further involved with this process.

- **What is the interest of the whānau, hapū, or iwi in the site or activity?**

Based on the above response, and assuming that this was indicative, I consider that there is little interest in this activity.

- **What are their views on the activity (taking place at the specified site)?**

As above.

- **What sort of adverse effects do the whānau, hapū, or iwi believe the activity will have on their interests (at the specified site)?**

None mentioned, but assume that removal of any introduced animal species will have a positive effect on natural values.

- Have the whānau, hapū, or iwi identified any methods to avoid, remedy, or mitigate these effects?

None mentioned.

- Summarise any other information provided by the whānau, hapū, or iwi.

None mentioned.

2. CONSULTATION UNDERTAKEN WITH CONSERVATION BOARD & RESPONSE RECEIVED

[redacted] did discuss the 2018 WARO permit process with [redacted] the chair of the Aoraki Canterbury Conservation Board (there is e-mail correspondence dated 17 & 23 April 2018).

The WARO process was also tabled at the Conservation Board Meeting on 12 June, held at Arowhenua Marae.

[redacted] commented that at this meeting, the main conversation centred around the St James Conservation Area and the need to be consistent with the CMS. [redacted] has an action point where he has advised he will report back to the Board before he signs off the WARO process. This is on the agenda for the meeting of 23 August in Geraldine.

Please see pages 2 & 3 of the draft Minutes from the June Board meeting. Link below.

https://doccm.doc.govt.nz/wcc/faces/wccdoc?dID=5343839&dDocName=DOC-5506188

3. DRAFT LAND ASSESSMENT - CONSULTATION WITH STAKEHOLDERS & WARO INDUSTRY -

Engagement undertaken	The following meetings were held: 3 May, Rangiora, Nth Canterbury Hunter Liaison Group (7-9pm) 12 June, Geraldine, Sth Canterbury Hunter Liaison Group (7-9pm) 25 June, Rangiora, Nth Canterbury Hunter Liaison group (7-9pm) 27 June, Mahaanui, Recreational Hunters (10am – 12noon) 27 June, Mahaanui, WARO operators (1 – 3pm)
Summary of feedback	Generally, the recreational hunters were wanting no WARO permitted on any new/extra pcl, and also no WARO to be permitted on any easily accessible pcl (good road access), or areas where they prefer to hunt. Generally, the WARO operators seemed to be happy with the status quo – and were concerned if any large areas were being taken out of the WARO permits (eg buffers around new tracks, etc.
What changes (if any) did this result in	The recommendation to close part of the St James Conservation Area appears to be the biggest change to the existing (old) permit.
Links to relevant documents ((e.g. consultation records, submission record/summary)	ESI Regional Communications Plan: DOC-5486285 District Offices (Rangiora, Twizel, Geraldine) were drafting their own submission record/summary. **Submission Summaries** Rangiora/Nth Canterbury table: DOC-5525163 Te Manahuna/Twizel table: DOC-5549351 Raukapuka summary: DOC-5555691 Coastal Otago table: DOC-5534279 • *Aoraki & Mahaanui Districts do not have any WARO activity.* **Meeting records:** • Rangiora Hunter Liaison, 3 May DOC-5547591 • Sth Canterbury Hunter Liaison, 12 June (Agenda DOC-3057916) – see [redacted] for notes/record if required) • Rangiora Hunter Liaison, 25 June (not in doccm, see [redacted] for notes/record) • WARO, Mahaanui, Rec Hunters, 27 June (am) DOC-5541874 WARO, Mahaanui, Operators, 27 June (pm)