

Recommendations following analysis of public submissions on the draft

Te Kaweka Takohaka mō te Hoiho and Te Mahere Rima Tau

Prepared by the Hoiho Technical Group
1 December 2019

CONTENTS

- Section 1.0 Introduction
- Section 2.0 Important issues
 - 2.1 Process
 - 2.2 Substantive

1.0 INTRODUCTION

This report has been prepared by the Hoiho Technical Group (HTG) for the Hoiho Governance Group (HGG), its purpose is to identify the significant results of the public consultation process on the draft documents, *Te Kaweka Takohaka mō te Hoiho* and *Te Mahere Rima Tau* and to record the decisions of the Hoiho Governance Group to complete the strategy.

The detailed analysis of submission is contained in the companion report to this document entitled “**Summary of public submissions on the draft Te Kaweka Takohaka mō te Hoiho and Te Mahere Rima Tau**” December 2019

This report is the synthesis of the comments made in the submissions into the key messages and urgent matters that need to be addressed by the HGG. For each major issue that the Hoiho Technical Group has identified, we have described the issue, and where necessary provided a comment from HTG to give context or background and recorded the decision made by the HGG.

This report focuses on the substantive matters raised in each submission. Minor issues and the finer details that were raised by submitters have been collated and will be addressed as part of the final review and edit of the strategy and action plan documents.

2.0 IMPORTANT ISSUES

2.1 Process

2.1.1 Requests to be heard

There were nine requests for oral submissions to be presented to the HGG.

HTG comments that oral submissions were not formally offered as part of the consultation process. If opportunities are provided for a hearing, then in the interests of fairness an invitation may need to be extended to all other submitters.

HGG decision is not to hold hearings on submissions as this will consume time and energy that should be directed towards the urgent completion of this work and subsequent implementation.

2.1.2 Stakeholder involvement

Nineteen submissions (18%) commented at some level on the structure of the group involved in hoiho recovery. Submissions varied but typically mentioned a lack of involvement of other stakeholders (e.g. researchers, rehabilitators, vets, tourism operators, local government, NGOs, fishers, public, site managers), including:

- All stakeholders involved in implementation should be involved in development of the plan.
- Researchers, rehabilitators and other experts were not involved.
- Stakeholders should be acknowledged and included within the document.

HTG comments that these submissions did not take into consideration the previous rounds of engagement through the stocktake report, nor other engagement such as the annual symposium and the pre-season meeting, nor CSP and AWEG meetings. The topics covered within the strategy and action plan are exceptionally varied and thus involve a wide range of stakeholders. It would be difficult to effectively include all of the stakeholders involved in hoiho conservation as part of the HTG/HGG group, whilst maintaining momentum to complete the strategy and move forward into the implementation phase.

HGG decision is that the HTG:

- a. amend documents to make clear the intention to involve stakeholders with a specific interest in each individual action in the implementation and review of that action.
- b. amend the documents to show the annual cycle of events to support the implementation and review of Te Kaweka and Te Mahere.
- c. include an acknowledgement of all of those involved in hoiho conservation in Te Mahere Rima Tau.
- d. commit to strategic priority 19 and will need to show that we engage with and listen to stakeholders.
- e. don't change the partnership structure at this late stage of completing Te Kaweka Takohaka mō te Hoiho for the reasons outlined in the comments.

2.1.3 Strategy framework (re-write)

Nine of 105 submissions (9%) recommended using one of four different frameworks to re-write the strategy and action plan. Five submissions from researchers at Otago University suggested a complete re-write using a different framework or structure (using a different group of experts). Two of these submissions requested using the kakapo model and three suggested a framework of fundamental objectives (see specifics under process and document structure). Two additional structures were proposed in two submissions from rehabilitators and one submission from a vet.

HTG comments that the current structure and layout of the Strategy covers the substantive points made in these submissions. There are a number of ways in which to write such strategies and the more substantive point is to ensure that there is a clear logic train from: vision to goal to objectives to actions and that this is clear in the current plan.

HGG decision is not to rewrite the strategy and action plan, but that the HTG focus on improving the specificity of the actions and making sure that they all SMART.

2.1.4 Resourcing

Four submissions (4%) asked that the resources available to support hoiho conservation work be identified (whether this be in the form of dollar value, support roles, extra rangers etc).

HTG comments that the style for recovery plans and strategies is that the necessary resources are not included in the plan as they are subject to change. Inclusion of this material can lead to problems of transparency which is what the submitters are seeking to have clarified. In addition, four agencies are involved which may make funding difficult to track.

HGG decision is that we do not specify supporting resources in the strategy or action plan.

2.1.5 SMART actions

Fourteen submissions (13%) suggested that actions should be -specific, -measurable, -achievable, -relevant and -time-bound (i.e. SMART) with performance indicators.

HGG decision is that the HTG reviews Te Mahere to ensure that actions are SMART and Treaty Compliant.

2.1.6 Accountability

Six submissions (6%) suggested identification of a lead person or organization, so that responsibility and accountability are clearly defined. One submission suggested that the partners and collaborators should be listed separately rather than being listed together under the “who” column.

HGG decision is that the Te Mahere:

- a. does not identify Partner leads for actions in Te Mahere because this will work against a commitment of mutual commitment that the Partnership in intended to promote.
- b. is amended to specifically recognize the stakeholder engaged in delivering the action.

2.1.7 Prioritisation and detail

There were four submissions that suggested that strategic priorities should be listed in order of importance within the document. An additional two submissions suggested that marine threats should be prioritized, and others suggested that other themes should be prioritised. Prioritisation was also mentioned under the separate themes of the documents. Two submissions stated that the action plan was not easy to read, one called for more detail and one called for fewer actions.

HTG comments that the strategic priorities are not currently prioritized, but that individual actions are assigned a priority order, e.g. E (essential), H (high), or M (medium). HTG was originally tasked to create a high-level action plan.

HGG decision is that the:

- a. strategic priorities will not be prioritised and not change the order in which they are presented.
- b. priority order for each of the actions is sufficiently achieved by E, H, or M designation.
- c. by making actions SMART the detail should become clearer.

2.2 Substantive

Ten submissions (10%) commented that the strategy and action plan is far too timid and need to place a lot more assertive priority on the conservation of hoiho over anthropogenic marine and terrestrial activities. Fourteen submissions (13%) state that urgency and immediate action is required (and in addition, urgency was called for under each theme of the document).

An additional six submissions (6%) call for urgent elimination of known threats. In particular, submissions called for concerted action in the marine environment to address fisheries and marine protected areas.

2.2.1 Establish marine protected areas

Eleven submissions (11%) have called for the immediate designation of large marine protected areas (or no take areas) throughout hoiho foraging habitat. Six submissions (6%) stated that the lack of marine protected areas was the reason for disagreement with the priorities for theme 2. Nineteen submissions (18%) recommended immediate implementation of marine reserves. Nine submissions suggested an action to

increase focus on identifying key foraging areas for hoiho and effectively protect them. One submission suggested voluntary protected areas be implemented and another recommended a rahui on foraging grounds.

2.2.2 Ban setnets

Eleven submissions (11%) have called for the elimination of bycatch and ban on setnets to be a strategic priority. Four submissions (4%) stated that the need for a ban and zero tolerance on setnets was the reason for disagreement with the strategic priorities for theme 2. An additional submission called for a strategic priority as a moratorium on setnetting for 5 years, and another submission called for work with fishing communities to outlaw setnets. Nineteen submissions (18%) highlighted further action around bycatch elimination: ten submissions suggested that bycatch be eliminated, and eight submissions suggested that setnets specifically should be eliminated.

2.2.3 Ban trawling

Ten submissions suggested a strategic priority to address food availability and resource competition from fisheries. An additional submission called for a strategic priority as a moratorium on bottom trawling for 5 years, and another submission was to make food source / addressing starvation a priority on its own. Eight submissions have called to prevent bottom trawling in hoiho foraging area, and another a moratorium on fisheries.

HTG comments that there is significant commentary and feedback from stakeholders on marine issues which needs addressing; in particular around urgent and stronger strategic priorities and actions on bycatch and marine protected areas.

HGG decision is that the draft strategy and action plan are reviewed to consider whether stronger wording and actions relating to the marine area are appropriate. Partners undertake to have the high-level discussions across the partnership to find a way forward.