

# Report of Te Awarua-o-Porirua Whaitua Committee Meeting 4.5.17

---

5-9 pm at Hongoeka Marae, Plimmerton

---

## Summary

---

### Contents

Overview .....	1
Meeting notes .....	2
Session 2 - Ngāti Toa and whaitua processes .....	2
Session 3. Introduction to Policy for Te Awarua-o-Porirua Whaitua .....	4
Session 4 - Whaitua scenarios – technical work update .....	5
Session 5 - Update on conversations with partners .....	6
Session 6 - Any other business.....	7

### Overview

#### Workshop/ meeting Attendees

##### Te Awarua-o-Porirua Whaitua Committee:

Dale, Diane, Jennie, Larissa, John G (Acting Chair), John M, Sharli-Jo, Warrick

**Apologies:** Stu, Richard, Barbara, David

##### Project Team:

Alastair (Project Manager), Brent, Grace, Hayley, Jon, Kara, Keith, Nicci, Suze

**Facilitator:** Isabella

**Guests:** Ned Norton (LWP), Phillip Barker (OLW National Science Challenge)

##### Ngāti Toa:

Jenny Ngarimu, Brian Gunson, Linda Hall-Thorpe, Patricia Grace, Kohai Grace, Awhina Tamarapa, Mike Thorpe

- Meeting purposes**      The purposes of this meeting/workshop were to:
1. To deepen appreciation of the Ngāti Toa relationship with the whaitua
  2. To hear and understand Ngāti Toa values & attributes in the whaitua context
  3. To get our bearings in the planning landscape for Te Awarua-o-Porirua Whaitua
  4. To be clear on the policy task at hand and prepared for the next meeting's work
  5. To share and report back on conversations with partner organisations and other relevant stakeholders

The purposes were achieved.

---

### Committee Decisions and actions to do

---

- Committee Decisions**      1. Remove last two bullet points from the Tech Team scope of work / ToR document

**Actions:**              Add timeline to all future agendas (for information, not for discussion)

## Meeting notes

The Committee were welcomed on to Hongoeka Marae with a pōwhiri.

Following this, Brian Gunson (vice-Chair of the Hongoeka Marae Committee), spoke about the history of Ngāti Toa since arrival in Aotearoa and the history at Hongoeka, focusing on the story of the wharenuī, Te Heke-Mai-Raro.

At the end Committee members thanked their hosts for the warm welcome, and thanked Brian for his interesting and engaging kōrero.

### Session 2 - Ngāti Toa and whaitua processes

(Hohepa Potini, Ngāti Toa and Collaborative Modelling Project

See [Ngāti Toa Values & Attributes paper](#)

- deepen appreciation of the Ngāti Toa relationship with the whaitua
- To hear and understand Ngāti Toa values & attributes in the whaitua context

Hohepa recounted stories of iwi and hapu tipuna who are represented in Te Heke-Mai-Raro. These ancestors' tales are intertwined with and illustrate the history of the Hongoeka rohe and its significance to Ngāti Toa.

Hohepa also spoke to the challenge of articulating Māori values through other cultures' processes, and the further challenge of doing so with a history of colonialism, and an ongoing colonial context.

Two of the important themes from this kōrero were holism and inclusion.

- Holism**
- Noting the difficulties of articulating worldviews in a few words, one of the defining features of the Pākehā approach to managing land and natural resources is a separating out, a reductionism: unpacking, classifying, specialisation, unbundling, segmenting.
  - This is a ubiquitous feature of natural resource management – biophysical and economic and social and cultural elements dealt with separately, different kinds of knowledge, different places within a rohe - using separate and distinct epistemological and legal approaches. With these approaches, “joining up” becomes the perpetual challenge to make the processes fit the real world.
  - This has a lot of merit but is fundamentally different from a Māori worldview and its consequent approaches to natural resource management.
  - Here, the approach is to always hold the whole view in mind and layer different perspectives over each other, each in itself comprising a total view of the world rather than being a single slice or dimension.
  - This means, for example, it is not meaningful to look at a single location within a rohe (e.g. a site of significance) without the wider environment; look at the present without the past; discuss socio-economics without the natural environment; consider biophysical phenomena without their cultural and philosophical meaning
  - This interconnectedness is illustrated in the diagram (see Appendix 1).
- Reduction -ism:  
whaitua  
history**
- The experienced history of how Māori values and natural resources have been handled by the British and New Zealand governments, including in Te Awarua-o-Porirua Whaitua, is one of using the reductionist / separating-out approach to the almost complete exclusion of the holistic.
  - This has had profound implications for the environment and people.
  - Development, for example, has gone ahead because it has been seen to be a good thing – but with decision-makers and the wider community looking at only one “slice” of the potential effects and ignoring all the others. While this is bad for everyone, it is particularly harrowing for Māori.
  - Getting it right is not about ownership or asserting one worldview over another; rather it is about caring about the entire rohe.

- Inclusion**
- The lived and remembered experience of resource and land management in Te Awarua-o-Porirua whaitua has featured some of the worst manifestations of colonialism, including the Supreme Court declaring the Treaty of Waitangi “a simple nullity” (*Wi Parata v Bishop of Wellington*, 1877).
  - In the 20<sup>th</sup> and 21<sup>st</sup> century, in a resource management context, this has typically been defined by no or tokenistic inclusion of Ngāti Toa in the processes that determine what happens in the whaitua.
  - The iwi are committed to participating in management processes and the whaitua is a real step forward in terms of its inclusive process, but people need to be aware of the strong and recent history.
  - For example, this means iwi are worried that identifying sites of significance will mean these are incorporated in planning in a reductionist way, where decision-makers decide “there’s not much impact on those sites, so all this [development] only has a minor affect for Māori, bring on the bulldozers”.
  - In terms of iwi participation in the process, it is great to see what the whaitua is doing – and Committee meetings on Ngāti Toa marae is an important thing to do.

- Modelling & analysis**
- In terms of the inclusion of mātauranga Māori and Ngāti Toa values in the substantive process of gathering information and creating a WIP, there are two key elements of the whaitua approach as it is evolving with the modelling work:
    - Ngāti Toa values must be included in all alternatives and at every level, sitting alongside western-style values (as articulated in the NPS-FM)
    - There is not going to be a “Māori model” operating within the modelling architecture. When scenarios are put together, a Ngāti Toa lens will be cast over the top to take an holistic view of the impacts on the whaitua.

Following Hohepa’s presentation there were some comments from the floor:

- Endorsing his kōrero from an iwi perspective, and noting that a layering rather than segmenting-out of worldviews has huge scope to be inclusive and benefit everyone.
- Noting that there is a real alignment of what had been presented with the whaitua values and attributes, and the benefit of the Committee constantly reflecting back on values through the process.

Ned Norton responded on behalf of the Modelling Leadership Group:

- He thanked Hohepa and advised that the MLG can step forward and work with this approach as presented.
- He also commented that he is uncomfortable with calling the work “modelling” or even “modelling architecture” because this implies a reductionism not present in the actual work. The work is incorporating a large amount of qualitative and non-model-based analysis to properly accommodate elements that don’t lend themselves to being modelled.
- He suggested the name to be used henceforth should be “modelling and assessment framework”.

---

### Session 3. Introduction to Policy for Te Awarua-o-Porirua Whaitua

(Alastair Smail, Greater Wellington Regional Council)

See [presentation](#) here

Session purposes:

- To get our bearings in the planning landscape for Te Awarua-o-Porirua Whaitua
- To be clear on the policy task at hand and prepared for the next meeting's work

Alastair spoke to the context in which whaitua work fits, with the “three legged table” – the interrelationship between regional planning, district / city planning, and infrastructure investment (see slide 1 of presentation).

He outlined the Committee's task with reference to the catchment (using the WMUs map).

He talked through the framework for policy (see slide 3) and what inputs the Committee would use to make their decisions, noting that modelling and analysis will provide lots of information on what actions will be useful, but ultimately it is the Committee's collective knowledge that will round this out.

Finally he worked through a made-up example of identifying a policy package to achieve an objective (see [mahinga kai table](#)). This session is an introduction only, and the policy work will occupy us for the next few meetings.

There was brief discussion after this. Some key themes were:

**What can be influenced**

- Many decisions have been already made (e.g. Transmission Gully consented, Grenada North housing development) and with these, the proverbial horse has bolted. These will become part of the existing urban legacy and will have a longer time frame to sort out.
- However, timing is very fortuitous with PCC's whole District Plan under review this and next year, which provides a huge opportunity.

**National policy shifts**

- There were questions about the influence of The National Policy Statement on Freshwater Management, the National Policy Statement on Urban Development, and the creation of Urban Development Authorities.
- Alastair commented that some of what's been in the media is pre-election guff, but there are some changes that will happen ahead of the election.
- He will update the Committee on the TAoPW implications of standards around pathogens, urban contaminants, plus swimmability standards.

---

## Session 4 - Whaitua scenarios – technical work update

(Brent King, Greater Wellington Regional Council, with Ned Norton, Land Water People / Modelling Leadership Group)

See paper [Te Awarua-o- Porirua Whaitua Committee – Collaborative Modelling Project – Update & Tech Team Plan](#)

Brent spoke briefly to the update Committee had received. Following this there was some discussion, with input from Ned.

**Next steps**

- The aim is for the Tech Team to meet before next Committee meeting
- The modellers don't need any more information from Committee – there is plenty to go on in the narrative scenarios.

- Narratives to model-able scenarios: risks**
- There was discussion about the role and scope of the tech team, vis-à-vis the modellers and the Committee.
  - There was comment that reading to some of the bullet points describing the role, committee members are getting into the nitty-gritty (modellers' area of expertise and beyond the mandate of the committee) and there is a strong risk of inefficient micromanagement and getting buried in the detail.
  - There was comment that tech team members each bring their own interest and specialism to the task.
  - Ned explained that while the modelling and analysis team have a really good steer on the scenarios, what they are grappling with are the general narrative descriptions and need to put hard numbers and assumptions to this work. There is a real risk in this process that the modellers go off on a tangent which moves away from committee's intention.
- Tech team process**
- However the process is not "open slather" by the tech team into all the modelling and analysis work
  - Rather, the tech team will be consulted where the modellers believe there's a risk that their work turning narratives into modellable and analysable material may be heading away from Committee's intent (or manifesting it in a particular way that precludes other manifestations).
  - In these circumstances the MLG will check in with the tech team to get guidance on Committee's intent without having to go to the full Committee.
  - The tech team will also need to think about whether they are able to advise the modelling and analysis team on a certain point without reference to Committee.
  - If a question is really significant, it should come back to Committee.
- Wording of tech team "ToR"**
- The discussion looked at the four bullet points and noted that the first two were sound and not in dispute; the issues with scope were in the second two.
  - There were some suggestions for rewording the second two but people agreed that the first two alone were sufficient for a ToR-type statement, and good management could better cover the useful elements of the second two.

**Decision:** Committee agreed to remove the second two bullet points of the tech team scope.

---

## Session 5 - Update on conversations with partners

### TA partners

- GWRC talking to cities at three levels: councillor, executive leadership and officer level, particularly in the district planning space
- Alastair is meeting with district plan managers from whole region
- Also now regular participant in PCC and WCC district plan managers' 6 weekly meeting - and noted that it is really positive to be getting in at this early and detailed level.
- Streams Stormwater & Development Liaison group reformed – first meeting, so work to do cross-organisation engagement including with WWL.

### NZTA

- One very early meeting has been held with NZTA, and it is agreed that there should be a follow up with the more developed conversation as to the relevance to the Agency.
  - The rail corridor will be part of the conversation.
-

### **Partners' communications teams**

PT members are developing an internal mechanism for spreading material between partner organisations, starting with a gradual process of raising awareness. First edition has been circulated, on the theme of 'what is whaitua and why should I care?'

### **Developers**

There are a number of conversations happening with developers in a number of contexts. We must have detail as to what the future game is – not whaitua specific. Developers will be waiting for the rules and then plan to litigate. The main challenge is to persuade them that doing development better will provide value to them as well as the wider community.

### **Other conversations**

Warrick told Committee that Megan Oliver (**GWRC**) convened meeting of freshwater people and Megan raised whaitua a few times.

Diane is having conversations with **PCC** around the rural communities' recovery from the effects of the November storm and earthquake – still grappling with groundwater, winter coming etc, and the need to mitigate the effects.

These are multi-agency issues so residents need to work across that – she is taking the opportunity to do some whaitua PR. (Keith added that this "shaking the trees" is stimulating valuable conversations that wouldn't otherwise happen.)

Jennie told Committee about the **Takupuwahia Marae** meeting in April on flooding / stormwater TAOP Whaitua had been mentioned as a partner by WWL which was a little surprising. Kara explained that WWL is partly navigating its "partnerships" through the whaitua frame – a series of working relationships rather than the treaty-partnership sense of the word.

Kara offered the opportunity for **WWL** to come to committee meeting to update on master planning process, which suggestions was well received.

Jennie informed Committee about **Imagining a Decolonised City – Symposium** on May 13 to conclude an urban design competition, jointly run by Ngāti Toa, Victoria University of Wellington and funded by UNESCO. Kara and Jennie will be speaking.

---

## **Session 6 - Any other business**

Jennie introduced Jenny Ngarimu - potential replacement for Naomi Solomon on Te Upoko Taiao.

### **Dates**

- Fieldtrips
  - May 18, 3.30 - 5pm – WW Treatment Plant
  - June 21, 9 – 10.30am – Open Spaces & Streams
- Restoration Day 21.5.17 – all day, registration required
- Tech Team meeting date – BK to confirm; all to be notified

### **Next meeting 25.5.17**

- It will be dominantly about policy work
- WWL Update

- The whitua timeline with “we are here” will be added to all agendas (not as a discussion item, just for reminders)
- Invitation to Committee – have a Committee-only session before next meeting? This was briefly discussed but not decided. A ten-minute session will be offered on the day.

#### **Consensus Decision-making Paper**

- There was an observation that the TAOPWC ToR already contains information about consensus and that there are potentially some contradictions in the Consensus Decision-making Paper.
- There is merit in having a more detailed decision-making process beyond that described in ToR (Ruamāhanga experience), but we can go with whatever works for this Committee
- Members have marked up the paper and all comments / markup should be sent to Suze

John Gibbs thanked the Ngāti Toa hosts, especially Brian and Hohepa for their korero, and for the wonderful hospitality.

**The meeting closed at 9pm.**

**The next meeting of Te Awarua-o-Porirua Whitua Committee is 25.5.17, 5 – 9pm**



Appendix 1

