

TRANS TASMAN RESOURCES

LTD

MARINE CONSENT

APPLICATION

EVIDENCE SUMMARY OF

BUDDY MIKAERE



SUMMARY

- Two statements – First Statement and short rebuttal statement
- Executive summary – review of CIA – establishes a conceptual framework
- Agree with CIA conclusions that kaitiaki implications have been considered
- Agree the proposed conditions avoid, remedy or mitigate the “known” effects

Introduction

- Background and experience – refer Appendix 1
- Scope of evidence
- Consultation issues – no response equates with strong disapproval; positive aspects – recognition of mana moana/rangatiratanga
- Identification of cultural issues difficult
- In previous TTRL application the following cultural values identified by Ngati Ruanui



Cultural Values

- Kaitiakitanga – sustainable guardianship over all resources;
- Puwaitanga – to safeguard and preserve the environment through sustainable growth;
- Manaakitanga – protection and preservation to ensure good health and well being;
- Whakapapa – our identity and where we come from;
- Tikanga – the spiritual, mental, physical and cultural determinants of Ngāti Ruanui; and
- Rangatiratanga



Addressing cultural values/issues

- Sanctioned by tradition – positive precedent for “interfering” with the seabed - Ruatepupuke and Maui
- A question of location and scale
- Kaitiaki and kaitiakitanga – taken into account and mitigation package via consent conditions offered
- Customary Fisheries – evidence confirms no impact
- Commercial Fishing Impact – technical evidence confirms minimal impacts

Addressing cultural values/issues continued...

- Puwaitanga and Manaakitanga – acknowledged; not impacted
- Whakapapa – acknowledged; not impacted
- Tikanga- acknowledged;
- Rangatiratanga – acknowledged but attempts to engage rebuffed; conditions and project direction recognise Treaty principles
- Mauri – not impacted in customary terms



Values and issues

- Mauri Restoration
- Benefits to iwi
- Submissions – wide ranging – only address those with cultural content
- Conclusions – disappointed at the non-participation of Ngati Ruanui but accept that is their right



Rebuttal statement

- Comments on Kaihautu report from Maori Advisory – unbalanced and ignores particular circumstances of the application
- Addresses evidence of Graham Young – in relation to consultation; conclusions are not accepted



CONCLUSIONS

- Based on the assumption that there are many similarities to the 2013 application – reasonable expectation is that cultural issues are largely the same.
- The proposed conditions avoid, remedy or mitigate the “known” effects
- Views expressed in First Statement remain unchanged as a result of reviewing submitters evidence
- From an examination of application documentation, submissions analysis, previous application documentation and other expert evidence no cultural reason for application to be declined