Tai Timu Tai Pari

Sea Change

Hauraki Gulf Marine Spatial Plan

Independent
Review Panel

Second Review Report

17 MARCH 2015

Hauraki Gulf
Marine Park
Ko te Pataka kai
o Tikapa Moana
Te Moananui a Toi

In partnership with mana whenua and the following agencies:

Hauraki Gulf Forum
Tikapa Moana
Te Moananui a Toi

Ministry for Primary Industries
Manatū Ahu Matua

Department of
Conservation
Te Papa Atawhai

Waikato
REGIONAL COUNCIL

Auckland
Council

INTRODUCTION

1. The Independent Review Panel for Sea Change – Tai Timu Tai Pari ("**Panel**") was appointed by the Project Steering Group in July 2014. The composition of the Panel is set out in Appendix One.

2. The Panel has been asked to review certain aspects of the Sea Change – Tai Timu Tai Pari process to date, and to provide three reports to the Project Steering Group. This is the second of those reports. The Panel delivered its First Review Report on 21 August 2014.[1]

3. The Second Review Report covers Phase 2 and the start of Phase 3 of the project, which has principally involved the ongoing work of the Stakeholder Working Group ("**SWG**") and the work of the seven RoundTables.

4. As noted in the First Review Report, the Hauraki Gulf is a very significant area to Mana Whenua, the communities of the Gulf and to New Zealanders more generally. The Hauraki Gulf is a taonga, and marine spatial planning ("**MSP**") provides an opportunity for a structured and collaborative approach to planning for the protection and use of that taonga.

5. The Panel acknowledges the significant ongoing commitment and efforts of the wide range of people and organisations that are contributing to Sea Change – Tai Timu Tai Pari. There has been a significant investment of time and resources which reinforces the importance of the Hauraki Gulf to all.

6. In undertaking this review, the Panel has had the opportunity to consider a range of documentation and to speak to some of the people involved in the process. Our conclusions are based on the written project documents and our interviews with project participants. They are necessarily inferences based on the understanding we have developed from those sources and not conclusions we have drawn from objective data or direct observations.

7. We were provided with a wide range of views and they were sometimes inconsistent, largely because people have differing perspectives. Our high-level conclusions are judgements based on what we have read and heard, and developed via conversations among Panel members. The Panel appreciates the time taken by those persons to share their views.

8. The Panel would like to again acknowledge and thank Dave Allen[2] and Mary Newman-Pound for their significant support and assistance during this review process.

---

[1] The First Review Report is available at www.seachange.org.nz.
[2] In his capacity as Function Lead for the Independent Review Panel.

OVERVIEW AND SUMMARY

9.   There has been a significant amount of work undertaken since the Panel's First Review Report was completed, including the operation and outputs of the seven topic specific RoundTables.

10.   There has been uptake of the Panel's recommendations in the First Review Report in a number of areas, but not in all. The project team prepared a matrix to track the uptake of those recommendations. The extent of uptake of the recommendations in the SWG and RoundTables is unclear, and some of the concerns expressed in that First Review Report remain. The improvements in the project in relation to the involvement of Mana Whenua and incorporation of mātauranga Māori have been very positive, as these were of particular concern to the Panel in the First Review Report.

11.   The emergence of the Mātauranga Māori RoundTable has been a very important and positive development. While there had been a slow start in relation to Mana Whenua and mātauranga Māori, real progress was and is being made. There is also an ongoing series of hui-a-iwi to provide for broader input from Mana Whenua to better inform this MSP process.

12.   The Mātauranga Māori RoundTable is preparing a Mana Whenua spatial plan: "He Taonga Papanga Pounamu" to complement and inform the marine spatial plan (as well as other processes). A key task moving forward for the Mātauranga Māori RoundTable and the SWG will be to ensure that He Taonga Papanga Pounamu can be integrated effectively into the SWG and MSP process.

13.   In terms of the UNESCO Guide,[3] the Sea Change – Tai Timu Tai Pari process is not conforming to good international MSP practice in all respects, as:

   (a)   there are only a few aspirational goal statements and no 'SMART'[4] objectives specified as a result of the RoundTable discussions; and

   (b)   no real marine 'spatial' planning has been undertaken to date, and the exercise of undertaking analysis of use conflicts/compatibilities and spatial allocation has been left until the final three months of the process.

14.   The RoundTables have performed several important functions including increasing outreach to broader communities of interest, leveraging the work capacity of the SWG by providing a wider range of information and having well-informed people collating and presenting information about the Hauraki Gulf. The RoundTable reports provide very good diagnostic information on the state of the Hauraki Gulf and the current issues in the Gulf. The appendices are a rich source of summarised information including in many cases maps (from previous work) delineating resources or activities.

15.   The RoundTables spent considerable time developing an understanding of the Gulf, but less time discussing what the data and other information meant, and little time was available for developing options and solutions and preparing reports. One result is that

---

[3] *UNESCO - Marine Spatial Planning – A Step-by-Step Approach.*
[4] See Appendix Two for a description of 'SMART' objectives.

the RoundTable reports include valuable data but are lighter than they might have been on options and solutions.

16. Despite these departures from good practice and slower than desirable progress, we have concluded that the SWG is well-prepared to make a great deal of progress in Phases 3 and 4 and that there is still potential for a valuable marine spatial plan to be developed within the time scheduled.

17. Phases 3 and 4, involving the SWG moving into MSP and preparing a plan, are critical. If the process of resolving tensions between different interests is not grappled with early and effectively, then the output may end up at the high-level and aspirational end of the spectrum.

18. The question that remains is what form of marine spatial plan can be delivered given the work required of the SWG over the next three months. It is critically important to manage expectations of what form the marine spatial plan will take. Some participants in the process are expecting a highly-specific plan involving spatial allocations across the Gulf, while many others expect a combination of spatial allocation, identification of future processes and higher-level aspirational statements.

19. The SWG will need to articulate a clear direction in terms of what it is seeking to achieve over the next three months. There appears to be a strong plan-writing team assembled to assist the SWG, but the SWG will have to do the work of resolving the hard issues and identifying options and solutions, before the plan-writing team can convert that analysis into a plan.

20. Given that the RoundTables did not get to the point of undertaking any significant option development or option testing, there has not been any real engagement with agencies to consider options against existing statutory or policy frameworks, or to learn from agencies as to the lessons from the past and the likelihood of particular options being implemented.

21. The agencies involved in the Sea Change – Tai Timu Tai Pari project have significant history and experience in seeking to implement planning solutions for areas such as the Hauraki Gulf. This experience is an invaluable resource for Sea Change – Tai Timu Tai Pari. An analysis and consideration of statutory, policy and non-statutory frameworks will be important for the next stage of the process.

22. It is also critical that agencies have had a meaningful contribution into the marine spatial plan and the options that are proposed. If agencies are not engaged, then options may be developed that do not reflect the frameworks under which agencies operate, and agencies may not recommend adoption of those options to the ultimate decision-makers.

23. In terms of SeaSketch, there are still no definitive goals and objectives articulated in a format that can be used directly for MSP or SeaSketch. The RoundTables did not use SeaSketch to any real extent in their deliberations. SeaSketch is ready for implementation if the SWG wishes to use it, and the SeaSketch support team remains

on stand-by for this role. However, the little time remaining presents a significant challenge.

24. The engagement and communications planning and activity continue to be effective.

25. Provision and use of information has been highly effective in that the RoundTables have been able to review an enormous volume of highly technical information delivered in an understandable format. A common statement at the RoundTable level however, is that this exhaustive process left little time for synthesis and discussion.

26. The SWG appears to be comfortable with this approach and considers it preferable for the RoundTables to have worked at their own pace and to have had as much time as possible to review the full suite of information. The implication is that the SWG will undertake the synthesis and convert the RoundTable products into the marine spatial plan. Some areas of information were, however, found to be lacking (such as spatial extent of biologically important areas and economic forecasting) and the links between mātauranga Māori and 'western' data/information are not well developed, rather, this is assumed to be covered in the Mātauranga Māori RoundTable report currently in production.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Theme Two – Involvement of Mana Whenua

27. The recommendation for Theme Two is that the SWG and Mātauranga Māori RoundTable work closely together and with lead writers, the technical support group and other support staff to ensure that mātauranga Māori and He Taonga Papanga Pounamu can be incorporated effectively into the SWG process and eventually into the marine spatial plan.

Theme Three – Function of RoundTables and SWG

28. The recommendations for Theme Three are:

    (a) systematically identify any relevant and important remaining gaps in information and understanding and launch efforts to close those gaps, recognising that information is likely to become available very late (or too late) in the MSP process and so incorporating that information needs to be considered in Phase 3 and Phase 4 project planning, or in the next round of MSP. Again, identification of goals and objectives would help to determine what information is really needed for the marine spatial plan;

    (b) identify remaining unresolved issues and ensure processes are in place to resolve those issues in time for the resolutions to be included in spatial allocations and other management actions in the marine spatial plan;

    (c) focus urgently on identifying which data gathering or analysis is required to inform decisions about unresolved issues and ensure availability of that data and analysis at the time it is required;

(d)   consider again whether negotiation training would help SWG members as they work together to develop their proposals (noting again that there is little time now left in the process); and

(e)   consider what planning work is likely to remain incomplete at the end of the Sea Change – Tai Timu Tai Pari process, and develop a means to get that work completed so that it can be taken up in the future. That might imply an extension of time, another MSP round or an institutional solution. It is important to note that as described in the UNESCO Guide, MSP is a continuing process.

Theme Four – Development of Geospatial Resources

29.   The recommendations for Theme Four are that the SWG:

(a)   urgently develops goals and SMART objectives for each of the thematic areas they are covering;

(b)   uses a decision support tool (SeaSketch or something familiar to them) to facilitate the effective use of existing geospatial information in the MSP process; and

(c)   uses the significant technical support on offer by DoC and other technical staff associated with SeaSketch, to the extent practical at this stage of the process.

Theme Five – Engagement and Communications

30.   The recommendations for Theme Five are that the engagement and communications team:

(a)   continues to inform stakeholders of the status of the Sea Change – Tai Timu Tai Pari process;

(b)   continues to seek input from stakeholders where required; and

(c)   prepares a proposal for monitoring public response to the marine spatial plan and its roll out.

Theme Six – Existing Measures and Consultation with Agencies

31.   The recommendations for Theme Six are:

(a)   that as options are developed, the SWG understands what those options mean in relation to the existing statutory and policy frameworks (including the extent to which those frameworks may require alteration); and

(b)   that the SWG work closely with/involve agencies to test potential options, both in terms of fit with the existing statutory and policy frameworks, and to increase the chances of those agencies adopting and implementing the marine spatial plan.

Theme Seven – Provision and Use of information

32.   The recommendations for Theme Seven are:

(a)   that the SWG takes note of the recommendations in Theme 3[5] (ie fill missing data gaps and complete necessary analyses that may otherwise inhibit speedy development of a marine spatial plan); and

(b)   that the SWG makes use of the available spatial information that is provided in the appendices of the RoundTable Reports, and from other sources, as a start towards preparing a marine spatial plan.

---

[5] Paragraphs 28(a) and 28(c) above.

SCOPE OF REVIEW

33.   The Project Steering Group provided the Panel with a scope for this second review which identifies seven key themes:

(a)   **Theme One**: uptake of key findings and recommendations from the First Review Report;

(b)   **Theme Two**: involvement of Mana Whenua;

(c)   **Theme Three**: function of RoundTables and collaborative interaction with the SWG;

(d)   **Theme Four**: development of geospatial resources to aid option development and testing;

(e)   **Theme Five**: engagement and communications;

(f)   **Theme Six**: assessment of existing measures and consultation with agencies to develop and test options; and

(g)   **Theme Seven**: provision and use of information.

34.   The second review has been undertaken in accordance with the following assessment criteria:[6]

(a)   does the process reflect good practice for MSP?

(b)   does the process reflect effective co-governance with iwi?

(c)   does the process recognise mātauranga Māori?

(d)   does the process reflect best use of best available information?

(e)   is the consultation and representation consistent with a best-practice, collaborative approach?

(f)   is there a sound evidential basis for the conclusions reached?

35.   The structure of this report reflects the seven themes in the scope for the Second Review Report.

---

[6] These were provided in the scope for the Second Review Report. There are additional criteria that will be more relevant to subsequent stages of the project, such as when a marine spatial plan has been prepared. Further, some criteria are more relevant to certain themes than others.

THEME ONE: UPTAKE OF KEY FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS FROM THE FIRST REVIEW REPORT

37. The Panel has been asked to briefly reflect on the uptake of the recommendations in the First Review Report.

38. In its First Review Report the Panel made 16 recommendations under the four review themes. Those recommendations were:

Stakeholder Working Group establishment and function

"identify and remedy any adverse effects of developing goals and objectives later in the MSP process on both the use of SeaSketch and on the work of the RoundTables; and

monitor attendance at SWG and RoundTable meetings, engagement of participants and community support to identify any need for remedial action to maintain momentum."[7]

Stakeholder Working Group engagement

"test connections to ensure there is sufficient engagement with relevant stakeholders. In particular assess connections with long-term large-scale economic development opportunities, with future tourism opportunities, with youth, with Asian and Pacific Island communities and with future education or scientific institute opportunities that might use or be located within the Hauraki Gulf;

ensure processes are in place to secure direct and effective mātauranga Māori input to the RoundTables;

consider the time that will be required for the RoundTables to complete their work given the current level of engagement and knowledge of RoundTable members, the information sourcing and processing requirements of the RoundTables (including the need for them to develop goals and objectives relatively early in Phase 2), and the highly collaborative process chosen. Identify risks to timing and to quality of output and develop mitigation strategies; and

consider the value of providing negotiation training or support to SWG and RoundTable members."[8]

Development of SeaSketch

"the appropriate use of SeaSketch requires the best available data. A clear specification of data needs from the SWG and RoundTables is required as soon as possible. This is only possible if and when a clear statement of the priority problems and/or the goals and specific objectives to be addressed in the MSP are available;

---

[7] Paragraphs 19(a) and (b) of the First Review Report.
8 Paragraphs 20(a) to (d) of the First Review Report.

since the time for planning is limited, a schedule should be developed of when goals and objectives together with outstanding data will be available for incorporation into SeaSketch;

similarly, since the SWG and RoundTables will need several iterations of SeaSketch applications to identify and select desirable spatial alternatives, a schedule of meetings for this purpose should be clearly specified;

since all SWG and RoundTable participants may not be satisfied with the use or limitations of SeaSketch, it will be important to evaluate its value to participants as the process progresses;

IP agreements should be reviewed to ensure information is freely available to SeaSketch; and

the UNESCO Guide lists the key elements of 'good practice' for the use of decision support tools. Statements are made later in this report in relation to best practice, and these should be communicated to the RoundTables and other prospective users of SeaSketch."[9]

Provision and use of information

"longer term prediction scenarios will be required to allow the MSP to survive the test of time. There is a need to integrate data layers and provide trajectory information for the major ecological drivers of the entire Gulf. The current lack of critical components of information will delay the implementation of SeaSketch mapping (for example localised commercial fishing data). Information on cultural values and vulnerable habitats is also required. There are plans to complete the necessary data layers, however, and as much projection planning as is possible is recommended;

the relationships with DOC and MPI are vital and will need to be resourced appropriately as the time approaches for detailed spatial planning. Linkage or awareness/use of the MPI devices for planning (NABIS) would be useful into the future as alignment of long term strategic planning of these agencies is important given the collaboration that has occurred;

the science that has been produced to date is exceptionally good. It is comprehensive in terms of the habitats and environmental issues it addresses. The information on trajectories of the ecological state of many key habitats and species is also present. This needs to be brought together and aligned with information on land use and likely scenarios for sediment and pollutant input as well as matters such as coastal margin development and reclamation. In the medium to long term 'climate' and 'urban growth-proof' MSP of the Hauraki Gulf will be needed. The ability to create a scenario assessment tool is viewed as highly desirable, noting the very significant technical difficulties in this process; and

---

[9] Paragraphs 21(a) to (f) of the First Review Report.

the acquisition and uptake of cultural and historical information is viewed as being important not only to provide balance in value assessments of resources, but also to provide background information of the state of the environment in the Hauraki Gulf before modern development. This information can be used to produce a 'baseline' for monitoring responses to management and in providing a target for enhancing environmental health.'"[10]

Comments on uptake of recommendations

39. Following the completion of the First Review Report the Sea Change – Tai Timu Tai Pari project team prepared a matrix to record and track the implementation of the recommendations. This has been useful in that it demonstrated an intention to ensure those recommendations were taken seriously and implemented through the project.

40. There has certainly been uptake of the Panel's recommendations in a number of areas, but not in all. That is to be expected in part due to the speed at which elements of the process are moving, and the challenge in implementing some recommendations in that context. The extent of uptake of the recommendations in the SWG and RoundTables is unclear, and some of the concerns expressed in the First Review Report remain.

41. Of particular note have been the improvements in the project in relation to the involvement of Mana Whenua and incorporation of mātauranga Māori. The emergence of the Mātauranga Māori RoundTable, for example, has been a very important and positive development. This was a matter of particular concern for the Panel in the First Review Report.

42. On the other hand, for example, the Panel remains concerned that general goals and SMART objectives for the MSP process (as contemplated in the UNESCO Guide) have not been developed or clearly articulated. This is a significant departure from the UNESCO Guide, although the Panel is also aware of the relatively unique circumstances of the Sea Change – Tai Timu Tai Pari process. The Panel recommends again that the SWG confirms whether goals and 'SMART' objectives will be developed to frame the important next stage of its work, or that the SWG proposes an alternative approach to defining the overall direction of the project.

43. The RoundTable process appears to have been very successful in many respects, including the bringing together of different interest groups. A collaborative process will usually result in participants having an improved understanding and acceptance of the interests and perspectives of other participants, and that appears to be the case here.

44. However, there appeared to be little time to undertake option development which we understood to be a stated purpose of Phase 2. The Panel had noted in its First Review Report the very tight timeframes and the need to set clear milestones for each phase. The RoundTable process had some significantly positive outcomes, including allowing for the collation and presentation of significant amounts of information.

---

[10] Paragraphs 22(a) to (d) of the First Review Report.

However, the process of reconciling different interests of stakeholders through negotiation and undertaking actual MSP has largely been left to the SWG in Phases 3 and 4 of the project.

45. There have been further attempts to connect with a variety of communities of interest including youth, Asian and Pacific communities. There have been some particularly successful connections with youth through social media. There still appears to be a gap in terms of connections with economic opportunities, and a need to focus also on alternative future states of the Hauraki Gulf.

46. We understand RoundTable meetings were monitored for attendance, and in some cases attendance was reported as low.

47. It appears that the recommendation regarding negotiation training was not taken up.

48. There continued to be minimal use of SeaSketch through the RoundTable process. Again, the lack of clearly stated goals and objectives makes the use of SeaSketch difficult, and the lack of these goals and objectives remains a concern for the Panel.

49. Despite that, there has been an impressive amount of behind-the-scenes work by project staff and technical support staff to ensure that SeaSketch is poised for use by the SWG (if required).

50. The information that has been provided continues to be of exceptionally high-quality, although there remain information gaps, for example, Gulf wide biodiversity maps linked to seabed structure. The RoundTables spent considerable time collating and assimilating information.

51. The Panel noted an aspiration in Phase 1 to develop predictive models that would allow some scenario testing of different options to address environmental issues in the Gulf. It was recognised that this was an ambitious goal and hence it is not surprising that this has not been attempted in Phase 2.

52. There remains a need to strengthen connections and relationships with agencies, both in terms of securing access to information around whether particular options are able to be implemented, and to maximise the chances that the marine spatial plan will be adopted and implemented by those agencies. Further, there is significant experience among agency officials that should be drawn upon. We understand that these connections and relationships are being strengthened as part of Phases 3 and 4.

THEME TWO: INVOLVEMENT OF MANA WHENUA

54. The Panel's First Review Report observed that there remained uncertainty in relation to how mātauranga Māori would be incorporated into the MSP process and we emphasised this as a key area for attention. We also noted that steps were already underway to ensure the involvement of Mana Whenua katoa – all of the iwi groups.

55. This review theme considers whether resources made available to Mana Whenua to support their involvement have been taken up; how Mana Whenua would work with the RoundTables; the use of a seventh RoundTable focused on mātauranga Māori; and/or other means (such as hui-a-iwi) to ensure that the perspectives of Mana Whenua and mātauranga Māori are made available to the thinking of RoundTables and the SWG.

56. We heard positive feedback for how the Sea Change – Tai Timu Tai Pari project was responding to mātauranga Māori input from Mana Whenua. We heard that while there had been a slow start, some real progress is being made. The marine spatial plan process is seen by Mana Whenua as "*a device to track beneficial change and movement toward a mutually beneficial outcome*".

57. A mātauranga Māori hui to inform the Sea Change – Tai Timu Tai Pari project was organised by Paul Majurey on behalf of Mana Whenua and held in the Hotunui meeting house at Tamaki Paenga Hira / Auckland War Memorial Museum on 21 July 2014. Presentations were given by His Honour Justice Joe Williams on findings within the Waitangi Tribunal report Ko Aotearoa Tenei and Dr Shaun Awatere on mātauranga Māori for planning and policy.

58. At the September 2014 SWG meeting the Mana Whenua members of the SWG and the PSG communicated that they were trying to connect with 26 iwi groups in an attempt to obtain a perspective of what is important in the Gulf to Mana Whenua katoa. The Mana Whenua members developed a plan for wider iwi engagement that included hui-a-iwi, the first of which was held in November 2014. The hui-a-iwi would involve both SWG and PSG Mana Whenua members, thereby ensuring a wide Mana Whenua representation. The strategy was to hold hui-a-iwi in various places around the Hauraki Gulf to ensure the widest possible Mana Whenua engagement.

59. In addition, a Mātauranga Māori RoundTable was also proposed which would include PSG and SWG members. Early discussions between Mana Whenua PSG and SWG members regarding how to best incorporate mātauranga Māori had identified two likely strategies:

    (a) provide for mātauranga Māori to be addressed in all RoundTables; or

    (b) provide for a separate Mātauranga Māori RoundTable.

60. The adoption of a separate Mātauranga Māori RoundTable was confirmed as the preferred strategy after a presentation by Dr Shaun Awatere demonstrated the success of a similar structure for Ngai Tahu in their involvement with the Canterbury Freshwater Management Strategy. Dr Awatere was initially engaged to assist the Mātauranga Māori RoundTable, and subsequently appointed as technical advisor.

61. We understand that Mana Whenua considered that having a Mātauranga Māori RoundTable would assist by:

(a) creating a positive space for Mana Whenua PSG and SWG members to contribute, where their perspectives and mātauranga Māori could be heard;

(b) creating a vehicle for other Mana Whenua to become involved in the MSP process;

(c) leading to the ability of Mana Whenua to speak with confidence at the SWG as a result of the Mātauranga Māori RoundTable process;

(d) producing useful ideas to contribute to the overall process;

(e) developing ideas around key theme areas of the Sea Change – Tai Timu Tai Pari process;

(f) having Co-Chairs from other RoundTables attend;

(g) identifying the key issues according to Mana Whenua;

(h) collating mātauranga Maori; and

(i) creating a strategy to incorporate the key issues and mātauranga Māori into the marine spatial plan.

62. As at 16 March 2015 there have been six hui-a-iwi, with one more scheduled, held at venues around the Hauraki Gulf and inland into its catchment regions.

63. The technical support group team leader organised mātauranga Māori presentations for the October SWG meeting. Dr Shaun Awatere (Landcare Research Ltd) presented on Māori values for environmental monitoring, Nathan Kennedy (Ngāti Whanaunga) on the use of tohu Māori (cultural indicators) in planning for Tikapa Moana and Terry Lynch (MPI) on Treaty settlements and cultural overview. It was determined at that meeting that the Mātauranga Māori RoundTable must provide the language to iwi that is relevant and in a language that is relevant to the RoundTable, SWG and MSP process. Above all else, the marine spatial plan must enable what Mana Whenua desire and dream about:

"It's about today, tomorrow and our futures, and includes culture, history, commerce, society and environment".

64. We understand that the Independent SWG Chair worked with the Mātauranga Māori RoundTable Co-Chairs to determine how they will move forward into the SWG process. There was some initial uncertainty as to what the Mātauranga Māori RoundTable would produce, and how what it produces would contribute to the marine spatial plan. It is important to note that due to the later start date for the Mātauranga Māori RoundTable, it is scheduled to continue until the end of March 2015.

65. At the February 2015 SWG meeting in Whitianga (the RoundTable Summary Report handover), the Mātauranga Māori RoundTable shared their vision:

"Kia mau ki te mauri o te Taiao o Tikapa Moana, Te Moananui a Toi – Enhance the mauri of the Hauraki Gulf."

66.   The Mātauranga Māori RoundTable also announced it was using the approach of a co-planning tradition to develop a partner document: "He Taonga Papanga Pounamu". The document will draw primarily from iwi environmental plans. He Taonga Papanga Pounamu is intended to be a document that is of use to Mana Whenua and to contribute positively to the marine spatial plan. It will contain a set of objectives and policies specifically for Mana Whenua but also pertaining to SWG issues:

"A partnership document with key issues interwoven into Tai Timu Tai Pari Spatial Plan".

67.   We understand the current thinking is that He Taonga Papanga Pounamu will have three themes:

(a)   Pataka – replenishing food;

(b)   Ki Uta ki Tai – integrated management; and

(c)   Kaitiakitanga – guardianship.

68.   Those three traditional concepts will provide breadth and depth of inter-generationally based explanations and a methodology aligning with western science. Mātauranga Māori, both the knowledge and the approach, is the culmination of over 600 years of living within and part of the ecosystem. Some mātauranga Māori is at once time averaged and seasonally accurate. Cultural valuation is being undertaken and there is consideration of how the marine spatial plan relates to tikanga and tupuna/tipuna. The Mātauranga Māori RoundTable intends to use whakatauki to send clear messages and inform the marine spatial plan.

69.   He Taonga Papanga Pounamu will be outcome focused, providing 'hooks' to ensure Mana Whenua can "*get in there and do what we need to do*". It is also intended to contribute to, and influence, the marine spatial plan.

70.   The general feedback of Mātauranga Māori RoundTable members regarding the technical support group and generic support is that they were well supported, in as much as they knew they had capable, expert support to call on when required. However, the need for additional technical support who had experience with mātauranga Māori was identified.

71.   The potential to acquire such technical support was made possible by the earlier designation of specific resources by the Project Leader Eddie Wrench in mid-2014, and allowed the more recent appointment of Richelle Kahui-McConnell and Nathan Kennedy to assist. A further demonstration of the commitment to assist Mana Whenua incorporate mātauranga Māori into the marine spatial plan is reflected in the structure of the SWG and project support team for Phases 3 and 4. This involves an eight person Mana Whenua support team with dedicated coordinator, and the appointment of Richelle Kahui-McConnell, Nathan Kennedy and Dr Shaun Awatere to the marine

spatial plan writing team and SWG close support team. This is another positive development.

72.   The Panel noted that during the Sea Change – Tai Timu Tai Pari process, many iwi participants have been or are under significant pressure from other demanding activities, including for example working on Treaty settlements, on the Proposed Auckland Unitary Plan, as well as business as usual activities.

73.   The process reflects the UNESCO Guide on stakeholder participation in this respect: "*involving indigenous people in your MSP efforts may not be a legal requirement, but they could however be greatly affected (positively or negatively by your MSP measures, and should therefore participate*"[11].

74.   In general, the co-governance structure of the project and the SWG membership ensures that Mana Whenua are involved and that mātauranga Māori is valued and incorporated into the process. For Phase 2 that was enhanced by the creation of the Mātauranga Māori RoundTable and a marae visit for an SWG meeting. The Panel also considers that the process for He Taonga Papanga Pounamu will lead to a stronger marine spatial plan.

75.   The Sea Change – Tai Timu Tai Pari process reflects effective co-governance with iwi and recognises and values mātauranga Māori. He Taonga Papanga Pounamu, a spatial document, will be derived from science and iwi environmental plans, themselves derived from mātauranga Māori, generated, tested and proven over 600 years.

76.   While there has been a slow start in this area, there has been some significant process made.

Recommendation

77.   The recommendation for Theme Two is that the SWG and Mātauranga Māori RoundTable work closely together and with lead writers, the technical support group and other support staff to ensure that mātauranga Māori and He Taonga Papanga Pounamu can be incorporated effectively into the SWG process and marine spatial plan.

---

[11] UNESCO Guide, page 42.

THEME THREE: FUNCTION OF ROUNDTABLES AND COLLABORATIVE INTERACTION WITH THE SWG

78.   The approach for the Theme Three assessment is to provide a high-level description of the operation and output of the RoundTables; to consider the implications of the progress made by the RoundTables in Phase 2 (option development); and for the subsequent tasks in Phase 3 (option testing) and Phase 4 (plan drafting) respectively; and to highlight implications from the status quo for likely project outcomes and implied priorities.

79.   RoundTables performed several important functions including increasing outreach; leveraging the work capacity of the SWG by providing a wider range of information; having well-informed people collating and presenting information about the Gulf; and contributing to the process of plan development. The RoundTables were well-served with technical information when information was requested.

80.   On the first three of these four functions the RoundTables performed very well. The SWG now has available to it a comprehensive data set and SWG members are very well-prepared for Phases 3 and 4 in terms of having comprehensive information to hand. It is, however, not in a form that lends itself to immediate spatially-oriented planning and decision-making.

81.   The design of the RoundTable process has helped with preparation. SWG members were assigned as Co-Chairs to the RoundTables and the Co-Chairs brought distinct perspectives to the RoundTables. SWG Co-Chairs were also members of other RoundTables which provided useful cross-connections with the content and process of building understanding of other themes. Having some cross-membership with the Mātauranga Māori RoundTable created similar shared understanding and informal flows of thinking. Some sharing of facilitators and of meeting attendees, as well as overview from the technical support group leader and shared SeaSketch support (available but not generally used), provided a further layer of cross-connections.

82.   Formally, the RoundTables were operated relatively independently of one another with conclusions being shared primarily at the end via a joint meeting where each RoundTable presented and via their published reports. The Accessible Gulf and Infrastructure RoundTables had one joint "design workshop" in October.

83.   The project methodology for Phase 2 required the RoundTables to identify issues, options and solutions and provide these as inputs to Phase 3. 'Options' and 'solutions' were not defined and appear to have been interpreted by the various RoundTables in different ways. Development of options and solutions to issues by RoundTables remains at a high and generic level.

84.   Our assessment is that the RoundTable approach was a reasonable one given where the project was at the beginning of Phase 2. However, it was not consistent with the UNESCO Guide's advice that goals and objectives be developed early in a MSP process.

85. There was considerable discussion and some written proposals offered to encourage rigour in the Phase 2 RoundTable process and make best use of what was widely recognised as a very limited timeframe. In particular, proposals were made to provide:

    (a)   clear and shared definitions of key terms being used within the project, in particular goals, objectives, issues, options and solutions;

    (b)   milestones for the work of the RoundTables with target timing for issue identification, option identification and assessment, and developing proposed solutions; and

    (c)   a common format for RoundTable reports.

86. In our assessment these were sound proposals, given where the project was, but they were, generally speaking, not adopted. Instead, RoundTables were encouraged to choose their own processes and to develop their own reporting formats. The justification for this was to permit a 'bottom up' stakeholder initiated dialogue without constraints.

87. The RoundTables committed a large amount of their time to listening to presentations they requested and learning about the state of the Gulf. In the course of doing that they developed deeper understanding of the issues, an understanding of the perspectives of other stakeholders, strong and potentially enduring relationships and a collaborative working style. The RoundTable processes were, in this respect, consistent with a best practice collaborative approach. We were told of instances where stakeholders with apparently opposing views became aligned.

88. There were exceptions to this generalisation, as you would expect, but the work of the RoundTables has deepened and widened understanding of the issues and seems to have made a strong contribution by identifying win/win solutions or laying the foundations for win/win solutions to be found by the SWG in Phases 3 and 4.

89. Spending a lot of time developing understanding of the Gulf meant less time spent discussing what the data and other information meant, and so less time was available for report preparation than had been intended. One result is RoundTable reports that include a lot of valuable data but are lighter than they might have been on options and solutions.

90. Later than ideal agreement about the issues meant that important data gaps were not identified early, resulting in some late calls for analysis and important gaps in understanding. The specifics of these gaps are also covered in our report on Theme Seven: Provision and Use of information.

91. That said, as a group the RoundTable reports provide very good diagnostic information on the state of the Gulf and the current issues in the Gulf. The appendices are a rich source of summarised information including, in some cases, maps.[12]

---

[12] See Appendix Three.

92. There are some important gaps that should be reported as these may affect the prioritisation of work in Phases 3 and 4, the adoption and implementation of the marine spatial plan and the work required after the Sea Change – Tai Timu Tai Pari project is completed.

93. The Biodiversity and Biosecurity RoundTable placed most emphasis on biodiversity while biosecurity issues received insufficient attention. This may have been partly because of the mix of skills and experience among RoundTable members, because biosecurity competence was not well-represented. It was suggested that biosecurity should have been a separate RoundTable.

94. Longer term issues such as climate change and population growth were signalled to the RoundTable members but the implications of these issues were not sufficiently included in the content of the RoundTable reports. There was some consideration of longer-term issues at the November SWG meeting but longer-term considerations do not seem prominent in RoundTable reports.

95. The SWG terms of reference state that:

    "The Sea Change Project . . . aims to provide increased certainty for the economic, cultural and social goals of our community"

96. There seems to have been little effort to include economic analysis in the RoundTable work, although an initial assessment of the current economic contribution from the Gulf was available. Two current gaps are significant:

    (a)   there has been no systematic attempt to identify the future economic value available from the Gulf and how the marine spatial plan should or could contribute; and

    (b)   there has been no consideration (yet) of the costs of proposals, the benefit-cost ratio of proposals or the GDP effects of the marine spatial plan being developed.

97. Local economic opportunities and effects on existing commercial entities are touched on but there is no economic vision. An economic analysis is being commissioned now but it seems unlikely that high-quality output on future economic potential will be available in time to be fully considered in the development of the marine spatial plan.

98. A related gap is consideration of the long-term vision for the Gulf and how that might be achieved. Attractive marine environments can be left pristine but under-appreciated, can be intensively developed like Waikiki, Cancun or the Gold Coast or can be managed to provide a balance between economic use and environmental protection.

99. Similarly, economic development might provide funding for environmental protection and restoration as well as jobs for communities. The planning process does not yet seem to have sought a productive balance among these goals. The Accessible Gulf RoundTable was presented with some information on longer-term economic

aspirations but it was not sufficient and that RoundTable's output may have been affected by less than ideal attendance.

100. More generally, the project's focus so far seems to have been on how to reverse the decline in the environment while accommodating current concerns of stakeholders. The future seems under-represented. There does not seem to be a vision of how long-term environmental sustainability will be reconciled with meeting aspirations of future Hauraki Gulf stakeholders.

101. Despite these weaknesses, the Panel acknowledges that if the Sea Change – Tai Timu Tai Pari project achieved only a reversal of the current environmental decline trend at an acceptable cost, or with an economic gain, then that could be a great result.

102. The planning process is being supplemented by research and the establishment of working groups to develop ideas raised in the RoundTables including economics, fish stocks and the Blue Highway (a proposal from the Accessible Gulf RoundTable for transport connections among Gulf islands). It is important to note, however, that agency and technical advice resources are stretched given the time remaining.

103. Inherent in MSP is the need to allocate resources or uses between contending stakeholder groups. When lines are drawn on maps, or rules are established, one party or stakeholder group may be advantaged at the expense of others. Negotiation and resolving trade-offs are inherent within MSP. The contentious issues are win/lose issues where if one party gets what it wants, then another party does not.

104. Issues that may seem to be win/lose issues can sometimes be turned into win/win issues, where both parties can benefit, by a collaborative process. The investment in developing shared understanding and collaborative solution development should make it very likely that where a win/win outcome is possible, it will be found. We have heard anecdotal evidence of stakeholders with apparently conflicting interests moving into alignment as a result of information provision and the collaborative style of the planning process. Collaboration is a particular strength of the process so far and the focus on win/win solutions was by design.

105. However, one consequence of the focus on shared understanding and collaboration in Phase 2 is that so far there has been limited consideration of how to resolve the win/lose issues. Finding win/win solutions is very important, but MSP inevitably requires specifying the geographic ranges for permissible or prohibited activities, which means that win/lose issues must be resolved too.

106. We were told, however, that there was a tendency to avoid negotiation about the win/lose elements of the plan within the RoundTables, creating a concern that there may be insufficient preparation or time in Phases 3 and 4 to resolve remaining differences so that a comprehensive marine spatial plan with specified uses for areas within the Gulf can be prepared.

107. The good practice approach promoted in the UNESCO Guide involves agreeing on goals and objectives, encouraging participants to agree to a process for identifying management actions that reduce or resolve use conflicts and encourage use compatibilities, and then using a spatial decision support tool such as SeaSketch to find good spatial solutions given the objectives. Those good spatial solutions then become the foundation for agreements among the participants, which may be negotiated.

108. The highly collaborative Sea Change – Tai Timu Tai Pari approach implies that differences will be resolved by negotiation which is less informed by structured analysis and planning. Our suggestion of negotiation training for project participants made in the First Review Report was not adopted.

109. The relative lack of contention so far means that the win/lose issues will either be avoided by preparation of a plan comprised of win/win agreements only, or will occur at and around the SWG during Phases 3 and 4. Highlighting contentious issues late in the process, making less than planned progress on identifying options and issues and having SWG members who might lack desirable conflict negotiation skills may make it difficult to develop an agreed plan in the limited time available for Phases 3 and 4.

110. Despite these departures from good practice and slower than desirable progress, we have concluded that the SWG is well-prepared to make a great deal of progress in Phases 3 and 4 and that there is real potential for a valuable marine spatial plan to be developed. The SWG members have had an excellent briefing on data relevant to the issues. Despite some important gaps, the information available is relevant, comprehensive, detailed and collated.

111. Relationships, shared understandings and a track record of collaboration have been developed among the SWG members and with many relevant external stakeholder groups. Many of the issues have been resolved or partly resolved already. A draft plan structure has been prepared along with a draft of key content. The SWG is poised to leap forward and members we spoke with are positive about their readiness to move quickly.

112. Those we spoke with in the course of the review expressed somewhat divergent views about the likelihood of completing the spatially specific plan intended. Some were optimistic that the SWG would produce a detailed marine spatial plan while others expressed reservations and considered that, while there may be some specificity, there will not be time to achieve that in all areas. Those who expressed reservations were mainly concerned about late surfacing of win/lose issues, apparently loose methodology, risk of lack of spatial specificity and the challenges of agency adoption. There are also broader timing complications to consider, including the ongoing Treaty of Waitangi settlement processes. We note that not all Hauraki Gulf issues can or should be resolved by spatial planning; there are important roles for other kinds of intervention and that is acknowledged in the UNESCO Guide.

113. The SWG will be able to complete a marine spatial plan in some form, because it can recommend at least five kinds of solution:

(a) proposed spatial/temporal allocations of areas within the Hauraki Gulf;

(b) strategic, or in-principle solutions that are not or not yet spatially specific;

(c) calls for further data gathering and analysis to close information gaps and inform future spatial allocations;

(d) recommendations to agree spatial allocations in the future because agreement cannot be reached within the SWG or because implementation obstacles appear insurmountable at present; and

(e) institutional arrangements, possibly including governance arrangements, which will ensure future work to complete the first MSP cycle, and continue into the future.

114. The question that remains is what form of marine spatial plan can be delivered given the work required of the SWG over the next three months.

115. The UNESCO Guide envisages a planning process that is focussed on spatial/ temporal allocations and uses decision support tools to help identify solutions that best meet the defined objectives. With the divergences from the UNESCO Guide process, the Sea Change – Tai Timu Tai Pari process seems to have become more of a 'strategic' planning process that prepares the way toward a marine spatial plan to be developed in the future.

116. While we note these divergences and highlight some of their consequences, we also note that the divergences may be a reasonable adaptation to the circumstances within which this marine spatial plan is being prepared.

117. The timetable was deliberately ambitious from the beginning but the collaborative and strategic approach adopted provides a solid foundation for developing a spatially specific plan, even if the spatial allocations are not completed in this round.

118. Regardless of the eventual outcome, the project should make every effort to agree a spatially specific plan. That would imply that the SWG identify and focus on the remaining issues and conflicts quickly and work out how they will be resolved. Where there are gaps in the data they should be identified and where possible filled. We are aware of efforts being launched to gather data and also of gaps that will not be able to be filled given the timing constraints.

119. If the planning process is unlikely to produce a spatial plan, this should be identified early in Phase 3 so expectations can be managed and recommendations can be included to ensure that the spatial allocation work can be completed either by extending the available time or by locking in another planning round.

120. It has been pointed out to us that the cost of this planning process is material and agency funds are tight. We acknowledge these constraints but also note the very high

economic value of the Hauraki Gulf compared to the relatively low planning costs and the material contribution that a high-quality plan would make to that value.

Recommendations

121. Systematically identify any relevant and important remaining gaps in information and understanding and launch efforts to close those gaps, recognising that information is likely to become available very late (or too late) in the planning process and so incorporating that information needs to be considered in Phase 3 and Phase 4 project planning, or in the next round of MSP. Again, identification of goals and objectives would help to determine what information is really needed for the marine spatial plan.

122. Identify remaining unresolved issues and ensure processes are in place to resolve those issues in time for the resolutions to be included in spatial allocations and other management actions in the marine spatial plan.

123. Focus urgently on identifying which data gathering or analysis is required to inform decisions about unresolved issues and ensure availability of that data and analysis at the time it is required.

124. Consider again whether negotiation training would help SWG members as they work together to develop their proposals.

125. Consider what planning work is likely to remain incomplete at the end of the Sea Change – Tai Timu Tai Pari process, and develop a means to get that work completed so that it can be taken up in the future. That might imply an extension of time, another planning round or an institutional solution.

THEME FOUR: DEVELOPMENT OF GEOSPATIAL RESOURCES TO AID OPTION DEVELOPMENT AND TESTING

127. The process has not followed the UNESCO 'good-practice' Guide. Goals and SMART objectives have not yet been defined in any detail at the RoundTable level. It would appear that this has been intentional to permit the RoundTables adequate 'freedom' to develop their own process for generating high-level 'issues and options' for SWG consideration. However, this alternative approach has not been clearly specified.

128. The expectation that the RoundTables would provide adequate goals and SMART objectives appears to not have been communicated clearly to the RoundTables. The assumption is therefore that this work would be done by the SWG in Phases 3 and 4. As a consequence, geospatial information and maps (required inputs for good MSP practice) have been largely absent from the RoundTable summaries and recommendations. Some information is found in Report appendices.[13] We understand that the SWG will now take RoundTable deliberations (RoundTable Reports) and generate the marine spatial plan accordingly.

129. Cultural geospatial layers from Mana Whenua have not yet been included in the assemblage of data layers that would be available for analysis in the MSP process (although some cultural information has been made available through, for example, the Unitary Plan data layers). This is understandable given culturally relevant intellectual property issues and the current Treaty settlement negotiations. A workshop specific to the issues of intellectual property protection within the SeaSketch 'cloud' framework was held to provide understanding and comfort for stakeholders, in particular Mana Whenua.

130. Appropriately, mātauranga Māori layers are being created by the Mātauranga Māori RoundTable and the time lines for components of these to be made available will become clear as the Mātauranga Māori RoundTable completes its assessments.

131. At the outset of the MSP process, some form of decision support tool was deemed to be necessary for the process and the decision support tool of choice was identified to be SeaSketch (First Review Report).

132. DoC has on this advice invested a great deal of time and resources into this spatial planning package support tool. SeaSketch is 'action ready'. A great deal of work has been provided by DoC and technical staff of other agencies to ensure the decision support tool is available for use in the project. In general, however, the RoundTables appear not to have availed themselves of SeaSketch and the SWG has also not engaged with the tool at this stage. As such, the considerable amount of information made available to the RoundTables has not been efficiently digested or visualised in any spatial context.

133. Geospatial information has been independently upgraded from the already impressive position reviewed in our First Review Report. More layers (identified as being in

---

[13] See Appendix Three.

development from 2014 in the First Review Report) have been added to SeaSketch. We understand that the SWG was introduced to geospatial information that could be harnessed through the provision of specially produced colour maps that demonstrated how spatially oriented options could be produced.

134. Almost across the board, all RoundTables reported that not enough time was available to think about what the significant amount of information meant with respect to creating options to resolve identified issues, nor how to convert that to a spatially explicit visualisation. Consequently, a great deal has been left to the SWG. The SWG appears comfortable with this, preferring the RoundTables to be exposed to as much information as possible to fully appreciate the issues at hand and to benefit from understanding the range of stakeholder opinion on these. In this regard, the sharing of information has been useful and the Panel has noted much greater awareness of alternate arguments around important issues in the Hauraki Gulf.

135. Under guidance from the SWG/RoundTable Co-Chairs, the RoundTables have to date focused on gathering information to understand the 'situation' pertinent to them, together with identifying relevant issues. This has meant that there has been less time available for development or testing of options. The phase has been exhaustive and highly effective in disseminating comprehensive high-quality information. The SWG appears comfortable with the RoundTable reports, although these are set at a high level.

136. However, no definitive goals and SMART objectives have been articulated by any RoundTable for use in SeaSketch or eventually MSP. This will need to be done in Phases 3 and 4 and is in the hands of the SWG. It is understood that agency technical staff will be available to assist with this process and in our view they will certainly be needed.

137. Most RoundTable members did not appear to have the capability or training sufficient to make effective use of SeaSketch. Demonstrations of SeaSketch were provided or were available to be provided should that have been desired, however, but it appears that the RoundTables did not get to this point. Useful maps and some scenarios are available in the appendices of most of the RoundTable reports. These could be imported into SeaSketch, or an alternative tool for evaluating alternative spatial options, and used to begin development of a marine spatial plan.

138. The SeaSketch support team remains ready on stand-by for this role.

139. It is acknowledged that many stakeholder groups represented within the RoundTables have been reluctant to place 'lines on maps' or even identify general areas of interest because they do not wish to create a precedent, do not wish to expose important or sensitive areas to others, or do not wish to create a confrontation. A number RoundTables reported that negotiated management actions would be a better mechanism for resolving some of the Hauraki Gulf issues. This is particularly the case from the Mātauranga Māori RoundTable that called for strong 'integrated management'.

140. If the expectation is for a spatially oriented plan, however, one potential approach is for the stakeholders and SWG consider using terminology and intent for describing general 'areas' or 'zones' with diffuse boundaries for spatial planning purposes. One of the assumptions of MSP is that not all areas of the marine environment are equally important and that it is central to any MSP process to identify, at minimum, which are biologically important and which are economically important (UNESCO Guide).

141. Finally, there remain a number of highly important data layers still to be made available (also identified in the Theme Seven - Provision and Use of Information). These include a need, as identified by the Biodiversity and Biosecurity RoundTable, for Gulf wide maps of seabed biological assemblages linked to the sedimentary regime and geology (location and extent of benthic communities), nutrient budget maps, and a more detailed and future directed economic information and modelling. Location of biosecurity hotspots are also conspicuous by their absence and given the rapidly increasing number of invasive species found in Auckland's inner harbour. It is acknowledged that, given the patchy information available on some of these thematic areas, there has been a reticence to make 'guesses' at the location of the features identified above. The point here is that these are issues of concern and the information needed must be identified if meaningful planning is to be considered.

142. A decision needs to be made soon on what the output from the MSP process is to be, and whether it will be maps, policy and integrated management, or a combination of those approaches. The Panel noted a range of expectations in this regard. If maps are to be developed, then the next question is how best to generate these. If a spatially explicit plan is proposed, the following recommendations are relevant.

Recommendations

143. That the SWG urgently develops goals and 'SMART' objectives for each of the thematic areas they are covering.

144. That the SWG uses a decision support tool (SeaSketch or something familiar to them) to facilitate the effective use of existing geospatial information in the MSP process.

145. That the SWG acknowledges and uses the significant technical support on offer by DoC and other technical staff associated with SeaSketch, to the extent practical at this stage of the process.

THEME FIVE: ENGAGEMENT AND COMMUNICATIONS

146. The engagement with and communications to stakeholders continues to occur at a number of levels in the Sea Change – Tai Timu Tai Pari process.

147. For example, engagement with stakeholders is a key driver of the SWG and RoundTable processes, and a key purpose of the RoundTable process was to increase the outreach to stakeholders.

148. The three key foci of the engagement and communications team in Phase 2 were to:

   (a) raise awareness of the process;

   (b) enable wider stakeholder input to the SWG and RoundTable process; and

   (c) integrate the engagement and communications plan.

149. Several initiatives were undertaken to raise awareness of Sea Change – Tai Timu Tai Pari and to elicit wider public views and knowledge on the issues facing the Hauraki Gulf. The Panel assessed whether the various sectors and wider public views and knowledge had been adequately encompassed during Phase 2 of the SWG and RoundTable process.

150. A single engagement and communications function lead was appointed for the project (Kyna Hart). A fully integrated engagement and communications plan was prepared, reviewed by the SWG Independent Chair and approved by the Project Board.

151. The Plan appears to have an adaptive management approach that makes it nimble and able to address anticipated and unanticipated situations and outcomes. The engagement and communications plan aligned strongly with the SWG priorities, in particular the RoundTable process.

152. The scope and geographic area of Sea Change – Tai Timu Tai Pari are wide, encompassing the entire combined Auckland and Waikato eastern coastal and marine coastal areas and their contributing catchments. Accordingly, the project team needed to employ a range of engagement and communication techniques to reach stakeholders, including:

   (a) face-to-face fora;

   (b) online engagement;

   (c) media;

   (d) social media;

   (e) events;

   (f) videos; and

   (g) surveys.

153. Wherever possible, the preference was for 'in place' engagement, to go out and meet people within their communities (for example, on beaches around the Hauraki Gulf).

154. Demonstrating transparency to stakeholders has also been key – all SWG meeting minutes and presentations to SWGs and RoundTables are freely available on the Sea Change website. This strengthens the stakeholder-driven nature of the Sea Change – Tai Timu Tai Pari process.

155. The first part of Phase 2 had a very strong focus on raising awareness through direct engagement and media, as well as establishment of systems and processes to ensure robust reporting.

156. Media Plans were completed for major media, sector media and regional/community media. The recent publication of a series of posters (five double-page spreads in the New Zealand Herald) appears to have been effective.

157. The newsletter circulation continues, with high opening rates (42%). One in three people canvassed were aware of the Sea Change – Tai Timu Tai Pari process when asked at the Auckland viaduct on Auckland Anniversary Day. We understand that there is lower awareness apparent in the Waikato region.

158. There has also been information provided by stakeholders to the SWG and RoundTables through various other mechanisms including Listening Posts, Love Our Gulf, Hauraki 100s, events (for example, the boat show) and the Whitianga Scallop Festival.

159. A 'broad-brush' survey designed to feed community opinions and knowledge into the RoundTables ran from August-December. The information was provided to RoundTable facilitators weekly.

160. This was superseded by a detailed survey, the 2014-2015 summer survey campaign, that both provided focussed detail on RoundTable issues (this was also provided to the RoundTable facilitators weekly) and demonstrated an overall 'strong to very strong' alignment between the priority issues identified by the RoundTables and the public's sense of priorities for Tikapa Moana/Hauraki Gulf.

161. Each RoundTable identified a set of priority issues, and these issues were taken to Hauraki 100 events for discussion and to seek ideas and solutions.

162. In its First Review Report, the Panel noted that there were potentially some engagement gaps: youth, Pacific and Asian communities.

163. We understand that there was an attempt to implement Youth Ambassadors in Coastal Communities which has not been effective.

164. The engagement and communications team collaborated with Auckland Council and DoC's MAD (Make a Difference) marine project running workshops with youth from over 40 schools on Rangitoto to share their passion for Tikapa Moana/ Hauraki Gulf. The team is now working on a multi-media project with them to be presented to the SWG and will continue to work with them.

165. There have been events organised that have proved effective for engagement with Asian communities. There are also attempts to make inroads into Asian media and also Auckland Council's advisory panels.

166. We understand that improvement is still required in the engagement with Pacific communities, and that proposals are underway.

167. The engagement team is trying to champion SeaSketch and find ways to use it – for example going to Hamilton Gardens to a 'game' and erecting a big screen with the whale map, and promoting it through 'Love Our Gulf'.

168. We also understand that the intention is to take the near final marine spatial plan 'on tour', although there is no intention to provide the public with an opportunity to provide formal comments or submissions on the plan.

Recommendations

169. The engagement and communications team continues to inform stakeholders of the status of the Sea Change – Tai Timu Tai Pari process.

170. The engagement and communications team continues to seek input from stakeholders where required.

171. The engagement and communications team prepares a proposal for monitoring public response to the marine spatial plan and its roll out.

THEME SIX: ASSESSMENT OF EXISTING MEASURES AND CONSULTATION WITH AGENCIES TO DEVELOP AND TEST OPTIONS

173.   This theme considers the link between the SWG, RoundTables and agencies in terms of assessing potential options against existing statutory, policy and non-statutory frameworks ("**frameworks**"); and the extent to which there has been interaction with those agencies to learn from past experiences in terms of the application of these frameworks. There is also the opportunity to test with agencies whether options are able to be implemented.

174.   In short, given that the RoundTables did not undertake much in the way of option development or option testing, there has been little engagement with agencies to consider options against existing frameworks, or to learn from agencies as to the lessons from the past and the likelihood of particular options being implemented. The Panel acknowledges that other participants in the Sea Change – Tai Timu Tai Pari project also have experience in those frameworks and processes.

175.   There is a complex set of frameworks that apply to the Hauraki Gulf. These include, for example:

(a)   Treaty settlement negotiations and settlements;

(b)   the Resource Management Act and local government legislation – covering catchments and the coastal marine area (administered primarily by local authorities);

(c)   conservation legislation (for example the Marine Reserves Act and the Marine Mammals Protection Act and regulations – administered by the Department of Conservation); and

(d)   fisheries legislation (administered by the Ministry for Primary Industries).

176.   The agencies involved in the Sea Change – Tai Timu Tai Pari project have significant history and experience in seeking to implement solutions for areas such as the Hauraki Gulf. For example, DoC has significant experience in seeking to promote marine reserves, and attempting to reconcile different perspectives and interests through those processes. Similarly, Auckland Council and Waikato Regional Council have extensive experience with catchment and coastal planning processes under the Resource Management Act.

177.   This experience is an invaluable resource for Sea Change – Tai Timu Tai Pari. At this stage the process has not drawn on that resource to any great extent. The engagement between the SWG/RoundTables and agencies to date has tended to be focussed on the provision of technical support, as opposed to engagement to consider and test options in terms of whether they will be able to be implemented.

178.   An analysis and consideration of these frameworks will be a key aspect of the next stage of the process. While the SWG may not wish to be constrained by these frameworks in developing options, it is important to have a clear understanding of what

options are broadly possible within the current frameworks, and what options will require changes to statutory or policy frameworks. To the extent that legislative change may be required, an understanding of the political and logistical implications of the legislative change process is required.

179. Further, it is critical that agencies have had a meaningful contribution to the marine spatial plan and the options that are proposed. If agencies are not properly included, then options may be developed that do not reflect constraints imposed by the frameworks under which agencies operate, and agency staff may not recommend adoption of those options to the ultimate decision-makers. In other words, agencies need to have 'skin-in-the-game' and feel a sense of ownership of the marine spatial plan. That is not intended to diminish the independence of the SWG, but to reinforce the importance of the marine spatial plan being adopted and implemented by agencies. If the plan does not connect (at least in broad terms) to relevant frameworks, and is not supported by agencies due to insufficient engagement, then it is far less likely to be implemented.

Recommendations

180. Ensure that, as options are developed, the SWG understands what those options mean in relation to the current statutory, policy and non-statutory frameworks.

181. That the SWG works closely with/involves agencies to test potential options, both in terms of fit with the current statutory and policy frameworks, and to increase the chances of those agencies recommending the adoption and implementation of the marine spatial plan.

THEME SEVEN: PROVISION AND USE OF INFORMATION

182. The RoundTables have completed an intensive review of most of the information that has been available for each theme. The information that has been presented to them has been of very high-quality. The technical support has been exemplary.

183. Collation and assimilation of available information by each RoundTable was exhaustive and comprehensive. The RoundTable reports are a good source of relevant information for the SWG. The executive summaries and recommendations are, however, very high-level in all reports.

184. The RoundTables have been encouraged to pursue their own pace and approach to understanding the relevant environment for their respective issue, and to then formulate a list of high-level issues, options and solutions. We understand that they had an enormous amount of information to digest and as a result had little time to fully assimilate it and discuss the results in any detail.

185. The Biodiversity and Biosecurity RoundTable in particular identified an enormous information base, although they may have not balanced their time effectively between these two 'sub themes'. This RoundTable also indicated that it would have been useful to have discussions along the lines of 'cost-benefit analyses' to explore various options associated with fisheries management and marine protected area development. That reflects other RoundTable comments that economic analyses could have been useful in their deliberations.

186. Information was used well to develop RoundTable and Co-Chair/SWG members' understanding of status and issues for each area of focus. Importantly, a shared understanding of issues and options was gained at each RoundTable. This is significant as frequently RoundTable members originally came from opposite view points on many of the issues. This is viewed as a major success of the RoundTable activities and should not be lost. In this sense, it is considered that there is an important role for some RoundTable members and agency staff to be available for assisting with the implementation of the marine spatial plan. They should therefore be actively engaged in the next steps of plan development.

187. The Mātauranga Māori RoundTable and the Mana Whenua hui-a-iwi generally indicated a need for cultural valuation information but also acknowledged that this information was owned by different iwi groups and would be sensitive if made widely available. It was acknowledged that the ongoing Treaty Settlement process is on a longer timeframe and therefore some information layers relevant to cultural assets and valuation may not be available at this stage.

188. As indicated above, a number of RoundTables identified important information gaps. Both the Fish Stocks and Biodiversity and Biosecurity RoundTables identified a need for better benthic biogenic maps for the Gulf. The Accessible Gulf RoundTable identified a need for detailed economic information and modelling.

189. In some instances the RoundTables found they needed to deal with conflicting information (for example, predictions on the nutrient budgets in the Firth of Thames and what the critical tipping points were, or how close the system was to them); or they were not fully convinced by some presentations (for example, any discussion on marine protected areas appeared to cause concern amongst RoundTable members). These are exactly the types of situations that one would expect from a MSP exercise where some form of prediction of future patterns needs to be debated and where compromise needs to be made.

190. This is a sign that the RoundTables were getting close to the hard discussions of what needs to go where. Unfortunately, these types of discussions were not couched with well-defined and clearly articulated objectives in mind, hence they tended to be open-ended and not entirely constructive.

191. This situation does demonstrate an in-depth knowledge of the RoundTable portfolios and heralds the start of developing options that address the unknowns (uncertainty about trends, lack of predictive modelling information, and apparent conflicting information). The key point here is that the character and extent of the 'unknowns' is now becoming known.

192. Given that the ultimate goal of the MSP process is to enhance the wellbeing of the Hauraki Gulf and improve its functioning across all sectors, the focus on environmental information is particularly important. The need for accurate (or with known certainty) environmental forecasting (such as water quality, fisheries stock assessments and climate change) is paramount.

193. We understand that the RoundTables had most of this information and were at a point that they could provide the needed synthesis to formulate goals and objectives underneath the issues and options currently provided by them (albeit at a high level of description). However, they ran out of time.

194. Although not explicitly called for, RoundTables did not make it to an option identification and analysis phase specifically addressing separate issues, hence information that may be needed in support of the process of choosing between possible solutions was not identified. Their work has, however, provided a basis for the roll out of issues as a precursor to SWG deliberations.

195. No RoundTable, with the exception of Aquaculture, offered maps depicting options for reducing spatial conflicts with other 'activities'. It appears that the intention was for this to be undertaken by the SWG in Phases 3 and 4.

196. The February 2015 SWG meeting (at Whitianga) where RoundTables provided their 'summary report back' was a highlight and clearly allowed for progress in commencing a cross theme synthesis of findings.

197. We note that agencies were constrained from providing their views so as to allow the stakeholders free rein to develop ideas around issues and options. Agencies and technical support staff are expected to contribute more to Phases 3 and 4, albeit within

a compressed timeframe. It is noted that the SWG is seeking further information from support staff, post RoundTable report submission indicating momentum and continuing information input to Phases 3 and 4.

Recommendations

198. That the SWG takes note of the recommendations in Theme 3[14] (ie fill missing data gaps and complete necessary analyses that may otherwise inhibit speedy development of a marine spatial plan).

199. That the SWG makes use of the available spatial information that is provided in the appendices of the RoundTable Reports, and from other sources, as a start towards preparing a marine spatial plan.

---

[14] Paragraphs 121 and 123 above.

APPENDIX ONE

INDEPENDENT REVIEW PANEL BIOGRAPHIES

Paul Beverley (Chair)

1. Paul is a partner at Buddle Findlay lawyers where he leads the resource management and Māori law team in Wellington. Paul specialises in resource management, Māori law and conservation law, with a particular focus on coastal issues.

2. From 2008-2012 he was appointed by the Ministers of Conservation and Fisheries as Chair of the Subantarctic Marine Protection Planning Forum, which made recommendations resulting in three new marine reserves in that area.

3. Paul has been a member of the core Crown design, negotiation and drafting team for over 30 Treaty of Waitangi settlements, and advises the Crown and local authorities on a wide range of Māori law issues and relationships. His particular specialty is designing and negotiating co-governance and co-management arrangements between the Crown/local authorities and Māori.

4. He also advises widely on RMA planning and consenting processes and a range of coastal legal issues including in relation to fisheries, aquaculture, ports and marinas, marine reserves, marine mammals and wildlife. Paul recently appeared in the Supreme Court in the NZ King Salmon case, as Counsel representing the Board of Inquiry.

Professor Charles Ehler

5. Professor Charles Ehler works in Paris, France, as a MSP consultant to UNESCO's Intergovernmental Oceanographic Commission (IOC), other international organisations, national governments, and non-governmental organisations.

6. Before moving to Paris in 2005, Charles was a senior executive for the U.S. National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) and US Environmental Protection Agency for 32 years.

7. Charles previously taught regional planning and natural resources management at the University of Michigan, the University of California at Los Angeles (UCLA), and the State University of New York at Stony Brook. He was the Marine Vice-Chair of IUCN's World Commission on Protected Areas from 2000-2005.

8. In 2007 Charles received an award from the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change for his work on coastal adaptation and its contribution to the award of the Nobel Prize to the IPCC. +He is the author of over 100 publications on coastal and marine planning, including the 2009 UNESCO Guide to the new field of MSP and a 2014 UNESCO Guide to evaluating marine spatial plans.

Professor Chris Battershill

9. Dr Chris Battershill became the inaugural Professor and Chair of Coastal Science with the University of Waikato in January 2011, following 12 years as leader of the Marine Resources and Biodiversity Teams at the Australian Institute of Marine Science (AIMS).

10. From an MSc start in petrochemical development and environmental toxicology funded by the Shell, BP and Todd Maui Environmental Program, he completed his PhD at Auckland University in reef ecology in 1986 then undertook a 3 year Research Fellowship funded through the National Cancer Institute (US) based at the University of Canterbury, leading the cancer drug discovery field program.

11. This was followed by post-doctoral work in Australia, a senior scientist role at DOC and program leadership at NIWA over 12 years, focused on conservation and sustainability of marine resource use.

12. Recent work includes leadership of the Rena Long Term Environmental Recovery Program. Publications include co-authorship of 3 books and over 100 international peer reviewed research articles.

Dr Dan Hikuroa

13. Dr Daniel (Dan) Hikuroa is an Earth System Scientist with interests in the integration of mātauranga (Māori knowledge) and science to realise indigenous development.

14. Dan has been the Research Director of Ngā Pae o te Māramatanga since July 2011, and has established himself as a world expert on integrating indigenous knowledge and science.

15. Dan has undertaken many projects including State of the Hauraki Gulf Environment Report 2014, geothermal developments, hazard and vulnerability assessment and industrial waste site rehabilitation.

Dr Rick Boven

16. Dr Rick Boven leads Stakeholder Strategies, a company that works with public and private organisations and NGOs on strategic issues in the commercial, economic, social and environmental domains. He has worked as a social scientist, market researcher and business strategist. He was the founding partner of the Boston Consulting Group in New Zealand and was the Director of think tank the New Zealand Institute from 2009 to 2012.

17. He has provided strategic advice to leading companies in Australia, New Zealand and USA in a wide range of industries including financial services, retailing and distribution, energy, telecommunications, high tech, information technology, transport, manufacturing and agriculture. His areas of expertise include organisation design, governance, risk management, strategy development, management development and operational effectiveness.

18. Rick is a Chartered Fellow of the Institute of Directors. He has been a director of ASB Bank and Sovereign Insurance and of several internationalising technology companies.

19. Rick's qualifications include an MA in psychology, an MBA and a PhD in environment management. He is published across a wide range of subjects, including social welfare, mathematical psychology, educational sociology, strategic management, business ethics, economic development and environmental strategy. He is an advisor to several environmental organisations and a frequent speaker on environment topics.

THE CHARACTERISTICS OF "MARINE SPATIAL PLANNING"

Some of the key characteristics of a marine spatial plan include:

1. **Place-based,** with a focus on marine spaces that people can understand, relate to, and care for

2. **Participatory,** building on a broad base of stakeholders to ensure long-term support for management

3. **Integrated and multi-objective,** including all-important economic sectors; economic and social objectives as well as ecological ones

4. **Strategic and future-oriented,** considering alternative means to achieve a vision

5. **Ecosystem-based,** with a focus on maintaining ecosystem services over time

6. **Continuing and adaptive,** with an emphasis on performance monitoring and evaluation—and learning by doing

Source: ***UNESCO Guide to Marine Spatial Planning, 2009***

THE CHARACTERISTICS OF 'SMART' OBJECTIVES

An "objective" is a specific statement of a desired outcome that represents the achievement of a management goal. Objectives should be linked to appropriate indicators and associated targets. Some of the characteristics of SMART objectives include:

1. **Specific:** objectives should be concrete, detailed, focused and well-defined in terms of defining desirable outcomes of the MSP process (have you specified what you want to achieve?)

2. **Measurable:** Objectives should allow measurement of the outcomes and progress toward their achievement (can you measure what you want to achieve?)

3. **Achievable**: objectives should be attainable within a reasonable amount of effort and resources (are the resources required to achieve the objectives available?)

4. **Relevant or Realistic:** objectives should lead to a desired goal, either on its own or in combination with other objectives, and

5. **Time-bound:** Objectives should indicate a start and finish date in relation to what is to be accomplished (when do you want to achieve the specific objective or objectives?)

Source: ***UNESCO Guide to Marine Spatial Planning, 2009, and***
UNESCO Guide to Evaluating Marine Spatial Plans, 2014

APPENDIX THREE

REVIEW OF ROUND TABLE REPORTS

Round Table Report Notes

1. The following notes are made in the context of the Panel's scope of review with particular focus on the Geospatial Resources and Provision and Use of Information themes.

General Comments

2. No report explicitly identifies spatial options for consideration, nor does any report indicate that that was a key directive, rather in one way or another, they indicate that the aim of their process was to coordinate and assimilate information, identify (high level) goals, issues and objectives. The implication is that the SWG will convert this information into the marine spatial plan. The information required by the SWG is largely within the RoundTable reports and the Appendices provide much of the spatial material needed for option testing and marine spatial plan.

Specific Comments

Accessible Gulf

3. The tenor of this report is epitomised by the statement "…*solutions pertaining to an accessible Gulf are less about spatial planning and more about hearts and minds.*" The report contains high level goals with no specifics as to quantifiable targets or timelines, i.e., SMART objectives. Solutions identified include marine protected areas (with a number of easy wins hinted at), and the development of economic hubs. A need for a rigorous economic assessment is however identified in this report.

4. There were no spatially oriented recommendations. There were however useful 'heat maps' that allows identification of usage hot spots that can be integrated into a MSP process.

Aquaculture

5. The executive summary for this Report does have a spatially oriented statement. No hard targets for spatial implementation of various 'use' areas nor timelines are provided.

6. Chapter 5 of the report has a useful section on the location and scale of aquaculture options for consideration.

7. The recommendation for a three-tiered approach for planning aquaculture development is useful.

8. There is a map in this report that outlines rough areas for aquaculture consideration as well as areas where aquaculture probably shouldn't go ahead. This is a useful contribution for the SWG to consider.

Biodiversity and Biosecurity

9.   The scope statement for this RoundTable does not have any spatially explicit information or recommendations. The statements and recommendations are set at a high level.

10.   Recommendations are largely for more preparative work (creating a management backdrop that invokes environmental information for Ecosystem Based Management ("**EBM**") is an environmental management approach that recognises the full array of interactions within an ecosystem, including humans, rather than considering single issues, species, or ecosystem services in isolation).

11.   There are lists of habitats with some locational information in the appendices to this Report.

12.   There are clear gaps in information that are needed to inform EBM, such as an integrated map of the Gulf's biodiversity assemblages linked to the geology of the seabed, maps of potential spawning and nursery grounds and identification of biosecurity hotspots. These are needed to further inform MSP.

13.   No information is provided on biosecurity hot spots, nor any locational information on risk areas. This is a major omission given the extremely deteriorated state of the inner Gulf with respect to invasive species incursions.

14.   Figure 1 in this Report depicts important environmental areas. This is of significant use to future MSP. Dr Roger Grace's added detail using SeaSketch was a late contribution to this RoundTable and apparently not fully endorsed. It is however an example of perhaps what may be expected as an output, keeping in mind that the actual delineation of areas has not be discussed nor agreed to. The Panel does consider this as a starting point for an ecosystem-based marine spatial plan.

Fish Stocks

15.   This RoundTable Report is again set at a high level with a succinct summary of the findings. Four objectives are identified but with no measurable targets or timelines.

16.   No maps are included in the report and there is limited discussion of findings. The results of most of the work of the RoundTable are found in summary tables.

17.   The RoundTable did identify the importance of biologically-important habitats (including the fact that little was known or documented), as did the Biodiversity and Biosecurity RoundTable.

18.   Figure 4 of the Appendices is very useful as it indicates snapper spawning areas which may align with biologically-important benthic areas.

19.   Hauraki Gulf Marine Park maps have been included and may be relevant marine spatial maps for this RoundTable. They indicate current delimitations for various fishing practices and constitute a start for discussing options for multiple use spatial planning and/or planning for future growth.

Infrastructure

20. No firm recommendations were provided in this RoundTable Report and no maps were included. A case study for the Coromandel region is provided in the Appendix to this RoundTable with options/scenario's discussed. This represents a start for spatial planning for that region within the Hauraki Gulf.

Water Quality

21. As above, this RoundTable states that its purpose is in essence to corral information and provide a high level synthesis. That is, to present the technical information to the SWG who will work on it.

22. Issues and options of relevance to water quality in the Hauraki Gulf are discussed and generic solutions offered.

23. The report presents useful indicative maps of water quality 'hot spots' for a number of the key water quality parameters (such as turbidity, zinc and nutrients).

24. The map by Reid[15] is very useful for future MSP needs.

---

[15] 1968 Fig 2 Page 87.