

Ko Ngāti Kahungunu te Iwi

Ko Ngāti Hawea, Ngāti Hori ngā Hapū

Ko Waipatu, Matahiwi, Houngarea ngā marae

He uri ahau o Winipere i tu ana i te takutaimoana ki te karanga ki a rātau i hokinga mai.

He uri ahau o Te Hira Te Ota.

E noho ana ahau i Wairua te papakainga ki Mangateretere

Ko Aramanu toku ingoa.

My name is Aramanu Ropiha. I am the author of the Whataangaanga and surrounds; Cultural values, names and associations report commissioned by Ravensdown for this resource consent application.

This is a significant application to discharge waste into the environment for a lengthy period of time. The location of the Ravensdown facility, where discharge of waste has been occurring under less than ideal conditions, is spiritually and culturally significant to Mana whenua and all Heretaunga Hapū would share an interest in this application and the cultural outcomes sought through the Cultural values, names and associations report.

[I oppose and reserve support to the resource consent application until recommendations and relevant conditions are incorporated into the consent application, including appropriate consultation.](#)

My submission will address the following aspects of the resource consent application process:

- Consultation and engagement with Mana whenua.
- The opportunity to lead with Mana whenua
- Time and technology
- Cultural outcomes

### **Consultation and engagement with Mana whenua.**

To my knowledge there has been no meaningful **consultation** with Mana whenua specific to this resource consent application.

**Engagement** included representatives of Ngāti Pārau Trust, Kahungunu ki Te Matau a Māui rohe moana and Ngāti Kahungunu Iwi Incorporated; with Kuia from Kohupātiki Marae, included as part of a stakeholder group and this group, essentially 5-6 people, are referred to in my report as a Mana whenua Attempts were made by Ravensdown (the Company) as stated in the application [19.2 Consultation with Mana whenua] to engage Te Taiwhenua o Heretaunga and Te Taiwhenua o Te Whanganui a Orotu. Engagement with these two Authorities did not occur.

I attended an introductory meeting at the office of Mitchell Daysh and two meetings at Ravensdown related to the HARP so I could scope the Cultural Values Report and proposed HARP.

These interactions are not consultation. Engagement with Mana whenua members of the stakeholder group does not imply or replace the need to consult with Mana whenua.

From page 6 of my report it reads:

*Consultation with Mana whenua needs to be appropriately undertaken through the resource consent application process.*

At page 18 of the report the Mana whenua hapū at the time of the Native Land Court hearings are identified. At page 22 of the report the Mana whenua hapū today are identified.

I reiterate: Consultation with Mana whenua needs to be appropriately undertaken through the resource consent application process.

### **The opportunity to lead with Mana whenua**

The land known to Mana whenua as Whataangaanga is the site of the Ravensdown fertiliser works.

After almost 70 years, the company has an opportunity to develop a foundation relationship with Mana whenua of Whataangaanga, returning a benefit to the lands and waters and to their people.

The report Whataangaanga and surrounds, cultural values, names and associations, sets out the outcomes that Mana whenua seek in working with Ravensdown and shows how that relationship can unfold as the two work together. Ngāti Pārau have submitted a Cultural Impact Assessment with their own recommendations.

While indicating support for the recommendations of the two reports, the Company appear to have misunderstood, or deliberately tried to dilute the potential of a Rangatira relationship with Mana whenua. The conditions proposed by the Company entitled Mana whenua Recognition and Participation, grossly underestimate this potential and opportunity of such a relationship.

This misunderstanding was identified by the Mana whenua roopu who wrote to the Company to inform of their position. A variation was proposed that included some valid ideas, however, there has been no attempt at discussion with the roopu, or myself as was indicated by the Company immediately following lodgement of the report.

The proposed Advisory Committee is unacceptable. Changing the word advisory to reference as has been proposed is also unacceptable. What is acceptable is a commitment to work with Mana whenua on a strategy to implement the recommendations of the two cultural reports and any subsequent conditions recommended through this submission process. Such a commitment is based on continued engagement with the Mana whenua, though a co-design process, built on a relationship of good faith.

This may seem a minor issue to the consent process however, the analysis of the application and correspondence with the Company, use of language and reference to Mana whenua and cultural concepts, indicate a far deeper concern to Mana whenua engagement and future collaboration.

## **Time and technology**

The proposed 35 year consent period with present time solutions does not take into account future legislative direction or improvements in technology around environmental protection. The Government is proposing major transformation in the way our natural resources are managed. Included in the proposed changes are improved recognition of Te Tiriti o Waitangi; providing hapū with a more effective role in the system and a move from an effects based system to an outcomes based one. Improvements that would support the recommendation of the cultural outcomes proposed.

The consent conditions could allow for regular reviews of the proposed HART project, political and legislative environment, technology for improving waste discharge quality and outcomes, and the Company's relationship with Mana whenua.

## **Cultural outcomes**

Mana whenua have identified the following cultural outcomes for this area and look to lead in partnership with Ravensdown to achieve them. Please refer to the report for more detail.

These are Mana whenua principles in this and any future engagement.

### **Mana; Mauri Tū; Taiao; Ahi kā**

- Mana whenua is recognised, engaged and respected.  
*Te Tiriti – together we acknowledge our **rangatiratanga***
- The natural environment is protected, restored and enhanced.  
*Taiao – together we exercise **kaitiakitanga***
- Environmental health is protected, mauri is enhanced.  
*Tangata – together we demonstrate **manaakitanga***

Through the Mana whenua principles, the tangible cultural outcomes desired for the project, proposed to run alongside the Habitat Abundance Restoration Project, can be achieved.

### **Whakapapa; Ahi kā; Mahi Toi; Tohu**

- Significant sites and cultural landmarks are acknowledged.
- Engagement and research on the use of correct ancestral names.
- Creative interpretation ensures that hapū narratives are captured; appropriately designed and expressed.
- The cultural landscape is explored; historical, physical, environmental, political, and social experience is honestly depicted.
- Māori names are celebrated, both traditional and new.