Introduction

1 This submission has been developed on behalf of the following Ngati Tuwharetoa Māori land trusts and incorporations:

   - Puketapu 3A Incorporation
   - Waihi Pukawa Trust
   - Waituhi Kuratau 1A1B2 Trust
   - Whangaipeke X Trust
   - Oraukura 3 Incorporation
   - Hauhungaroa 1C Incorporation
   - Hauhungaroa 2C Incorporation
   - Pukawa 5B Trust
   - Waihi Kahakaharoa 4A Trust
   - Tauranga Taupo 1B2A3 Trust
   - Tauranga Taupo 1B2F Trust
   - Manaaki Limited Partnership

These Ngati Tuwharetoa Māori Trusts and Incorporations are collectively referred to as ‘the Trusts’ in the balance of the submission and all points made should be attributed to each and all of the Māori land trusts listed.
The Trusts’ key asset of land is an intergenerational asset. Ensuring land use flexibility and reasonable use of the land for both current and future generations is of great importance to the Trusts. The Trusts collectively are the kaitiaki of over 23,696 hectares of farm, forestry and undeveloped land in the Taupo and Ruapehu Districts of the Central North Island (see Figure 1). Please refer to the table below. The Trusts hold this land for the benefit of over 20,000 beneficiaries.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Block</th>
<th>Area (ha)</th>
<th>No. of Owners</th>
<th>Land Use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Puketapu 3A Inc.</td>
<td>6,607.0</td>
<td>1,630</td>
<td>Dry stock farming, plantation forestry, undeveloped used for tourism (lodges and hunting)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waihi Pukawa Trust</td>
<td>3,532.9</td>
<td>6,039</td>
<td>Dry stock farming and plantation forestry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waituhi Kuratau 1A1B2 Trust</td>
<td>2,537.3</td>
<td>501</td>
<td>Dry stock farming, sheep milking and plantation forestry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whangaipeke X Trust</td>
<td>1,101.3</td>
<td>5,048</td>
<td>Dry stock farming, plantation forestry, undeveloped used for tourism (hunting and fishing)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oraukura 3 Inc.</td>
<td>1,256.9</td>
<td>1,124</td>
<td>Dry stock farming and plantation forestry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hauhungaroa 1C Inc.</td>
<td>4,328.1</td>
<td>874</td>
<td>Dry stock farming and plantation forestry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hauhungaroa 2C Inc.</td>
<td>3,228.2</td>
<td>603</td>
<td>Dry stock farming and plantation forestry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pukawa 5B Trust</td>
<td>665.9</td>
<td>2,362</td>
<td>Largely undeveloped but area leased for dry stock farming</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waihi Kahakaharoa 4A Trust</td>
<td>160.8</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>Undeveloped (historically farmed but now reverting)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waihi Kahakaharoa 3B2B2B Trust</td>
<td>143.8</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Largely undeveloped (historically farmed but now reverting) - small area leased for cropping and small area of exotic forest shelterbelts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tauranga Taupo 1B2A3 Trust</td>
<td>114.5</td>
<td>319</td>
<td>Undeveloped</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tauranga Taupo 1B2F Trust</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>1,789</td>
<td>Undeveloped</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>23,696.1</strong></td>
<td><strong>20,401</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As mentioned, the Trusts collectively hold approximately 23,696 hectares of land. Of this approximately 8,100 hectares or 34% of the total land area is in indigenous vegetation. Approximately 11,500 hectares is in farmland or 49% of the total area. The balance of the land being approximately 4,000 hectares or 17% of the total area is in plantation forest. Please refer to the table below which
provides an approximate breakdown of land use by individual trust. This shows that the percentage of indigenous vegetation by individual trust varies from 5% to 100% of the total land parcel area.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Block</th>
<th>Total Area (ha)</th>
<th>Farmland (ha)</th>
<th>Farmland (%)</th>
<th>Plantation Forest Land (ha)</th>
<th>Plantation Forest Land (%)</th>
<th>Indigenous vegetation (ha)</th>
<th>Indigenous vegetation (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Puketapu 3A Inc.</td>
<td>6,607.0</td>
<td>2,103.1</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>730</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3,773.9</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waihi Pukawa Trust</td>
<td>3,532.9</td>
<td>2,498.1</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>685</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>349.8</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waituhi Kuratau 1A1B2 Trust</td>
<td>2,537.3</td>
<td>2,290.3</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>152.0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whangaipeke X Trust</td>
<td>1,101.3</td>
<td>727.5</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>328.8</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oraukura 3 Inc.</td>
<td>1,256.9</td>
<td>1,093.3</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>63.6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hauhungaroa 1C Inc.</td>
<td>4,328.1</td>
<td>1,762.8</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>560</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2005.3</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hauhungaroa 2C Inc.</td>
<td>3,228.2</td>
<td>960</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>1,800</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>468.2</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pukawa 5B Trust</td>
<td>665.9</td>
<td>130.9</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>535.0</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waihi Kahakaharoa 4A Trust</td>
<td>160.8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>160.8</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waihi Kahakaharoa 3B2B2B Trust</td>
<td>143.8</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>131.8</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tauranga Taupo 1B2A3 Trust</td>
<td>114.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>114.5</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tauranga Taupo 1B2F Trust</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>23,696.1</strong></td>
<td><strong>11,576.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>49</strong></td>
<td><strong>4,017</strong></td>
<td><strong>17</strong></td>
<td><strong>8,103.1</strong></td>
<td><strong>34</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4 The Trusts oppose the Proposed NPS on Indigenous Biodiversity (the Proposed NPS) in its current form.

5 Overall, the Trusts consider that unless the document is substantially modified it will result in significant costs for limited environmental benefit and creates real risk of exacerbating the loss of biodiversity on private land.

**Support for indigenous biodiversity**

6 The Trusts support the broad objective of the Proposed NPS to maintain and enhance indigenous biodiversity and are very conscious of the value of biodiversity. The Trusts endeavour to be environmentally responsible kaitiaki and land managers that are proactive in promoting sustainable management approaches to the management of their whenua.
A large number of the Trusts have voluntarily entered into Land Improvement Agreements with the Waikato Regional Council. This has resulted in large areas being permanently retired from grazing allowing these areas to regenerate into indigenous vegetation. A number of the Trusts have actively encouraged and undertaken animal pest control which has significantly benefited the large areas of indigenous vegetation on their land and plant pest control within riparian margins and wetlands located on their land.

Notwithstanding its support for indigenous biodiversity, the Trusts do not support the Proposed NPS in its current form, because it does not recognise the importance of landowners and occupiers in protecting and enhancing these areas. It does not incentivise them to continue to play such a role, and the nature of the policies and methods actively disempowers landowners. The design of the Proposed NPS will also perpetuate the loss of rangatiratanga experienced by tangata whenua as it is another example of the Crown appropriating the right to regulate resources. The proposed NPS also perpetuates the confiscation of use of Māori Land by the Crown further adding to the inequitable burden of regulation that will fall on such land as a result i.e. the design of the Proposed NPS does not appropriately provide for the relationship of Māori and their culture and traditions with their taonga, nor does it support the ability to meaningfully act as kaitiaki.

Recognition of Māori Landowners

Section 1.7 of the Proposed NPS sets out the fundamental concepts that underpin the document. Foremost of these is Hutia Te Rito which quotes a whakatauki recognising the impact people have on the natural environment and its survival and enhancement. Of specific reference are the following words:

“He aha te mea nui o te ao? Māku e kī atu, he tangata, he tangata, he tāngata”

This whakatauki highlights the importance of people in particular landowners in protecting the environment. However, this is not reflected in the Proposed NPS. There is little reference in the proposed NPS to the important role that these people, with an intimate relationship with their land, play in protecting and enhancing these areas, expressing tino rangatiratanga and kaitiakitanga. Instead it sets a regulatory framework which will work to alienate these people from such areas and from a desire to act in a positively empowered way to improve them.

To be effective in achieving all the objectives set out in Section 2.1 of the Proposed NPS the document needs to be reframed to focus on recognising and empowering landowners and occupiers to create positive outcomes for these areas. The current approach of regulating instead of incentivising and acknowledging that these areas are part of a working landscape means that the document is taking a command and control approach that it is unlikely to result in practical benefits for our biodiversity.

The Proposed NPS also takes an overly academic approach to defining the role of Māori in protecting and enhancing indigenous biodiversity. The objectives refer to landowners ‘and’ tāngata whenua (2.1.6) and the policy refers to the role of tāngata whenua as kaitiaki. However, the proposed NPS is lacking in reference and recognition of tāngata whenua as kaitiaki and as landowners. Section 3.3 of the Proposed NPS focusses on matters such as cultural monitoring, taonga and customary use. While recognition of these concepts is supported, for Māori these are not separate from our role as landowners but one in the same and not able to be separated. A more holistic understanding and recognition of the role of Māori and Māori ecological management processes in the Proposed NPS is required.
The need for better recognition of landowners is important for all, but this is especially important for Māori landowners whose land is generally overrepresented in implementing the Proposed NPS. This issue is noted in Section C.6 of the Discussion document on the proposed National Policy Statement for Indigenous Biodiversity (the Discussion Document), “...protections for SNAs could unfairly impact on Māori, and worsen disadvantages created by historic confiscation and loss of land”\(^1\).

This inequity is very evident in the Taupō District where around half (340,000ha) of the district has been identified as a Significant Natural Area (SNA) and around half of those are in private ownership. Of those in private ownership in excess of 80%\(^2\) of SNAs in Taupō District are on Māori land. This is not including Settlement land or land held by Māori in general title. It is likely that under the Proposed NPS the number of sites and the area will grow as activities in lesser value areas will become regulated.

This can be illustrated by approximately 34% of the total area of the Trusts’ land being indigenous vegetation with approximately 29% being identified as SNAs within District Plans. Consequently, it is likely that additional areas of the Trusts’ land will be identified as SNAs under the Proposed NPS placing additional constraints and associated costs on to the Trusts thereby reducing the profitability of the commercial activities undertaken by the Trusts.

The reasons for this inequity are accurately identified in the discussion document as being based on the fact that Māori landowners have been historically restricted in the use of their land. This inequity, and in a lot of cases a desire to protect these areas, has resulted in the presence of more indigenous vegetation remaining on their land. In respect to the Proposed NPS this will result in the burden of regulation falling heavily and unequally on Māori and consequently penalising Māori for retaining these areas in indigenous vegetation. Māori are now required to lock these areas up as mitigation for those other landowners who have cleared their land previously.

The discussion document (page 54) also notes that the Proposed NPS is likely to impose significant constraints on Māori land. It also notes that for those with large amounts of indigenous vegetation on them, the landowners will have limited options for development. There is no response to this observation in the Proposed NPS except for provision 3.9.2.iv which refers to the use of Māori land in a way that will make a significant contribution to enhancing the social, cultural or economic wellbeing of tāngata whenua. While this is a positive reference it is likely to be applied against a dominant regulatory framework which seeks to avoid effects entirely, or to manage them through the effects management hierarchy. Such an approach has absolutely no recognition of the role of Māori and their desire to use their land in a positive manner.

The Proposed NPS with its regulatory dominant approach has little recognition of the effect that it will have on Māori landowners. The effect is to seriously undermine Māori control and management over what Māori own, and to constrain economic and thus cultural and social outcomes. This is because the Proposed NPS will give territorial authorities no choice but to identify the vast areas of indigenous vegetation within the Trusts’ estate as SNA’s and, based on the direction to avoid effects, make use of these areas non-complying. This is being

---


\(^2\) Information provided by Taupo District Council planning Department
done due to the national importance of these areas, however there is no recompense provided to landowners. For Māori landowners this is yet another form of alienation of Māori land for public good.

Unfortunately, at the end of the process there is not likely to be any benefits to the areas which are to be ‘protected’ as it is a nominal legal protection, without the necessary active protection provided by pest control. The loss of autonomy of action – tino rangatiratanga – is likely to diminish any desire to carry out such active protection.

**Other General concern with Proposed NPS**

19 As highlighted above, 49% of the Trusts’ land is farmland, 17% is plantation forest and 34% indigenous vegetation. The mix and integrated nature of the various land uses within the respective land trusts means that each trust has a range of activities occurring on their lands. This not only includes the activity of farming and plantation forestry but also activities that are undertaken within areas of indigenous vegetation located on the Trusts’ land. Such activities include animal grazing, beekeeping, tourism, managing deer populations for hunting purposes, native log salvage, maintenance of roads and tracks for access and general food gathering. The integrated nature of the various land uses and the proximity of the Trusts’ land to the nearby Conservation Estate means that the Trusts’ lands have highly mobile fauna present e.g. native birds, native insects (some of which can be agricultural pests e.g. porina) etc.

20 Policy 3.12 applies to the management of effects of existing activities on SNAs and Policy 3.13 and 3.15 requires local authorities to maintain indigenous biodiversity (including highly mobile fauna) by amending their plans to manage adverse effects of land use on such indigenous biodiversity. These policies could lead to new and stringent regulation of existing activities. If these are done as resource consent conditions they are often written by people who have little or no experience of such activities, and are thus unable to make informed or appropriate management suggestions i.e. it is quite possible that ineffective, unnecessary and inappropriate constraints are put on activities to protect them from hazards that don’t affect them. The Trusts are very concerned about what this means in practice.

21 When a resource consent application is triggered by indigenous biodiversity controls, policy 3.19 contains onerous requirements for assessment of potential adverse effects which would be very expensive to complete in the context of such integrated land use.

22 The Trusts acknowledges that the Proposed NPS contains some recognition that plantation forest should be treated differently from indigenous forest remnants. However, these provisions are limited in scope, their meaning is unclear and their relationship with other parts of the Proposed NPS is ambiguous.

23 Policy 3.10 provides that plantation forest identified as containing SNAs are deemed to be “plantation forest biodiversity areas” (PFBA). However, as currently drafted Policy 3.8 of the Proposed NPS would require all SNA within the Trusts’ land to be identified and mapped in district plans.

24 The breadth of the criteria for identifying SNA (Appendix 1 of the Proposed NPS) is not refined through suitable policy to accurately define what is genuinely significant. This means that large areas of plantation forest, farmland and grazing land that contains indigenous vegetation would be identified as SNA. The surveys required to complete this task would come at enormous cost, they are
likely to then impose significant constraints on both farming and plantation forest activity - without recognising that in this instance both the farming and plantation forest activity is the source of habitat for a range of indigenous species - and are likely to achieve little benefit in terms of maintaining indigenous biodiversity.

Policy 3.10 applies to PFBA and requires that adverse effects of plantation forestry activities on (a) threatened or at-risk flora must be managed, and (b) significant habitat for threatened or at-risk indigenous fauna must be managed, to maintain long-term populations of such fauna. The Trusts are very concerned about what this means in practice.

Overall, it is reasonable to anticipate that the Proposed NPS in its current form will be relied upon to impose significant new restrictions on farming and plantation forestry. Such measures would impose considerable additional costs on farming and forestry activities resulting in the reduced profitability of farming and forestry as a land use.

The potential implication for the Trusts is that the increased costs associated with the Proposed NPS will inevitably put downward pressure on land values, land rentals and reduce the profitability of their current business activities. Accordingly, Trusts’ income flow from its major asset could decrease over time reducing the social and cultural benefits delivered to their beneficiaries.

The Trusts are also concerned that the Proposed NPS will establish further inequities in the rural environment, where land owners with indigenous biodiversity (many of whom have been actively supporting it) are penalised and regulated, and those currently without will have no incentive to make a positive contribution.

The Trusts considers that the Proposed NPS should be substantially modified to address the above concerns of restoring agency (tino rangatiratanga) to landowners; ensuring that any constraints on action are well-founded in research; and recognising that an approach that relies on command and control will extinguish goodwill and a desire to “do the right thing”, when that already comes at a substantial cost. The design and policies of the Proposed NPS needs to place much more emphasis on non-regulatory measures and incentives to support positive outcomes for indigenous biodiversity on farmland and within plantation forests.

Compensation and Incentivisation

As noted in the paragraphs above, the Proposed NPS does not require any compensation or incentivisation to be provided to affected landowners. 3.16.5 states that ...“local authorities may provide incentives for restoration and enhancement and in particular on Māori land...”. There is no recognition of the need to incentivise protection, the difference it will make, or the role of central government. Use of the term ‘may’ means that it is a pretty easy option to ‘not’ use incentives, especially given that incentives require more resources and time than relying on regulation. This also puts the onus on territorial authorities who, in the majority of cases, lack the resources and expertise to do this. The upshot of this is that regulation will be relied on to ‘protect’ such areas. The irony of this is that the use of regulation will not result in any actual or active protection, or enhancement of the values. Instead it may work contra to that outcome, as the command and control approach disincentivises landowners to proactively manage these areas, as it devalues their efforts and will now come with significant additional costs.
The likely application of non-complying status to new and potentially existing activities within SNA’s will render the land incapable of reasonable use. The very high bar set for high value areas mean that activities such as beekeeping, tourism uses (such as the development of lodges or managing deer populations for hunting), native log salvage, maintenance or development of roads and tracks for access for vehicles, bikes or walkers will all be required to go through a rigorous consenting process with no guaranteed outcome. Such activities are not able to be considered against the wider values or use of the land. The costs will be prohibitive for our smaller trusts.

Section 3.12 of the Proposed NPS sets out how existing activities in SNAs are to be managed. The wording of the provision is unclear so that sub-clauses are in conflict with each other. This will result in an understandable precautionary approach taken by regional councils, with an outcome that existing activities will be unduly regulated.

If the Crown is to remove the capacity for reasonable use of rural land, then there needs to be compensation for landowners. As noted above, these restrictions are being imposed for the good of the nation and as such it is appropriate that they are funded by the nation. Expecting local authorities to provide such compensation or incentives is not realistic. These costs will simply be passed onto the ratepayer meaning that we will end up paying twice.

To achieve real protection and enhancement of these areas, there needs to be incentive to do so. While the Trusts’ as with most other landowners, generally value these areas, it costs to undertake fencing and animal and plant pest control. The application of regulation will not lead to the enhancement of these areas. At best their values will be maintained but most likely they will decline as the owners have no resources to undertake the physical works required to protect them and/or their value is eroded through the application of regulation. The use of rules to try and increase the value of these areas seems counter intuitive, especially if there is no incentivisation to actively manage them.

Lack of Consultation

The Trusts are also concerned with the lack of meaningful consultation that has been undertaken with Māori landowners in relation to the Proposed NPS. The Trusts only recently became aware of it through internal communications within the forestry sector and more recently general media put out by the likes of Beef and Lamb. In particular it is apparent that very little direct consultation has taken place with many of our Māori landowners, who will be significantly affected in terms of their future opportunities to use their land and make a financial return. Given the far-reaching consequence of the Proposed NPS for all landowners, in our view the level of consultation with this group, already identified in the Proposed NPS process as being more significantly affected than most landowners, has been woefully inadequate.

Revised approach

The Proposed NPS fetters Councils’ ability to create good outcomes. Regulation is unavoidable under the proposed policy (i.e. use of term ‘avoid’) even in places where there are gains in biodiversity. The Taupō District has experienced a gain in indigenous biodiversity. In the Waikato Region portion of the Taupō district a District Council desktop study has shown SNAs have potentially increased by 17.5% over the past 10 years. This is due to the voluntary methods landowners are undertaking on restoration and enhancement projects, along with naturally
regenerating indigenous vegetation\(^3\). This is not as a result of rules but through landowner and community driven initiatives.

37 In its current form, the Proposed NPS has the potential to create perverse outcomes through encouraging the clearance of areas not currently identified as SNAs in order to prevent such areas being classified as SNAs under provisions 3.8.7 or 3.8.8.

38 As noted above, there is little chance that the Proposed NPS will bring about any positive change through reliance on regulatory measures, in large part because it rides roughshod over the values of tino rangatiratanga and kaitiakitanga. By not harnessing these potentially powerful drivers, through which landowners can be supported and lauded for doing "the right thing", the NPS sabotages its potential effectiveness.

39 A non-regulatory approach is recommended where the areas of indigenous biodiversity or potential areas for indigenous biodiversity are considered as part of a wider management framework for respective properties. Areas of value should be identified, and measures collectively identified to enhance these areas. Such measures should be resourced accordingly by the central government.

40 The identification of areas of importance should be undertaken by suitably qualified professionals who have a practical understanding of forest and farming practices and land management instead of relying solely on ecologists. The proposed identification process in section 3.8 relies on ecologists to identify the areas against established criteria. From our experience to date, ecologists have fundamental conflicts as they have developed the established criteria, have a natural desire to preserve such areas and generally do not consider people have a place within such ecosystems. They generally have little knowledge of the practicalities of protecting such areas within forests and farms, yet their management recommendations are given primacy by Councils.

41 The Trusts note that 3.8.2.a states that a partnership approach needs to be used when identifying these areas. We struggle to see how this can be done with any form of sincerity or understanding. Given that the Proposed NPS sets councils on a path of regulating activities in these areas, korero with landowners will never be on the equal footing demanded by a partnership basis, as a regulatory outcome is a fait accompli. This epitomises the flaws in the Proposed NPS design, which relies entirely on command and control and fails to harness the large pool of goodwill and interest in biodiversity management. It is a naïve approach to biodiversity management which is doomed to failure.

42 The Trusts submit that instead of relying on regulation, management plans are developed between the appropriate territorial authority and landowner or occupier (or even group of landowners or occupiers) that apply systems thinking and look at land use of a property as a whole. The management plans should set out a series of actions by the landowner or occupier and the council that lead to a net benefit to the ecological values present. Initiatives undertaken by farm and forest owners, landowners or occupiers, as active kaitiaki, should be recognised including any kawenata or forest certification schemes such as Forest Stewardship Council (FSC) or any environmental management systems that farm or forest owners, landowners or occupiers have in place. This process should be resourced by central government as should any follow up actions which will result in the active protection and enhancement of these areas.

\(^3\) Pers com Taupō District Council planning staff
Conclusion

43 The Trusts oppose the Proposed NPS in its current form on the basis that it will not be effective or efficient at achieving its objective of maintaining and enhancing biodiversity on private land.

44 The Proposed NPS will generate an adverse reaction from landowners that threaten the very values that the Proposed NPS seeks to protect. It will create significant and disproportionate costs for Māori landowners including to the Trusts and will inevitably put downward pressure on the Trusts’ income over time. This is seen as being perverse given that the land management practices to date have resulted in large areas of biodiversity on the land.

45 The Proposed NPS and its reliance on regulation will result in the alienation of these areas from the Māori landowners. The dual role of Māori landowners as kaitiaki and landowners is not recognised in the Proposed NPS in any meaningful way. Māori landowners are instead being required to carry a disproportionate cost, without any compensation, because of the actions of others that have cleared indigenous biodiversity from their lands.

46 The Trusts strongly support the continued and increased use of non-regulatory methods and incentives as the most effective way to achieve the desired biodiversity objectives. Such measures can encourage and support positive actions from landowners and ensure that the costs of such measures are equitably distributed amongst all those who benefit from the shared biodiversity values. Such methods should be adequately resourced by central government to ensure that they will be effective and the desired biodiversity gains are achieved.

47 The Trusts seek that the Proposed NPS be substantially modified to address the concerns raised above or otherwise that it be withdrawn.

Thank you for the opportunity to submit on the Proposed NPS.

Dated 10 March 2020
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Figure 1 Trust Land