

13 March 2020

Submission to NPSIB from the Taranaki Kiwi Trust

Overall point: We wish for the NPSIB to be as landowner/farmer friendly as possible to avoid putting landowners in compromising position between a commitment to protecting indigenous biodiversity and farming, which is their livelihoods.

Background: The Taranaki Kiwi Trust has worked side-by-side with private landowners since 2006 protecting kiwi on their property through a trapping partnership. TKT loans traps, provides expertise to landowners, and services the trap lines while the landowners agree to check the traps and provide TKT with catch results. Many of our landowners are farmers. We now know that kiwi conservation can happily cohabitate with farming practice. Many of the tracts of bush that kiwi live in on these properties are not fenced, and often have stock throughout the periphery.

TKT supports the NPSIB and recognises its vital importance to conservation of indigenous biodiversity but we are concerned that some aspects of the Significant Natural Areas proposals may have negative effects on the landowners we work with, and other landowners who have both indigenous biodiversity and farming practice occurring simultaneously. The SNA proposal could result in animosity from landowners who are forced to 'lock up' large (or small) tracts of their land, when they have already been a successful part of kiwi or other conservation. The relationship TKT and these landowners have may become fractured if they are put in a compromising position between their livelihoods and indigenous biodiversity/kiwi conservation.

Issues:

1. Definition of an SNA – this currently seems too broad and 'significant' is not clearly specified. SNAs could be interpreted as entire farms in places. Areas adjacent to SNAs may also be included, further limiting landowner activity in these areas.
2. Costs incurred from SNA identification - SNA identification is likely to result in fencing and pest management needs as well as potential restorations, which will be costly. The NPSIB does not specify who is to shoulder the costs. Landowners may view indigenous biodiversity as a liability if they are expected to pay for and upkeep the SNA management.
3. Non-regulated SNA management would be preferred to regulated management - this would encourage landowner participation on their own terms rather than forcing them to conform to the NPS which is likely to result in adversity to indigenous biodiversity and thus conservation of kiwi on their land.
4. Existing activities in the SNAs by farming landowners to be permitted to continue – our landowners still use various tracts of indigenous biodiversity on their land, for example for stock grazing. These activities seldom impact kiwi conservation and restricting them would have negative impacts on the business of the landowner as well as their relationship with conservation.
5. Mobile fauna – this should be non-regulatory and implemented by experts and landowners together to design management plans suited to both the fauna and the farming business.

Nga Mihi



Raul Johnson

Community Trapping Project Coordinator