From: Michael Kay
To: Indigenousbiodiversity
Subject: NZ outdoors party submission;Indigenous biodiversity national policy
Date: Friday, 13 March 2020 8:18:38 pm

MFE CYBER SECURITY WARNING
This email originated from outside our organisation. Please take extra care when clicking on any links or opening any attachments.

Submission for: indigenous biodiversity national policy

We wish to be present our submission orally.
We require receipt of our submission
michaelkay280@gmail.com

NZ OUTDOORS PARTY has a rapidly growing and active membership, whom enjoy the New Zealand outdoors for a range of activities. Including, food gathering, recreation, producing food, caring for the environment and the community. Together whom share a vision for New Zealand, inclusive of all its people, Tikanga and environment, to thrive.

The NZ OUTDOORS PARTY promotes more self sufficiency and co opportunity from the core of our policies generated from inter generational knowledge of our people of whom will implement them and thrive in the environment, from them.

We consider the consultation of all parties effected by policy is a basic human right.
We conclude this would have been best at the front end of this national indigenous biodiversity policy formation.

We agree biodiversity in whole including indigenous biodiversity has been in constant decline.
We find the following as root cause post the first Industrial Age of NZ

1. Pine monoculture row crop forestry as a genetic uniformity planted in once biodiverse lands, adding to its contribution is being planted on the most erosion prone lands. It contributes the highest of any land use to carbon depletion in soil and erosion of the aggregate total of all land use of 192 million tonnes per year. A three fold depletion on land of carbon, indigenous biodiversity and then in soil sediment and turbidity in all waters as a major contribution to eutrophication in lakes and in the ocean such as the from in particular the phosphorus content. Protected in multiple industry only policy
2. Foreign owned and operated infrastructure in particular waste water municipal sewage. We calculate off the report from water care Auckland that for the whole of NZ more than 1 million tonnes of solids removed from sewage is dumped to the majority foreign owned and operated land fills, where all seems to progressively leach back out effecting ground water and what is recaptured is pumped back to sewage treatment plants and diluted and disposed in waterways along with all exceeding phosphorus levels and nitrate. Protected in industry only policy
3. Failing pest management broadcast aerial 1080 of the largest land owner the crown killing biodiversity and especially indigenous protected biodiversity. Protected in industry only policy
4. The over use and absent oversight of pesticides and herbicides, urea and use of monoculture and conversion to smart agriculture has contributed to loss of biodiversity and had an effect on indigenous biodiversity. We do not see any policy approaching this where as we see a global awareness and abundance of scientific literature that confirms this. We do however see an landowner wide awareness as well as a more aware consumers nationally or locally and globally, with transitioning away from tech, monoculture and high dependency and low returns and a focus on biodiversity and inclusive of indigenous biodiversity in private landowners, whom have not had any contribution to this policy. Whereas the representation of the scientific institutions landcare and MFE that have protected high contribution of points 1,2 and 3 and the EPA whom has failed to act at all has had major contribution along with the stakeholders whom make up the majority of the collective that have constructed this policy targeting private land owners while protecting their own special interests.

The following supports our claims.
Where we observe those with indigenous biodiversity are penalised and those with none or endangering it are exempt.

Core Data

1. From 2002 to 2016 the number of the caretakers of land or farmers has decreased by 24.1 percent, from 69,510 in 2002 to 52,785 in 2016, the amount of Farmed land has decreased by 10.3 percent.
So as not to confuse farm consolidation with actual decrease of farmland. We ask the committee to balance their conclusion on the area farmed has decreased.
These figures were taken from info census and surveys Stats NZ.

2.From the pubic consultation document prepared By MFE.
Page 81/103 refers to land representation of ownership.
Of which states clearly the crown is the owner of 39 percent of NZ.
Of lands managed by DOC and It's corporate partnerships.
50 percent is owned by non crown entities
4 percent held by treaty claims
5 percent held by the Maori land court.

By our calculations 50 percent of NZ is under the management of the crown with its private partnerships.

50 percent is owned or under the stewardship of non crown entities
2 percent is owned by no one, of which by default the crown is the steward.

Of this 50 percent it is unknown what percentage or land area is owned, farmed, managed by NZ full time live on land NZ farmers or growers or lifestyle land owners.

Or how much land in volume and percentage is in the shareholding ownership majority foreign owned.

3. On page 12/103 reference is made to the loss of 24,000 hectares of shrub land and 16,000 hectares of native forest.

It does not for consultation or drafting of this policy designate if this was from the crown land of 50 percent or the privately owned land of 50 percent that at the time of compiling this its unknown how much of this is operated and owned by non foreign ownership.

Page 40 suggests or infers these losses have come for pine monoculture row crop genetic uniformity plantation forestry.

General consultation of the wider community and land owners believes this to be the case from our own consultation.

4. Page 15/103

Public consultation 2011
Conclusion was to bring this policy out into the wider community to build it.

We refer here to the core group used as representation.
Royal forest and bird
Fed Farmers
Environmental defence society
Pou Taiao iwi advisory group
Infrastructure industries
Local and central government

50 percent of the land stewardship is as at 2016 52,785 individual land owners and farmers that are not reflected in this policy as having had their say as was suggested and accepted in 2011 page 15/103 of the MFE consultation document.

6. Infrastructure including mining industry is exempt.

7. Fed Farmers have helped negotiate an industry exemption and managed exclusion form any effect of the indigenous biodiversity policy for pine row crop plantation.

We wish to remind the committee 10.3 percent of farmed land of the private owned 50 percent has been shifted elsewhere.

To here, as pine mostly foreign owned has increased its area and if page 12 is to be taken as read has wiped out 40,000 hectares of indigenous biodiversity.

Additionally, our own membership whom testify to the loss of biodiversity in conservation department management areas, and to take it as read by this policy public consultation document that concurs with this.

Summary
We have not been satisfied these documents are sufficient or as brutally honest as they needed to be. The lack of relevant diversity and representation in the steering group to form the ambitious policy that the majority of NZ demands. Moreover it was intentionally captured by conflicts of interest.

This aside.

We have asked for very specific details to the ownership of land which we hope to have furnished by the time of the oral submission.
If we have not we will ask the committee to assist with consolidating this data and procurement of it so as to have a comprehensive critique of this policy as it is integral to our submission and to be presenting fact.

8.The outdoors party wishes to thank all the staff that have tried to form this policy over the years in MFE. Whom have tried to serve this country in its time of real need around bio diversity. The lack of an agro ecology policy while in the grips of lobby as a big exporter of agricultural products and now pine. Where lobby is on the supply side or cost of production. The land side or means of production is under enormous foreign lobby influence for grab and control. Additionally on the regulation side with lobby privatising the gains and capitalising on losses of all agro ecology into investment returns.

Note: The very high turnover of staff we also hope to have fully furnished data by the time of our oral submission.
This relates to consistent data publicly available up until 2014.

From this data, 27 percent of MFE staff has been traditional, ending employment per annum, the average period of employment only 4 and a half years.

Part of the total cost of construction of this policy is represented in the MFE financial statements and a true front end to date cost far exceeds its value.

The main contribution stakeholders are disproportionately excused while the policy disproportionately seeks to remove stewardship from land, live on landowners and apply none to foreign owned lands especially pine monoculture and retain and further insulate decades long behind closed doors management and special interest groups whom have escaped any ownership for the depletion of indigenous biodiversity.

9.The NZ Outdoors party openly rejects the poisoning of our indigenous biodiversity by private public partnerships Predator Free, Ospri and the protection that its subsidiaries and the ministry give them.

Equally the government and these special interest groups contest our claims of which we accept and encourage that they have every right to do.
We hope one day, soon to have an evidence based disclosure with them and that they can behave with dignity and refrain from personal attacks and intimidation. Defamation is not a legal right, nor is there a right to privacy to almost drive indigenous biodiversity to extinction.

An indigenous biodiversity national policy provides the opportunity for a benchmark for environmental reporting standards and transparency in pest management of which this policy also makes exempt. We maintain an indigenous biodiversity national policy built as a part policy of agro ecology, from the ground up would be preferable. Even traditionally policy has always been soil and water.

From a public trust and freedom of information baseline of democracy. The absence of independent transparent loss monitoring of indigenous biodiversity due to the non targeting of 1080 has been offset in our opinion on to the minority land users and caretakers. Private landowners as proposed, will now additionally, pay the price tag of implementation of a policy provisions that can only reduce the security of their land ownership or viability of their land use.

We also wish the committee to take into account that this policy has only added to more stigma on our landowners whom some of the worst effected will be, those whom have embraced indigenous biodiversity and incorporated it into being farmed and managed and protected along with all their other flora and fauna.

These land stewards, will now find themselves in a struggle on private owned land with all number of clip board wielding SNA wardens.

As well as subject to landcare's own digital 3D imagery and combining this as it's own property, harvesting all years of public paid for scientific data and incorporating it as 100 percent intellectual property landcare owns and operates.

We do not accept this. All that data is historical public paid for information.
Mapping and collecting in real time data, the activity on our lands, the quality of our lands, the crops we have planted everything available to anyone to harvest what they wish.

For many commercially sensitive reasons it's bad business to disclose to international competitors access like this.

It is also begs the question that we all need to consider.
What is privacy and who is allowed it and whom is not.

This policy sends a clear message to corporate farming and foreign owned farms, to clear their land ahead of implementation.
This adds, to a growing feeling of being the unwanted and the usual scapegoat as family farming and growing, whom has had only two messages from the leader of the house that farms are not homes. Which we did very much think they are.

More over, farms are the home, we pass on to our children and grandchildren the knowledge we learnt from our parents, where we ourselves learn how best to protect and nurture nature with the next generation.

And that farmers are rednecks according to Minister Jones.

So as to be clear to the committee we hope that prejudices can be set aside that yes politically our position on 1080 is well known.

The poison itself has become a chalice or focus where as our whole concern is the outcome on the environment and especially the indigenous biodiversity.

We are very concerned for the continuation and enormous loss of indigenous bio diversity pending any even partial adoption of predator free 2050.
With over half New Zealand's land mass proposed to be subject to this with additional access to all areas designated SNA.

Special interest groups dominate the indigenous biodiversity policy for privilege and lack of independent oversight. This poses one of the highest threats to indigenous biodiversity with its intent to use retiring GMO gene edit technologies that are retired for solid scientific findings.

Gene edit technologies known as terminator are a severe transgenic gene therapy.
Transgenic meaning it's can be transmitted inter species, though all of life cycles or agro ecology including soil bacteria.

Predator free and even, minister Shaw of the greens along with the sustainable NZ party showcase a great interest in incorporating Gene edits into the agro ecology of NZ.

To engage with GMO at a time in the world of genetics, when far more is known, than when NZ decided with scientific evidence to ban it.

Today we can actually say with overwhelming evidence and confidence banning nuclear and GMO was enormously forward thinking.
The cost to biodiversity and indigenous biodiversity world wide has been extreme.

Often we are led to believe by salesmen of technology, especially biotech, that we our traditional inter generational knowledge is worthless, that a family or Iwi that's had uninterrupted generational stewardship of their landholding is primitive and inferior to tech or biological new organisms GMO, gene edit, genetically engineered.

We have become more often a country that evaluates our future based on the disconnected top down managerial class that has increased that does not have direct contact with land.

Collectives MPI MFE or DOC or landcare which are primarily abandoning their responsibilities and more often extending their authority onto private land ownership often the hindering elements of self motivated localised responses.

An example of course is embodied in this national indigenous biodiversity policy statement.

Shifting their overarching influence on regional councils with long extensive knowledge and action and turning a blind eye to systematic and the intent to intensify and extend the abuse on crown land to private landholdings.

In 12 months we have seen MPI raid Raw milk suppliers. A free will and response to plastic bottles and a consumer producer market place with the want and with informed consent to consume unpasteurised milk.

We have had Canterbury pet foods an initiative to cull rabbits and possums and sell them as pet food endure frequent charging of inspection fees and of which threatens the viability of this business of pest control while taxpayers pay millions for this use of 1080.

We read on the 9th of March on stuff a Canadian company is being paid for by the provincial growth fund to map Malborough.
Theres absolutely no consideration that this will be used as a tool by foreign investment to select and purchase core infrastructure and land to exploit.

10.Need for change in engagement.

So many things now highlight a need for a culture values shift smartly.

To offer equal opportunity and dignity to all stakeholders not disproportionately to those whom in fact are indoors or special interest groups aiming to capture the policy.

To value inter generational knowledge in preference to techy fix's or speculative harvest patent rent ventures.

To value the human capital of people whom make the plans along with the community and stakeholders will implement more change for the environment in the environment than in multi story office blocks.

No one should have to endure a captured state that individually it's without question we all want a best future for NZ so why exclude us.

We are such a nice country, how even federated farmers looks out for foreign ownership of forestry more so than the dwindling number of farming families that learnt from generation to generation how to sustainably farm the land, especially from those whom wiped out biodiversity and caused massive soil erosion by clearing the lands with fire.

This policy offers protection for foreign ownership to plant a monoculture row crop genetic uniform pine plantation on, wiping out all the habitats and indigenous biodiversity and clear fell it and shift massive flows of topsoil to waterways.

We have completely excluded a new generation of farming that is fully embracing biodiversity and agro ecology.
We are employing people in cubicles in MFE, people whom obviously want to affect change and instead factory farming them in a city, rather than them coming to the land as has been the trend for years from the city to live a full life growing or farming.

We ended the carbon Zero policy that detracts from the 4p 1000 policy we signed in Paris to sequester 0.0004 percent carbon to soil per annum to offset climate change. Harnessing, full agro ecology and the beneficial relationships between all ecology.
A policy itself centred on biodiversity and the exclusion of the genetic uniformity or monoculture and smart biotech, chemical synthetic monopoly.

To a zero carbon sequestration that By the result is to subsidise pine monoculture foreign investment with free trees on purchase and carbon credits to an industry that mines carbon from soil before harvest then creates soil erosion to send the soil itself to the waterways.

If we use a biomass calculator to reward carbon drawn out of soil we could equally have a methane bill that applies credits to the energy sector to frack natural gas superheat the atmosphere with it and suck out nitrogen to make urea to wash off our ploughed grounds with soil and bank them both in our waterways.

We could get both credits by putting urea on pine trees if we owned them.

11. Our most charitable suggestion to the committee would be to place the idea of how do we already protect indigenous biodiversity and how can we do better along with a future farming and waste and water groups titled agro ecology future communities throughout NZ.

Similar to what has been done in the EU to recover from the exact outcome of central top down planning in its own agro ecology policy formed by land owners and stakeholders in many hundreds of non paid working groups.

We have attached a links here for your convenience.
Please do not hesitate for requesting any clarification or scientific study or reference to any points of agro ecology we have raised here.

https://www.watercare.co.nz/CMSPages/GetAzureFile.aspx?path=~%5Cwatercarepublicweb%5Cmedia%5Cwatercare-media-library%5Cwastewater-collection-treatment%5C2015_wastewater_treatment_performance_watercare.pdf&hash=aaa332c69c252b093aca40752be05827cd0497adaa91e27b5fa8dc7412d19085

http://agroecology-europe.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/02/CFP_FullReport.pdf

https://www.nzherald.co.nz/nz/news/article.cfm?c_id=1&objectid=11112150