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Introduction

1. This submission, on behalf of the Wakatū Incorporation (Wakatū), is made in response to the Resource Management Review Panel’s (the Panel) Issues and Options Paper.

2. Wakatū’s submission includes overarching and specific submissions, alongside framing our submission with kōrero about our responsibilities as kaitiaki (guardians) and our connection to our taonga (treasure/s) including he wai (water).

Ko wai mātou? Who are we?

3. Wakatū Incorporation (Wakatū) is a Māori Incorporation pursuant to Te Ture Whenua Māori Act 1993. Based in Nelson, New Zealand, Wakatū has approximately 4,000 shareholders who are those families who descend from the customary Māori land owners of the Nelson, Tasman and Golden Bay Regions – Te Tau Ihu.

4. Wakatū has an intergenerational 500 year vision - Te Pae Tawhiti - which sees us through to 2512.¹ It is a declaration of our fundamental values, common goals and guiding objectives that will ensure our success and create a strong identity now and in the future. At the heart of Te Pae Tawhiti is our overarching purpose which is to preserve and enhance our taonga for the benefit of current and future generations.

5. Wakatū grew from $11m asset base in 1977 to a current value of over $300m. Whenua is the foundation of our business with 70% of assets held in whenua (land) and waterspace. We manage a diverse portfolio from vineyards, orchards to residential properties, large retail developments, office buildings, marine farms and waterspace.

¹ Te Pae Tawhiti is available online at https://www.wakatu.org/te-pae-tawhiti.
6. Kono is our food and beverage business focused on high quality beverages, fruit bars, seafood products, pipfruit and hops. We understand that innovation and adaptability is the key to our success.

7. Auora is that part of our organisation which is focused on innovation, particularly new ingredients, new products and new business and service models.

8. Our whānau and our businesses are located primarily in our traditional rohe, Te Tau Ihu – the top of the South Island.

9. In short, our purpose is to preserve and enhance our taonga, for the benefit of current and future generations. Our submission on the Panel’s Issues and Options Paper is made with that at the forefront of our minds.

10. We have included further detail in an Appendix to this submission which sets out who we are in further detail.

Our kaitiaki responsibilities

Toitū te marae a Tāne, Toitū te marae a Tangaroa, Toitū te Iwi

11. We have a unique relationship with our ancestral lands and waters which have sustained us since the arrival of our tūpuna. The proverb above, “Toitū te marae a Tāne, Toitū te marae a Tangaroa, Toitū te Iwi”, has been passed down by our ancestors and identifies that when the realm of Tāne – deity of the forest and the domain of Tangaroa – god of the Ocean are sustained, so too is the future of the iwi. The Māori connection to customary land is very powerful. It is mana tūpuna - power from the ancestors. This generation is the living face of all those that came before, carrying all of their hopes and aspirations in our DNA. They give us the right to be. The blood of our tūpuna was spilt on our lands. The connection is visceral.
12. As Mana Whenua, we have rights to use and access the land and water within our rohe. We also have intergenerational responsibilities to protect the physical and spiritual components of our land and water. We are always mindful of the need to look after our resources for the benefit of current and future generations.

13. As kaitiaki, we adhere to certain practices and protocols that were established by our tūpuna when using land and resources. These practices ensure that the physical and spiritual aspects of life are kept in balance.

14. Fundamental to our identity is our connection with place. It has reflected the tenets of our culture since time immemorial. It shapes our thinking, our way of being and our priorities of what is of value. Learning about land is not the same as recognising that we learn best from land.

15. Our interaction with our lands and waters defines us, providing clarity on our roles and relationships, our responsibilities, and our place in the natural world.

16. Our relationship with our land and water is based on and strengthened by our whakapapa to the land and water and the fact that we are descendants of the earth and sky, and all elements. We whakapapa to our ancestral lands and waters and see them as a part of us, as our ancestors.

17. This whakapapa demonstrates how the world has unfolded both physically and spiritually. It is the thread connecting us from the beginnings of time to today and beyond. It demonstrates how everything is part of a web of relationships, not only in relation to other human beings but in relation to everything in nature as well. This understanding underpins our approach to our environment and our use of resources.
18. There is no separation between the land, water and people. All things are inter-connected, particularly through the burial of our ancestors. The land and water, for example, is one - an indivisible whole. The land is connected to the water resources which flow in, on or under it, as is the water connected to the land that surrounds it. Both the land and water are in turn connected to us, as the people who have mana whenua and mana moana over this area. Water is imbued with a mauri, a life force and personality of its own which is to be protected and sustained for future generations. Maintaining and protecting the mauri of our ancestral waters are of critical importance to us.

19. Wakatū has a number of work-programmes underway focused on ensuring that we whakatinana (embody) our kaitiaki values and responsibilities, these include our Whenua Ora and Tangata Ora programmes. Wakatū is committed to showing leadership in these matters to achieve transformative change.

**Scope of submission**

20. Wakatū’s submission focuses on the following parts of the Panel’s Issues and Options Paper:


(b) Issue 3 – Recognising Te Tiriti o Waitangi / the Treaty of Waitangi and te ao Māori and Issue 6 – National Direction.²

(c) Issue 5 – Addressing climate change and natural hazards.

(d) Issue 10 – Allocation.

² We address these issues together.
(e) Issue 13 – Institutional roles and responsibilities.

21. Whilst we acknowledge the Panel’s terms of reference and the scope of the current reform as being directed by Cabinet, we have not restricted our comments necessarily within the scope of the reform. This is intentional. In our view, some reform is so urgently required that falls outside of the Panel’s technical scope, but we think the Panel needs to comment on it in its advice to the Minister. We also note that there is a range of related reforms being undertaken (e.g. the current consultation on the National Policy Statements for Freshwater Management and Indigenous Biodiversity) that also need to be considered in light of the Panel’s work.

Overarching submissions

22. We are pleased to see references in the Issues and Options Paper to the Waitangi Tribunal’s reports in Ko Aotearoa Tēnei\(^3\) and the Stage Two Freshwater Report.\(^4\) We endorse the recommendations in those reports (and refer specifically to a number of them in this submission).

23. We further support the findings in the Kāhui Wai Māori report entitled Te Mana o te Wai – The Health of our Wai, the Health of our Nation (April 2019) (Kāhui Wai Māori Report) namely that:\(^5\)

(a) Aotearoa New Zealand’s current resource management system is broken. It is failing to achieve its purpose and has become complex, dysfunctional and inaccessible.

\(^3\) Waitangi Tribunal, Ko Aotearoa Tēnei (WAI 262 Waitangi Tribunal 2011) (\textit{Ko Aotearoa Tēnei}).
\(^5\) Kāhui Wai Māori Report, p.4. Acknowledging that these findings were in the context of the freshwater reform, in our view, they continue to have relevance to the Panel’s work with respect to Resource Management reform.
Our waters are sick. We must heed the cry to make our waters well again.

Diverse communities all over Aotearoa New Zealand are hearing these cries.

Te Mana o te Wai is the korowai that should frame and inform structural and system reform.

It is time for a new system.

We also endorse the Auditor-General’s very recent February 2020 report entitled *Reflecting on our work about water management*, which calls on local and central government to do more to involve Māori in water management. Of particular relevance to the Panel’s work, Wakatū notes the following:

(a) The relationship between the Crown and Māori enshrined in Te Tiriti o Waitangi is central to water management. Māori are critically important partners for those public organisations managing water resources.

(b) The Crown, Māori, and local government need to have ways to work together to design effective and enduring solutions to water management challenges.

(c) Co-governance and co-management arrangements have been established and avenues created for iwi and hapū to contribute to the management of water resources. Although there are enduring

---

benefits for Māori and communities, achieving these can come at a cost for Māori communities and councils.

(d) The commitment required to establish relationships and processes, and to build and maintain a shared understanding of what everyone is trying to achieve, is significant and often underestimated.

(e) Continued Crown engagement and resourcing is needed for the current and future arrangements that enable Māori involvement in managing water resources to remain effective.

25. Wakatū makes the following further overarching submissions which apply across the proposed resource management reform:

(a) As emphasised in paragraphs 10-18 Māori are kaitiaki of the natural world; we are connected to the natural world through whakapapa. Within our kaitiaki responsibilities, we are also part of industry. This places Māori in a unique position to, among other things, carry over kaitiaki responsibilities into industry best practice. The reform to our resource management system needs to recognise the multifaceted rights and responsibilities that Māori hold.

(b) Te Tiriti o Waitangi is central to this discussion. There is a broader constitutional conversation that needs to occur in parallel to reform such as this. The place of Te Tiriti, and the rights and responsibilities of Māori that are guaranteed by Te Tiriti, need to be properly considered and given effect to by the Crown. The current Governmental arrangements do not reflect a true partnership.

(c) Māori rights and interests in natural resources, particularly water, should have been addressed in advance of this reform. It is simply unacceptable to continue to advance reform that continues to leave addressing this fundamental matter for another day. We have
addressed this further in paragraphs 34-35, to the extent it is relevant to the issue of allocation of natural resources.

(d) Last year, the Government announced that it intends to take an all-of-Government approach to responding to *Ko Aotearoa Tēnei*. *Ko Aotearoa Tēnei* includes a chapter addressing the environmental concerns that the claimants raised through the Wai 262 inquiry. That chapter, as acknowledged in the Issues and Options Paper, recommends amendments to the Resource Management Act 1991 (the RMA) that need to be considered in the context of the reform. This is inline with the Government’s announcement to respond to the Tribunal’s recommendations which are now nine (9) years old.

(e) The Waitangi Tribunal’s findings and recommendations in its Stage Two Freshwater Report must be addressed. Many are relevant to the issues that the Panel will need to grapple with. In particular, Wakatū supports the following recommendations of the Tribunal (with respect to water but also should be applied more broadly across taonga resources):

- the Crown must recognise proprietary rights and economics interests by providing for proprietary redress;
- the Crown devise a new allocation regime in partnership with Māori;
- local authorities must actively seek opportunities to enter into section 33 transfers and section 36B Joint Management Agreements for freshwater bodies (where Treaty settlements have not already established co-governance agreements for freshwater bodies).

(f) Local authorities’ regulatory powers need to be tightened to make room for Māori authority over our taonga (for example, wai).
(g) The Government needs to invest in measuring water, soil and biodiversity quality in catchments.

(h) There needs to be appropriate tools to manage sediment control especially with storm events and the risks of flooding/high tides etc.

(i) The proposed resource management review must also align with the Government’s three waters review (noting the recent announcement about the primary regulator).7

(j) The Waitangi Tribunal in both Ko Aotearoa Tēnei and the Stage 2 Freshwater Report have recommended that appropriate Crown funding is applied to any reform package. The Stage 2 Freshwater Report recommended that the Crown should urgently take such necessary action(s) to ensure that under-resourcing no longer prevents iwi and hapū from participating effectively in RMA processes, including freshwater management and freshwater decision-making. Ultimately, Central Government has to adequately fund this reform and the suggestions of the Panel. This will require funding directly to Councils and Māori to assist Council with capability and capacity building. This is critical to the success of any reform that proposes to shift the RMA in the direction that this think-piece suggests.

(k) Wakatū have recently led, in conjunction with our local authorities and broader community, the development of the Te Tau Ihu Intergenerational Strategy.8 In developing the Strategy, we held a range of intergenerational public conversations. These were all heavily subscribed (with some being over-subscribed). In our view, the process we followed to develop the Strategy, which was

7 See https://www.beehive.govt.nz/release/independent-regulator-make-drinking-water-safe
8 Available at https://tetauihu.nz/
inclusive and values-led, is an example of how planning can proceed differently in communities (including planning about the management of our Taiao).

**Specific submissions on the Issues in the Issues and Options Paper**

26. This section of the submission addresses those matters that are provided for in the Issues and Options Paper. Wakatū’s position is set out at paragraphs 27-35.

**Issue 2 – Purpose and principles of the Resource Management Act 1991**

27. Wakatū agrees with the Panel that the sustainable management purpose of the RMA has not led to positive environmental outcomes.

28. In addition, the way in which Part II has operated in practice, has resulted in a balancing out of Māori interests. This has not been beneficial for Māori or the Taiao (the natural environment).

29. Wakatū endorses an approach that would incorporate Te Mana o Te Wai within Part II of the RMA as a matter of national importance and for taonga to be able to be specifically recognised as matters of national importance.

**Issue 3 – Recognising Te Tiriti o Waitangi / the Treaty of Waitangi and te ao Māori and Issue 6 – National Direction**

30. In our view, appropriate recognition of the Treaty of Waitangi in the Resource Management framework needs to address the following:

---

9 Which the Tribunal also found in the Stage Two Freshwater Report (p.56).
10 We address these issues together.
(a) A strengthened Te Tiriti o Waitangi provision that provides the principles of the Treaty need to be “given effect to” by decision-makers rather than simply “taken into account.”

(b) To properly recognise the partnership envisaged by Te Tiriti o Waitangi, compulsory Māori decision-making within the Resource Management framework should be directed, rather than simply enabled. Specific National Direction needs to be provided, potentially through a National Policy Statement on Māori participation and decision-making,\(^\text{11}\) to provide the Te Tiriti o Waitangi is given practical effect at the planning level. Such National Direction needs to be directive enough to ensure that Councils must implement Māori decision-making (not simply engagement) whilst being flexible enough to accommodate regional differences for Māori. In that regard, direction can be provided without having to be overly prescriptive as to what the particular co-governance arrangements might look like for each region. This should be decided by whānau, hapū and iwi region by region. However, there will be scope to strike a middle-ground in such National Direction to provide an appropriate level of guidance whilst retaining the ability for regional difference in models.

(c) Tikanga Māori and mātauranga Māori need to be better recognised within our resource management system. For example, the way in which taonga are recognised, and the relationship with kaitiaki provided for, should have a higher status within the RMA and planning contexts. This would be recognising tikanga Māori albeit within the confines of the current status quo\(^\text{12}\) – namely a legislative system to manage our natural resources.

---

\(^{11}\) As envisaged by the Waitangi Tribunal in *Ko Aotearoa Tenei*.

(d) We support the ability for taonga to be recognised in a way that local whānau, hapū and iwi support. Legal personality, as acknowledged in the Issues and Options Paper, could be one way to do that. National direction needs to be explicit about this to ensure it happens.

(e) Māori landowners need to be appropriately provided for in a revised resource management system. Wakatū is a Māori Incorporation whose shareholders are those families who descend from the customary Māori land owners. Alongside our kaitiaki role, we also use our resources on our land and have practical experience that can assist to guide effective resource management outcomes. \(^{13}\)

(f) The issue of Māori representation on local government will not be simply addressed through providing for co-governance and Māori decision-making over resource management matters. The Local Government Act 2002 also needs to be reformed to ensure that equitable Māori representation on local authorities is provided for.

31. Recognising and providing for tikanga Māori and mātauranga, is another way of shifting the system away from an effects-based analysis towards a values based and outcomes focused framework. In our view, this will enable better focus to be placed on those matters that we need our resource management framework to remain adaptive to (including the end-use of activities and climate change).

\(^{13}\) It is important to note that the Waitangi Tribunal in Ko Aotearoa Tēnei (at 269) emphasised that Māori were kaitiaki of the environment but they also used natural resources. The Tribunal explained the nature of this relationship as “not necessarily by forbidding their use, but by using them in ways that enhance rather than damage kin relationships.”
**Issue 5 – Addressing climate change and natural hazards**

32. Climate Change needs to be appropriately provided for in the resource management framework. The way in which the RMA operates, and the specific exclusions with respect to greenhouse gases, are not conducive to positive environmental outcomes. The NZ ETS should not be the main policy tool to address climate change. Part II should be amended to refer to climate change mitigation.

33. Wakatū has a robust climate change strategy and work-plan within our organisation to ensure that we are responding, and changing business practices, to ensure we live our kaitiaki values through our work on the land.

**Issue 10 – Allocation**

34. The “first in first served” allocation system is inequitable and affecting the ability for a meaningful conversation to occur about Māori rights and interests in natural resources (including water). It is also not focused on positive resource management outcomes. It is outdated and needs to be changed.

35. When considering this matter, space must be found for Māori rights and interests in and over natural resources (including water). This will likely be a challenging conversation for the country to have but giving proper effect to Te Tiriti o Waitangi demands that it happens and it needs to happen urgently.

**Conclusion**

36. The Panel has a real opportunity to affect positive change for our environment and our people. We encourage the Panel to be expansive in
its thinking and to have courage when providing its recommendations to the Minister particularly in relation to Te Tiriti o Waitangi.

37. Thank you for the opportunity to participate in this process.

Ngā mihi nui,
APPENDIX

A BRIEF CUSTOMARY HISTORY OF THE NELSON AND TASMAN DISTRICT

1. In the 1820s and 1830s, mana whenua then living in Te Tau Ihu were conquered by tribes from the North Island, including Ngāti Rārua, Ngāti Awa (now known as Te Ātiawa), Ngāti Tama and Ngāti Kōata. This tribal grouping is known as Ngā Tāngata Heke – the people of the Heke. The Heke were the series of migrations back and forth from the north to the south, including to Te Tau Ihu, in the early 19th century from the Kāwhia and Taranaki coasts. These migrations are remembered in the collective memory of the people as a series of named Heke.

2. By 1830, it was established that the hapū who held Māori customary title or mana whenua in Nelson, Tasman Bay and Golden Bay were the descendants of the four Tainui-Taranaki iwi of Ngāti Koata, Ngāti Rārua, Ngāti Tama and Te Ātiawa.

3. The four Tainui-Taranaki iwi in western Te Tau Ihu are recognised as the mana whenua on the basis of acquiring Māori customary title through a combination of take (raupatu (conquest) and tuku (gift)) and ahi kā roa (keeping the fires alight, by occupation or in other recognised ways). Over time, the whakapapa of the migrant iwi from the north became, as the Waitangi Tribunal has put it, ‘embedded in the whenua through intermarriage with the defeated peoples, the burial of placenta (whenua) and the dead, residence, and the development of spiritual links.’

4. From the time of the heke onwards, Māori customary title manifested itself in western Te Tau Ihu (Nelson, Tasman Bay and Golden Bay) as an exclusive right to land, with the power to exclude others if necessary, with the ability to dictate how land and resources was used and accessed.

---

14 Waitangi Tribunal, Te Tau Ihu o Te Waka a Maui, vol III, 1366.
5. Ngāti Rārua, Te Ātiawa, Ngāti Tama and Ngāti Koata did not move to Te Tau Ihu en masse, but particular whānau and hapū, or sections of particular whānau and hapū, from those iwi settled in a staged series of migrations, with land allocated in various locations as different groups arrived.

6. The pattern of mana whenua in Te Tau Ihu was dictated by the pattern of settlement, in which each kāinga (village) was established around a chief or chiefs and each kāinga was home to extended whānau, with most residents at each kāinga related by blood or marriage. The whānau or hapū (an extended whānau or cluster of whānau could equally be described as a hapū) tended to establish themselves at locations where their neighbouring communities were relatives and/or close allies.

7. By 1840, whānau or hapū belonging to the four Tainui Taranaki iwi were established in Nelson, Tasman Bay and Golden Bay as the mana whenua.

**The arrival of the New Zealand Company**

8. When the New Zealand Company ("NZ Company") arrived in the South Island in 1841, rangatira [tribal leaders] representing the families of those whānau or hapū who held mana whenua and who were resident in western Te Tau Ihu negotiated with Captain Arthur Wakefield of the NZ Company and agreed to welcome European settlement in parts of the Nelson, Motueka and Golden Bay area.

9. One of the main reasons for this agreement, from the Māori perspective, was to promote trade relationships between European settlers and Māori for mutual benefit, bearing in mind that tribes of Te Tau Ihu had already had several decades of contact with European traders prior to 1841.
10. According to the arrangements a major benefit promised by the NZ Company when it entered into what it called 'Deeds of Purchase', was that the resident Māori and their families who held mana whenua in the relevant parts of western Te Tau Ihu (Nelson, Motueka and Golden Bay), would be entitled to retain all existing Māori settlements, including urupa, wāhi tapu and cultivated land, and in addition reserves would be set aside comprising one-tenth of the land purchased. These additional land reserves became known as the Nelson Tenths Reserves ("Tenths Reserves").

11. As a result of the negotiations between the NZ Company and tāngata whenua, the Crown issued a grant in 1845 which extinguished Māori aboriginal (or customary) title over 151,000 acres in Nelson and Tasman (the Nelson settlement). The 1845 Crown Grant excluded all existing Māori settlements, including urupa, wāhi tapu and cultivated land, along with one-tenth of the total area of land acquired for European settlement (15,000 acres).

12. The Crown intended to hold the Tenths Reserves on trust on behalf of and for the benefit of the tāngata whenua who were those families who held Māori customary title to the 151,000 acres in the 1840s.

13. Despite the guarantees and the provisions stipulated in the 1845 Crown Grant, the Crown failed to reserve a full one-tenth of land or exclude settlements, urupa, wāhi tapu and cultivated land from European settlement.

14. On completion, the NZ Company’s Nelson Settlement comprised approximately 172,000 acres, although it is likely a much larger area of approximately 460,000 acres was eventually acquired by the Crown.

15. As at 1850, the Nelson Tenths Reserves comprised only 3,953 acres (this figure does not include the designated Occupation Reserves).
16. Between 1841 and 1881, Crown officials administered the Tenths Reserves and the occupation reserves on behalf of the original owners. From 1882, the Public Trustee administered the estate.

**Identifying the original land owners**

17. In 1892 – 1893, the Native Land Court undertook an inquiry to ascertain who owned the land in Nelson, Tasman Bay and Golden Bay prior to the transaction with the New Zealand Company. The reason for this inquiry was to determine the correct beneficiaries of the Tenths Reserves trust.

18. The Native Land Court Judge (Judge Alexander MacKay) considered that the “New Zealand Company Tenths” (as he called them) had been set aside in accordance with the NZ Company’s stipulation in the Kapiti Deed that it would hold a portion of the land on trust, and accordingly he decided that to ascertain those persons with a beneficial interest “it was necessary to carry back the inquiry to the date the land comprised in the original Nelson Settlement was acquired by the Company”.

19. The Court’s ruling determined the ownership of the 151,000 acres “at the time of the Sale to the New Zealand Company”, with the ownership of the four hapū – Ngāti Koata, Ngāti Tama, Ngāti Rārua and Ngāti Awa - broken down according to each of the areas awarded by Commissioner Spain in 1845 (Nelson district, 11,000 acres; Waimea district, 38,000 acres; Moutere and Motueka district, 57,000 acres, and Massacre Bay, 45,000 acres).

20. The Judge’s ruling included a determination:

> That although the Reserves made by the Company were situated in certain localities the fund accruing thereon was a general one in which all the hapū who owned the territory comprised within the
Nelson Settlement had an interest proportionate to the extent of land to which they were entitled, at the time of the Sale to the Company.

21. The Court requested each of the hapū so entitled to provide lists of the persons who were the original owners of the land at the time of the New Zealand Company’s arrival and their successors.

22. Importantly, therefore, the 1893 lists were not drawn up by the Native Land Court, but by the people. The evidence of how this was done is consistent with a tikanga Māori style process where the lists were debated and revised until consensus is reached.

The Crown’s management of the land

23. From 1842 until 1977, when the original owners regained control of their lands, the Crown held the Tenths Reserves and occupation reserves in trust and managed it on behalf of its owners.

24. From 1882 onwards, the Public Trustee, Native Trustee and Māori Trustee administered the Tenths Reserves and occupation reserves on behalf of the original owners and their descendants. During this period, a great deal of land was either sold or taken under public works legislation - in many cases without the owners’ consent and without compensation for the loss.

25. A clear example of the Crown’s mismanagement during this period is illustrated by the imposition of perpetual leases on the Tenths Reserves and occupation reserves. By way of legislation, the Crown imposed perpetual leases on the land, which for example, allowed for 21-year rent review periods, rents below market value, and perpetual rights of renewal for lessees. In practice this meant the Māori owners could not access or use their land, nor did they receive adequate rent for leasing the land. The
problems associated with the perpetual lease regime continue to impact adversely on the submitters’ land, despite some legislative changes in 1997.

26. In the period to 1977, as a result of the Crown’s mismanagement, the Tenths Reserves estate was reduced to 1,626 acres.

Proprietors of Wakatū (Wakatū Incorporation)

27. By the 1970s, the descendants of the original owners were lobbying for the return of their land to their control and management. This led to a Commission of Inquiry (the Sheehan Commission) into Māori Reserved Lands.

28. Our establishment was the result of recommendations made by the Sheehan Commission of Inquiry that the Tenths Reserves should be returned to the direct ownership and control of Māori. This recommendation was implemented by the Wakatū Incorporation Order 1977, which according to its explanatory note constituted “the proprietors of the land commonly known as the Nelson-Motueka and South Island Tenths”.

29. The land vested in Wakatū Incorporation comprised the remnants of the Tenths Reserves and occupation reserves and the beneficial owners of the land were allocated shares in the same proportion as the value of their beneficial interests in the land transferred.

30. With a few exceptions, those beneficial owners were the descendants of the 254 tūpuna identified as beneficial owners by the Native Land Court in 1893. Wakatū can therefore trace the genesis of a large portion of the land in its estate back to the initial selection of the Tenths Reserves in 1842.
Wakatū Incorporation today

31. Wakatū is the kaitiaki and legal trustee of the remnants of the Tenth Reserves and occupation reserves. Wakatū Incorporation is responsible for the care and development of the owners’ lands.

32. The Incorporation represents approximately 4000 Māori land owners in Nelson, Tasman Bay and Golden Bay. Apart from the Crown and local authorities, Wakatū is one of the largest private landowners in the Nelson/Tasman regions.

33. Since 1977, the owners of Wakatū have built a successful organisation that has contributed to the economic growth of the Tasman District and the economic, social and cultural well-being of the descendants of the original owners.

34. Wakatū Incorporation’s primary focus is based around its management and use of the ancestral lands of the owners for their cultural and economic sustenance. Today, this comprises a mixture of leasehold land, commercial land and development land.

35. Wakatū has interests in horticulture, viticulture and aquaculture (Kono NZ LP) throughout the Tasman and Nelson District as well as in other parts of New Zealand.

36. The principles and values of Wakatū Incorporation are reflected in its guiding strategic document – Te Pae Tāwhiti.

Further information

37. A full history of the lands administered by Wakatū Incorporation, along with Ngāti Rārua Ātiawa Iwi Trust, Rore Lands, and other whānau and iwi
trusts, who own land in the Nelson and Tasman region is set out and discussed more fully in the Waitangi Tribunal, Te Tau Ihu o te Waka a Maui report. Also see www.Wakatū.org.nz for further information.