



WHAT WE HEARD

FROM OUR SECOND ROUND
OF CONSULTATION





On 20 August 2018, the Accelerating Protection for Kauri Dieback project opened its second round of consultation into how the programme can improve its response to kauri dieback disease. In the first round of consultation, we asked you what changes are needed to the current strategy for managing kauri dieback. A summary of the feedback from the first round of consultation can be found on our website

www.kauridieback.co.nz/consultation/round-one-consultation

The refreshed strategy, amended to take into account your feedback, was one of the documents being consulted on in this second round. In addition to this refreshed strategy, we consulted on some ideas for a National Pest Management Plan (NPMP), including the way we are proposing to zone kauri lands and the kind of measures or activities that will be in place in each of these areas. Lastly, we asked for your help designing the management body to implement the NPMP and refreshed strategy, and sought your input on what kind of activities and decisions you think should sit at local, regional and national levels.

**THIS IS WHAT WE
HEARD YOU SAY:**

ON THE STRATEGY

- You liked the long term focus of the strategy – some even went so far as to call the 1000 year focus “visionary”. In line with this long term focus, you said that you want eradication to be more clearly and explicitly expressed, and many of you said that there was little point having such a visionary long term strategy if this was not aligned to a likewise visionary goal of eradicating the disease.
 - In line with this, many said that there was too much emphasis on reducing the impact and spread of the disease, with a number of you saying that you felt that objectives 2 to 6 www.kauridieback.co.nz/media/1735/mpi18965-kauri-dieback-round-2-handout-booklet-4.pdf could be reduced to a more simply worded, smaller number of objectives.
 - As in the first round of consultation, many of you spoke about the need to look at a whole of forest approach. You said the strategy needs to focus on not just the disease, but on maintaining a healthy environment for trees to improve kauri resistance to the disease.
 - A number said that you thought the current strategy was fine – it was “implementation” that was the problem. Many said the main priority should be getting started on actions, as you want to get on with tangible activities in your communities. That requires more funding, greater sharing of information, publicity and education campaigns, and less discussion.
 - A number of you wanted a stronger focus on science and research in the objectives and priorities, and felt the creation of the Strategic Science Advisory Group was an important step on that path. Most acknowledged the role of Mātauranga Māori in the programme, but some were concerned that what they perceived to be the important role of ‘western science’ was de-emphasised as a result.
-

ON THE NPMP

- The zoning of kauri lands made sense to most of you, although a few didn't necessarily agree with the proposed zones. Some worried about their practicality and applicability, particularly in relation to private land and popular walking forests.
 - Most people were supportive of sanctuary zones, although some of you expressed caution because "all kauri have value". Some of you suggested the sanctuary and prevention categories could be merged as forests either had *Phytophthora agathidicida* (PA) or were at risk of it. Others saw the benefits of having certain stands or areas that had special protection.
 - Many of you thought that the controls proposed in the NPMP should be mandatory and not optional, including being binding on local authorities. You want to see strong action, including closing of land, and you do not think this should be "optional". This was a view most strongly expressed in the Auckland region and in relation to DOC managed public conservation land.
 - But a number of recreation groups questioned the effectiveness of, and need for, forest closures, particularly those heavily used by the public. Many of you thought the negative impact of closures on people using the forests had not been given enough weight. Some also questioned the scientific basis for track and forest closures, arguing that kauri dieback incidence did not match human movement patterns. Often you felt that the role of (particularly feral) animals in the spread of PA was not given enough attention.
 - In other regions such as Northland, where people use the land less for recreation and more for day to day living, there were concerns about the blocking of access to land, because many rely on the land and access to the kauri forests for their livelihood.
 - We heard quite strongly that a rahui, where laid down, must be respected and that this should be the preferred means for closing land. Tangata whenua advised that we go and speak to the iwi and hapu in the three areas that currently have rahui in place over kauri lands, and seek their input to develop a policy on rahui and how this will work in practice.
-

- You want maps and access to data and information that will help with decision making. This is a consistent message and was reiterated in our discussions about zoning. The level and type of information publicly available was a concern to a number of people, especially in the Thames/Coromandel region, where many expressed a desire to know which properties have kauri dieback detected. Other submitters expressed reticence about this information being publicly available for fear of public shaming and/or retribution.
 - Controlling vectors, and in particular pigs, is the biggest concern for many and this is especially so for private land owners. There was anger in some places about what some perceived as hunters having more rights over land than the owners do. A number of you said the NPMP should have a focus on the elimination of pigs and other feral animals.
 - We heard you say that community is a space for innovation – and we saw evidence of this from the number of people who brought along ideas to our consultation meetings to share with the programme and others in the room. We saw proposed engineering solutions, community cleaning stations design and rongoa to name a few. The NPMP should support community led innovation, in addition to driving science.
 - Science remains, however, the most important factor for the majority of submitters. Like in the first consultation round, we heard you say that you want more of it, you want access to it, and you want findings and results to be better communicated.
 - You showed mixed levels of support for extending the NPMP's focus beyond PA. Many of you said it makes sense to look at the forest environment where kauri live as a whole, while others said PA should be the priority unless the science suggests otherwise. Some of you said that a range of other species were dependent on kauri, so ensuring their survival needed to be included in any plans.
 - Most of you said that the NPMP and progress should be reviewed more frequently than 10 years. With so little known about the disease, sticking with the same approach for 10 years could increase risks to kauri. There needs to be the flexibility to change in response to new information.
 - Nearly all of you supported a targeted approach to managing the disease. Some of you said that good information was needed on where PA was present. Risk decisions need to balance a range of factors, not try to eliminate every risk.
 - Most of you agreed generally with the activities proposed, but there were some strong differences over the application of individual ones, particularly closures and movement control.
-

ON THE BODY TO MANAGE PROTECTION FOR KAURI

- You told us that engagement and involvement of local communities was important for the success of any programme. Some of you are frustrated because you want to be more involved at a practical level but that there are few opportunities. Some of the things that you thought communities could be involved in include hygiene station development, signage, track development and management, fencing and pest control, and local education. Some of you thought that having a national framework within which this local work will happen is important because this would improve the effectiveness of the outcomes. You also said that information sharing by, and stable funding from, central government were important for local efforts to be successful.
 - You saw Non-Government Organisations (NGOs) as having some role in terms of supporting and helping coordinate local activities, and through supplying expertise. Government funding would be needed to improve NGO input.
 - Regional bodies were seen as important for coordinating local activities, for providing resources and allocating them fairly, pest control, regional education campaigns and surveillance, monitoring and compliance activities.
 - You thought industry could help with sponsorship of local activities and education campaigns aimed at their members, including farmers and foresters, and through adopting codes of practice to limit the risk of PA spread. You also thought that there might be a role for industry to get involved in tourism opportunities through the creation of facilities that allow people to experience kauri forests without the risk of contamination (e.g. skywalks).
 - You thought a national organisation should provide the overall strategy and leadership of the programme, and deliver the regulations, national public awareness campaigns and funding needed. It should also generate and coordinate research efforts, share information and bring together regional and national groups.
-

- Other government agencies were seen as being able to contribute a range of skills and resources to help deal with kauri dieback. These could be research and science, a workforce to support track building, enforcement activities and information campaigns. Many of you said that a key issue was funding. An independent agency could provide national consistency.
 - Most of you want a management body to be governed by a representative cross section of kauri land communities. A number of you asked that this body be independent so it can call central and local government agencies to account.
 - Almost all of you said that tangata whenua have an important role in dealing with kauri dieback, and particularly in relation to their own land. They would need financial support and information sharing, and support for rahui.
 - Many of you thought the traditional and ongoing relationship of Māori with kauri could provide valuable information on the health of local forests, and matauranga Māori could be used to improve the health and resilience of kauri forests. But some of you questioned the value of traditional practices in dealing with a disease that is new to kauri; the focus should primarily be on science. Some were also concerned that iwi views would be given disproportionate weighting at the expense of local communities that were actively involved in issues relating to their local forests.
-

