

## WARO REGIONAL FEEDBACK/CONSULTATION & LAND ASSESSMENT

REGION: Central North Island

DIRECTOR: [REDACTED]

WARO COORDINATOR: [REDACTED]

1. Treaty Partners
2. Conservation Board
3. Consultation with stakeholders & WARO industry

### SECTION A: Treaty Settlement implications

- Is any site subject to the application due to be transferred to whānau, hapū, or iwi?

YES, see following table;

Iwi Negotiation	Current Settlement Milestone	CNI Specific Area Under Negotiation	CNI District	Recommended WARO Status	Comment
Ngāti Maniapoto	AIP	Hikurangi Scenic Reserve (124ha) - Taumarunui	Wanganui	Not permitted	Only very minor CNI overlap
Te Whakatohea	AIP	Waioeka/Urutawa	Whakatane-Whirinaki-Opotiki	Permitted	29 vesting sites. Total 6700ha. Relationship protocol over wider area
Ngāti Hinerangi	AIP	Kaimai/Mamaku	Tauranga-Rotorua	Not permitted	Tauranga-Rotorua not permitted so unlikely to be a significant topic for iwi
Ngāti Maru (Taranaki)	AIP	Wanganui National Park	Wanganui	Permitted	Crown has agreed through the AIP to settle Ngāti Maru interests in Wanganui NP
Ngai Te Rangi	DOS	Kaimai/Mamaku	Tauranga-Rotorua	Not permitted	Tauranga-Rotorua not permitted so unlikely to be a significant topic for iwi
Ngāti Rangi	DOS	Tongariro National Park, Rangataua Conservation Area	Tongariro	Restricted	Rangataua CA (8700ha) to have a form of joint management

Iwi Negotiation	Current Settlement Milestone	CNI Specific Area Under Negotiation	CNI District	Recommended WARO Status	Comment
Ngāti Ranginui	DOS	Kaimai/Mamaku	Tauranga-Rotorua	Not permitted	Tauranga-Rotorua not permitted so unlikely to be a significant topic for iwi
Ngāti Tūwharetoa	DOS	Kaimanawa Forest Park, Tongariro Conservation Area, southern Whirinaki	Central Plateau, Tongariro, Whakatane-Whirinaki-Opotiki	Restricted	All areas subject to partnership agreement approach
Tauranga Moana Iwi Collective	DOS	information not yet available	Tauranga-Rotorua	Not permitted	Tauranga-Rotorua not permitted so unlikely to be a significant topic for iwi
Te Rohe o Te Wairoa	DOS	Panekirikiri Conservation Area (2758ha)	Te Urewera	Permitted	No consultation has occurred with this grouping as discussion around this land block did not technically fall within scope of consultation
Hauraki Collective	iDOS	Kaimai/Mamaku	Tauranga-Rotorua	Not permitted	Tauranga-Rotorua not permitted so unlikely to be a significant topic for iwi
Marutuahu Collective	iDOS	Kaimai/Mamaku	Tauranga-Rotorua	Not permitted	Tauranga-Rotorua not permitted so unlikely to be a significant topic for iwi
Ngāti Whānaunga	iDOS	Kaimai/Mamaku	Tauranga-Rotorua	Not permitted	Tauranga-Rotorua not permitted so unlikely to be a significant topic for iwi
Ngāti Maru (Hauraki)	iDOS	Kaimai/Mamaku	Tauranga-Rotorua	Not permitted	Tauranga-Rotorua not permitted so unlikely to be a significant topic for iwi

Iwi Negotiation	Current Settlement Milestone	CNI Specific Area Under Negotiation	CNI District	Recommended WARO Status	Comment
Ngāti Paoa	iDOS	Kaimai/Mamaku	Tauranga-Rotorua	Not permitted	Tauranga-Rotorua not permitted so unlikely to be a significant topic for iwi
Ngāti Rahiri Tumutumu	iDOS	Kaimai/Mamaku	Tauranga-Rotorua	Not permitted	Tauranga-Rotorua not permitted so unlikely to be a significant topic for iwi
Ngāti Tamatera	iDOS	Kaimai/Mamaku	Tauranga-Rotorua	Not permitted	Tauranga-Rotorua not permitted so unlikely to be a significant topic for iwi
Ngāti Tara Tokanui	iDOS	Kaimai/Mamaku	Tauranga-Rotorua	Not permitted	Tauranga-Rotorua not permitted so unlikely to be a significant topic for iwi
Ngāti Rangitihī	Pre-AIP	Matata, northern Rotoma	Whakatane-Whirinaki-Opotiki, Tauranga-Rotorua	Not permitted	Unlikely to be a significant topic for iwi
Te Whānau a Apanui	Pre-AIP	Raukumara	Whakatane-Whirinaki-Opotiki	Permitted	No consultation occurred with this grouping as discussion around the Raukumara did not technically fall within scope of consultation. Iwi is likely to have an interest
Whanganui Iwi - Ngāti Haua	Pre-AIP	Wanganui and Tongariro National Parks	Wanganui - Tongariro	WNP Permitted, TNP Restricted	Comprehensive collective negotiations re Wanganui NP and Tongariro NP pending
Whanganui Iwi - Southern Groups	Pre-AIP	Wanganui and Tongariro National Parks	Wanganui	WNP Permitted, TNP Restricted	comprehensive collective negotiations re Wanganui NP and Tongariro NP pending

Whanganui Iwi - Uenuku	Pre-AIP	Wanganui and Tongariro National Parks	Wanganui - Tongariro	WNP Permitted, TNP Restricted	comprehensive collective negotiations re Wanganui NP and Tongariro NP pending
------------------------	---------	---------------------------------------	----------------------	-------------------------------	---

- Has a Treaty settlement disclosure form been completed for the site? Were any existing encumbrances noted on that form?

Yes, various.

- Who is leading the negotiations process for DOC in the Policy Negotiations Team?

Various, [REDACTED] Treaty Negotiations Unit Manager. Information for the above table was provided by [REDACTED] (DOC – TNU Team )and sourced from the NZ Government website.

- If your Treaty Partners have settlement legislation in place already, are there any specific post-settlement implementation obligations that relate to the site or proposed activity?

Yes, various. Each District Office has engaged with whānau, hapū and iwi as they deemed appropriate according to the different settlements and the prescribed scope of the consultation process.

#### SECTION B: Marine and Coastal (Takutai Moana) Area Act 2011

- Is the location subject to any applications or approvals for customary marine title or protected marine rights under the Marine and Coastal (Takutai Moana) Act 2011? If yes, identify the Treaty Partners who have either applied for or had approved customary marine title or protected marine rights at the location.

No.

#### Whakatane-Whirinaki-Opotiki District

#### SECTION C: Whānau, hapū, and iwi consulted

Whānau, Hapū and Iwi Consultation Summary		
Treaty Partner consulted with	Ngāti Whare	Te Whakatohea
Date consultation was sent out	June/July 2018	June/July 2018
Consultation time frame end date	20/7/2018	20/7/2018
Consultation method (email, phone, face to face etc)	Email, face to face	Face to face, telephone calls

How many attempts made to consult?	Four	Multiple
DOC-CM link to any consultation emails received	<a href="https://doccm.doc.govt.nz/wcc/faces/wccdoc?dDocName=DOC-5520752">https://doccm.doc.govt.nz/wcc/faces/wccdoc?dDocName=DOC-5520752</a>	

#### SECTION D: Consultation with Ngāti Whare

- Does this application activate any agreed triggers for consultation with Treaty Partners?

Yes.

- Did the whānau, hapū, or iwi engage in consultation on this application?

Yes.

- What is the interest of the whānau, hapū, or iwi in the site or activity?

Ngāti Whare are kaitiaki and mana whenua across all of Whirinaki Te Pua-a-Tane Conservation Park.

- What are their views on the activity (taking place at the specified site)?

*“My initial thoughts revolve around the concession document and should or how does it recognise Te Runanga o Ngāti Whare co-governance status, a changes since the last agreement.*

*The other query I have is related to Wahi Tapu, I understand the CMP identifies permitted aircraft landing sites which is great however I wonder if a mention of this might be included within the agreement somewhere”.*

*Earl Rewi, Ngāti Whare Environmental Manager.*

- What sort of adverse effects do the whānau, hapū, or iwi believe the activity will have on their interests (at the specified site)?

None mentioned.

- Have the whānau, hapū, or iwi identified any methods to avoid, remedy, or mitigate these effects?

Ensure permit recognises Ngāti Whare as kaitiaki of Whirinaki Te Pua-a-Tane Conservation Park. Ensure permits align with all provisions from Whirinaki CMP.

- Summarise any other information provided by the whānau, hapū, or iwi.

NA.

#### SECTION D: Consultation with Te Whakatohea

- Does this application activate any agreed triggers for consultation with Treaty Partners?

Yes.

NB – Te Whakatohea signed an AIP with the Crown at the end of 2017. There are currently 31 sites which are identified in their AIP which are either to be transferred fee simple, or to be handed across with existing reserve status. A number of these sites are within the proposed new WARO permit areas.

- Did the whānau, hapū, or iwi engage in consultation on this application?

Yes.

- What is the interest of the whānau, hapū, or iwi in the site or activity?

All sites identified in the AIP with the Crown which are within WARO permit areas.

- What are their views on the activity (taking place at the specified site)?

Te Whakatohea are nervous about inheriting any encumbrances that will affect their ability to manage their lands on their terms after settlement.

- What sort of adverse effects do the whānau, hapū, or iwi believe the activity will have on their interests (at the specified site)?

They will inherit encumbrances that will affect their own decision-making ability across the reserve sites.

- Have the whānau, hapū, or iwi identified any methods to avoid, remedy, or mitigate these effects?

Limit the length of WARO permits for their AIP land transfer sites to a time that aligns with probable Treaty settlement e.g. 3 years.

## Wanganui District:

### SECTION C: Whānau, hapū, and iwi consulted

<b>Whānau, Hapū and Iwi Consultation Summary</b>			
Treaty Partner consulted with	<b>Nгаа Rauru Kiitahi</b>	<b>Te Ropu Mana Whenua</b>	
Date consultation was sent out	11/6/2018	31/5/2018	
Consultation time frame end date	13/8/2018	21/6/2018	
Consultation method (email, phone, face to face etc)	Face to face	Face to Face	
How many attempts made to consult?	1	1	
DOC-CM link to any consultation emails received	<a href="#">DOC-5536245</a>	<a href="#">DOC-5490549</a>	

### SECTION D: Consultation with Nгаа Rauru Kiitahi

- Does this application activate any agreed triggers for consultation with Treaty Partners?

Yes, Nгаа Rauru Kiitahi Claims Settlement Act 2005.

- Did the whānau, hapū, or iwi engage in consultation on this application?

Yes.

- What is the interest of the whānau, hapū, or iwi in the site or activity?

First and only meeting was held in Whanganui office with Nicola Patrick, Environmental Advisor. Low interest in this activity at present but may be interested in applying for a WARO permit in the future. Email sent by N [REDACTED] on 23/7/2018 informing that they will respond by 13/8/2018.

- What are their views on the activity (taking place at the specified site)?

View from face to face meeting is that their rohe is not suitable for WARO as mainly bush covered and treated with 1080.

- What sort of adverse effects do the whānau, hapū, or iwi believe the activity will have on their interests (at the specified site)?

Potential job opportunities taken away from iwi if locals not involved.

- Have the whānau, hapū, or iwi identified any methods to avoid, remedy, or mitigate these effects?

Apply for a WARO permit when organised and trained.

- Summarise any other information provided by the whānau, hapū, or iwi.

The Wanganui District Office is awaiting further feedback as per email sent by [REDACTED] link here [DOC-5536245](#).

Note: As at 3-8-2018, no further correspondence has been received from [REDACTED] The Wanganui District Office are of the opinion that any further correspondence is;

- a) Unlikely to be received, or
- b) If received by 13-8-2018, unlikely to necessitate review of the current CNI Regional WARO land recommendations

#### **SECTION E: Consultation with Te Ropu Mana Whenua** (Tupoho, Tamaupoko, Hinengakau/Ngāti Haua, Tamahaki, Uenuku and Tamakana)

- Does this application activate any agreed triggers for consultation with Treaty Partners?

Yes – Working relationship document.

- Did the whānau, hapū, or iwi engage in consultation on this application? If not, ensure attempts to engage are detailed in Section C.

Yes.

- What is the interest of the whānau, hapū, or iwi in the site or activity?

All mandated representatives were interested in this and had various views and thoughts on the activity. They all agree that pest control is important but not all agreed on the methods used.

- What are their views on the activity (taking place at the specified site)?

Responses were varied from full support from Hinengakau to anti from Tamahaki.

- What sort of adverse effects do the whānau, hapū, or iwi believe the activity will have on their interests (at the specified site)?

Concerns over deer being removed from Maori Land (poaching), kai being removed from locals and wastage, locals not being employed, local hunting competition being affected, safety, monitoring.

- Have the whānau, hapū, or iwi identified any methods to avoid, remedy, or mitigate these effects?

WARO operator advertises in local paper when hunting will happen, inform iwi of the operation occurring, buffers around Maori lands, restrict areas around Pipiriki and the Awa, pay locals to do the work.

- Summarise any other information provided by the whānau, hapū, or iwi.

Concern as to whether the DOC decision maker will listen to iwi concerns and the partnership they hold with local DOC or carry on regardless as seen before. Also how does the Te Awa Tupua settlement affect this in regard to Section 7 – Interpretation of the Awa (airspace and tributaries).

#### Tauranga/Rotorua District:

No consultation occurred due to there being no WARO permitted in this District.

#### Tongariro District:

#### SECTION C: Whānau, hapū, and iwi consulted

Whānau, Hapū and Iwi Consultation Summary	
Treaty Partner consulted with	Ngāti Hikairo (a hapū of Ngāti Tūwharetoa)
Date consultation was sent out	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 22/5/ 2018 - [REDACTED] on behalf of Ngāti Hikairo, Tongariro Conservation Area meeting - operations meeting DOC/Iwi</li> <li>- 13/6/2018 - Community meeting notes shared with [REDACTED]</li> <li>- 20/6/2018 - Face to face check in. [REDACTED]</li> </ul>
Consultation time frame end date	20/7/2018
Consultation method (email, phone, face to face etc)	Face to face
How many attempts made to consult?	3

DOC-CM link to any consultation emails received

No written correspondence received

#### SECTION D: Consultation with Ngāti Hikairo

- Does this application activate any agreed triggers for consultation with Treaty Partners?

Yes, section 4 of the Conservation Act generally requires the Department to consult with whānau, hapū, or iwi. Additionally, after enactment of the Ngāti Tūwharetoa Claims Settlement Bill, forecasted to occur in October 2018, the Department will co-author a chapter of the CMS pertaining to part of the Tongariro Conservation Area. Consultation with Ngāti Hikairo expressed concern about the permit term unnecessarily encumbering CMS discussions and other similar post-settlement considerations for Ngāti Hikairo, as they work with the Department in accordance with the Te Piringa partnership agreement.

- Did the whānau, hapū, or iwi engage in consultation on this application?

Yes, high level face to face discussions with [REDACTED] as hapū representative.

- What is the interest of the whānau, hapū, or iwi in the site or activity?

High interest in Tongariro Conservation Area and collective interest in Tongariro National Park.

- What are their views on the activity (taking place at the specified site)?

In summary, feedback supports the wider communities interest to have no helicopter recovery of deer. The current hunting by community (who include whānau, hapū, or iwi members) is keeping numbers manageable and is a source of kai for community.

- What sort of adverse effects do the whānau, hapū, or iwi believe the activity will have on their interests (at the specified site)?

The feedback is that food source will be reduced for whānau and hapū. Helicopter recovery is not supported.

- Have the whānau, hapū, or iwi identified any methods to avoid, remedy, or mitigate these effects?

Not directly, although they expect that DOC will not support helicopter recovery in Tongariro Conservation Area and Tongariro National Park

Note: Current CNI WARO recommendations are;

Tongariro Conservation Area: Not Permitted (same as previous 3 years)

Tongariro National Park: Restricted – where WARO is permitted for one month only (same as previous 3 years).

Central Plateau District Office

**SECTION C: Whānau, hapū, and iwi consulted**

<b>Whānau, Hapū and Iwi Consultation Summary</b>			
Treaty Partner consulted with	<b>Te Kotahitanga o Ngāti Tūwharetoa</b>	<b>East Taupo Lands Trust</b>	<b>Lake Taupo Forest Trust</b>
Date consultation was sent out	27/06/2018	27/06/2018	27/06/2018
Consultation time frame end date	20/7/2018	20/7/2018	20/7/2018
Consultation method (email, phone, face to face etc)	Letter via email	Letter via email	Letter via email
How many attempts made to consult?	Once	Once	Once
DOC-CM link to consultation letters sent by DOC	DOC-5536186	DOC-5536184	DOC-5536185

**SECTION D: Consultation with Te Kotahitanga o Ngāti Tūwharetoa**

- Does this application activate any agreed triggers for consultation with Treaty Partners?

Yes - The Ngāti Tūwharetoa Deed of Settlement was signed on 08/07/2017 <https://www.govt.nz/treaty-settlement-documents/Ngāti-Tūwharetoa/Ngāti-Tūwharetoa/> Te Kotahitanga o Tūwharetoa (is the new PSGE entity), with consultation required with their Environmental Steering Group [patai@tekotahitangaoTūwharetoa.co.nz](mailto:patai@tekotahitangaoTūwharetoa.co.nz)

<https://doccm.doc.govt.nz/wcc/wccproxy/d?dDocName=DOC-3173456> Te Piringa Partnership Agreement.

- Did the whānau, hapū, or iwi engage in consultation on this application?

No response received to date.

**SECTION D: Consultation with East Taupo Lands Trust**

- Does this application activate any agreed triggers for consultation with Treaty Partners?

No, East Taupo Lands Trust however control 30,270 hectares of land to the south east of Taupo on behalf of Ngāti Tūwharetoa owners. This land adjoins Kaimanawa and Kaweka Forest Parks.

- Did the whānau, hapū, or iwi engage in consultation on this application? If not, ensure attempts to engage are detailed in Section C.

No response received to date.

**SECTION D: Consultation with Lake Taupo Forest Trust**

- Does this application activate any agreed triggers for consultation with Treaty Partners?

No, Lake Taupo Forest Trust represents the interests of the owners of 68 separate Maori land titles on the eastern shores of Lake Taupo. The Trust acts on behalf of more than 13,000 beneficial owners who retain their shares in the lands.

- Did the whānau, hapū, or iwi engage in consultation on this application? If not, ensure attempts to engage are detailed in Section C.

No response received to date.

## 2. CONSULTATION UNDERTAKEN WITH CONSERVATION BOARD & RESPONSE RECEIVED

Consultation occurred with the Bay of Plenty and Tongariro-Taupo Conservation Boards. This involved the provision of a briefing memo outlining the WARO renewal process that was underway and with an invite to comment. Both Conservation Boards noted the correspondence but did not provide any comment.

## 3. DRAFT LAND ASSESSMENT - CONSULTATION WITH STAKEHOLDERS & WARO INDUSTRY -

Engagement undertaken	Engagement type	WARO Operators (number)	Other (rec hunters, iwi, community, neighbours etc) – number	Comment
	DOC letter sent	1	31	The same letter sent to all WARO permit holders
	Meetings held	0	11	Several offers of face to face hui were offered to North Is based WARO permit holders
	Submissions received	6	22	See below for summary of themes
	Phone conversations/emails	Not recorded, although, two or	Various, not recorded	

		more conversations occurred with each North Island based permit holder		
Summary of feedback – WARO Operators	<p><b>CNI Consultation Approach:</b> The CNI Regional Coordinator, ██████████ talked to all of the North Island based WARO permit holders. Face to face meetings were offered. With a combination of these ‘regional’ conversations, and communications between ██████████ and these operators, the CNI region is satisfied that WARO operators have been consulted satisfactorily.</p> <p><b>WARO Operators – summary of feedback</b></p> <p><b>Industry Submission;</b> The submission made by the South Island WARO Association is the most notable submission from WARO Operators, see attached link: <a href="https://doccm.doc.govt.nz:443/wcc/faces/wccdoc?dDocName=DOC-5520105">https://doccm.doc.govt.nz:443/wcc/faces/wccdoc?dDocName=DOC-5520105</a></p> <p>This submission is supported by ██████████ as the North Island representative and is a relevant consideration across all public conservation land in New Zealand. There are multiple points made in this submission which strongly advocate for the maintenance and growth of the WARO industry through various means.</p> <p><b>North Island WARO Permit Holders</b> North Island WARO permit holders that we consulted with were generally satisfied with the overall current situation, in terms of land access and permit conditions. There was a lack of strong dissatisfaction in respect of any particular issue. This was reflected in their relatively brief written submissions, and the fact that the three CNI based operators did not take up the opportunity to meet in person, being satisfied instead with phone conversations and the opportunity to provide a written submission. They were consistently open to discussion about their operations and willing to engage. The issues that were raised were consistent with those issues raised in the submission from the South Island WARO Association.</p>			
Summary of Feedback – Other (predominantly recreational hunters)	<p><b>CNI Consultation Approach:</b> Each CNI Operations District determined their own respective consultation approach. Overall there was some targeted consultation but largely a reactive approach to submitters was taken. Given that the opportunity to submit was notified through the DOC website, and that initially at least the scope for consultation was new pieces of pcl or those that had a changed status in the period 2015-2018 only, CNI determined to take a more reactive approach.</p> <p><b>District approaches are summarised as follows;</b></p> <p><b>Central Plateau:</b> Letters sent to interested parties inviting feedback and reactive approach to submissions  <b>Whakatane/Whirinaki/Opotiki:</b> Targeted consultation with some iwi, and reactive approach to submissions  <b>Tongariro:</b> Targeted consultation with Ngāti Hikiaro, multi-stakeholder hui held to capture community views, and reactive approach to submissions  <b>Wanganui:</b> Targeted consultation with some iwi, and reactive approach to submissions  <b>Tauranga/Rotorua:</b> No consultation undertaken</p> <p>The following table summarises submissions received per stakeholder type</p>			

Individual rec hunters	Hunting Club	NZDA Branch	Hunter Liaison Group	Whānau, hapū, iwi	Community Hui (Tongariro)	Affected land owner
11	1	3	1	4	1	1
<b>Total: 22</b>						

The following document, through the 'Summary Other' tab, provides a detailed look at the points raised by the submitters.

CNI Communications Plan and Record of

Consultation: <https://doccm.doc.govt.nz:443/wcc/faces/wccdoc?dDocName=DOC-5493183>

The following bullet points summarise **the most commonly occurring themes** that came through in the submissions:

- A strong sentiment was evident that DOC could be managing WARO better to benefit recreational hunters, the Fiordland Wapiti Foundation model was held up as an example to follow
- There is a tension between WARO operators and recreational hunting values
- WARO has limited conservation benefit, recreational hunters provide more meaningful deer control
- Recreational hunting through the domestic and international markets are worth significantly more to the NZ economy than the WARO industry
- Hinds should be targeted by WARO operators to improve recreational hunting opportunities and reduce deer populations
- There is widespread dissatisfaction at the Department's decision to not undertake a full review of the WARO system
- Consistently there are concerns around the transparency of the WARO industry from a compliance perspective
- The majority of submitters expressed concern over the duration of the new permit, most recommending periods not exceeding 2-3 years
- The Christmas and roar closure periods are a point of concern, most submissions requested extensions to existing periods
- No further access should be given to PCL by WARO operators
- Areas that are accessible to ground hunters should be not permitted areas for WARO operators

Other **less commonly occurring themes** are:

- DOC should work more with recreational hunters to improve deer control, examples given included things such as;
  - The work occurring in the Kaimanawa Forest Park involving Ospri, DOC and the Kaimanawa Hunter Liaison Group
  - Provision of more landing sites to encourage hunter access
- There needs to be better correlation between WARO effort and ecological priorities
- WARO results in a reduction of recreational hunting effort by hunters, which can result in a net loss of total numbers of deer shot
- There needs to be better information availability and quality from DOC and WARO operators
- The Department should only allow one WARO operator per area
- Concern in regards WARO operators poaching on to private land

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Control of deer is acknowledged as an environmental and legislative requirement</li> <li>• Deer hunting is part of our culture, history and important for our wellbeing</li> <li>• There should be no right of renewal with this next permit</li> </ul> <p><b><u>CNI specific points of interest</u></b> that were raised are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Kaimanawa Hunter Liaison Group submitted that: Kaimanawa Forest Park should be closed to WARO until 2020 to avoid conflict with the Ospri TB testing programme. However, communications with Ospri and Landcare Research – Ospri’s contractor for the TB testing, has dismissed this as an issue</li> <li>• The Taupo NZDA submitted that: Tongariro National Park should be closed to WARO for 12 months of the year, not just the 11 months that is the current situation</li> <li>• The Thames Valley NZDA submitted that: WARO should be excluded from the Pihanga/Lake Rotopounamu area and the north-eastern corner of Whirinaki Te Pua-a-Tane</li> <li>• The Central North Island Sika herd was recognised as a herd of significance by the Kaimanawa Hunter Liaison Group, the Thames Valley NZDA and Chas Hutton</li> <li>• Iwi concerns as expressed in previous sections above in this document</li> </ul>
<p>What changes (if any) did this result in</p>	<p>The recommended changes to WARO access to PCL in the Wanganui District are based on consultation with communities of interest over the past three years. This includes whānau/hapū/iwi, hunters, land owners, and community groups. Coupled with the knowledge that WARO operations have virtually been non-existent in this landscape since the issue of the 2015-2018 WARO permit, and that the landscape is heavily bushed and not congruent to WARO operations, CNI is willing to endorse the community views we have heard in the last three years by making the changes recommended.</p> <p>See 2018 North Island National WARO Permit Regional Land Assessment Recommendations for recommended Wanganui changes and links to maps:</p> <p><a href="https://doccm.doc.govt.nz:443/wcc/faces/wccdoc?dDocName=DOC-5460454">https://doccm.doc.govt.nz:443/wcc/faces/wccdoc?dDocName=DOC-5460454</a></p>
<p>Links to relevant documents ((e.g. consultation records, submission record/summary)</p>	<p>CNI Communications Plan and Record of Consultation (contains links to all submissions):</p> <p><a href="https://doccm.doc.govt.nz:443/wcc/faces/wccdoc?dDocName=DOC-5493183">https://doccm.doc.govt.nz:443/wcc/faces/wccdoc?dDocName=DOC-5493183</a></p>