
Statement of Evidence of Karena Hita
13 May 2023

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 Haititaimarangai Kaitiaki Trust

1.2 Haititaimarangai Marae is the marae of Te Whānau Moana and Te Rorohuri. Haititaimarangai Marae is the tūpuna marae of Ngāti Kahu. It is named after the mokopuna of the Ngāti Kahu founding tūpuna, Kahutianui and Parata.

1.3 The rohe of Te Whānau Moana and Te Rorohuri encompasses the Karikari Peninsula, the surrounding waters and the taonga within. Haititaimarangai Marae is the only marae within our rohe that was established in accord with Te Whānau Moana and Te Rorohuri tikanga.

1.4 The Haititaimarangai Marae Kaitiaki Trust was established to: nurture and promote the relationship Te Whānau Moana and Te Rorohuri have with their taonga, promote realisation of Te Tiriti o Waitangi and its principles and advocate or co-ordinate advocacy of matters concerning Te Whānau Moana and Te Rorohuri rohe.

1.5 Kaitiaki Trust

1.6 Prior to 2022, environmental matters were predominantly addressed by the Haititaimarangai Marae 339 Trust. This Trust is a Māori reservation Trust. Part of its function is to tautoko ropu in environmental issues.

1.7 As matters within the environmental space evolved and participation of our Marae in environmental processes increased, it became clear that a more efficient and streamlined approach would be to establish a separate entity to develop strategies and influence outcomes in environmental processes that concern our rohe.

1.8 Given the above, the Haititaimarangai Marae 339 Trust endorsed the establishment of the Haititaimarangai Kaitiaki Trust in 2022.

2. OUR ARRIVAL

2.1 Maturangi gifted a mokai (pet) wheke (octopus) to Kupe to guide his travels from Hawaiiki to Aotearoa. Kupe arrived at Rangiawhia and then travelled around what was then an island to Puheke. Unfortunately, the wheke birthed babies on their travels, which ate the bait of Kupe's fisherman, so Kupe killed the wheke. It now sits as the Maunga of Te Whānau Moana and Te Rorohuri. Its name is "Te Puke O Te Wheke O Maturangi" or "Puheke" according to our tradition and pronunciation.

1.1 Next, the Mamaru waka arrived, under the rangatira Te Parata and Kahutianui.

1.2 Ruakamea and Waipapa waka arrived after Mamaru. I understand that these were internal migrations, rather than new arrivals from Hawaiiki. The people who stayed from these waka married into Te Whānau Moana, Te Rorohuri and other Ngāti Kahu hapū.

3. TE WHĀNAU MOANA ME TE ROROHURI

3.1 The environment is inseparable from who we are as a hapū. Our lands, waters, and the systems within it inform how we must conduct ourselves in the roles we undertake.

3.2 Our hapū names provide an example of the fusion between our identity and the environs. "Te Whānau Moana" translates to "the sea family". "Te Rorohuri" translates to "the head turned". It refers to an occasion where our tupuna Parinuitonu was guided to wheua (whale bone) by a mako shark. He retrieved the bone and took it to a Ngāti Whātua tohunga to carve. When Parinuitonu arrived to collect the bone, there was very little carving. The tohunga advised that the head kept turning, as if alive and wouldn't allow the puku to be carved.

3.3 In practical terms, Te Whānau Moana and Te Rorohuri traditionally lived by and were sustained by shellfish and fish from Tangaroa and wai

Māori as well as vegetables and fruit from Papatūānuku. During my childhood, our hapū was largely self-sufficient. We grew kumara collectively in the mahinga (garden) and shared it. Each whānau had their own home gardens. We fished and collected kaimoana. We only brought things that we could not gather or grow, like sugar, tea, and flour for rewana bread. We did not have electricity, so we couldn't store food. Food was shared amongst ourselves and used to provide for visitors and events like tangi. It was a sign of manaakitanga. We also shared this to avoid waste.

- 3.4 Kaumātua and kuia keep, nurture and maintain our tikanga and culture. Elders and pakeke (adults) observe these in the gathering, growing and harvesting of kai from Papatūānuku. In Tangaroa, some species like whai (stingray), mango (sharks) and wheke (octopus) are seen and treated as Taniwha who look after the fishing grounds and places (Kai Tohu). Those steeped in the knowledge apply it while fishing and pass it on practically, by example.
- 3.5 We see all things as connected, even though there are different kaitiaki for the domains of Papatūānuku and Tangaroa. The obligation to look after Papatūānuku helps to ensure our Kai Tohu and Tangaroa are healthy.
- 3.6 Traditionally, protection of our rohe was achieved through our practices. We fished, planted, and harvested food. Our waters, sea and earth were given time to replenish themselves. This achieved balance, ensured future generations could be provided for and upheld our relationships with Papatūānuku, her children and the taonga within.

4. TIKANGA / CUSTOMS

- 4.1 Tikanga is an integral part of our culture and traditions. It translates to “the rights”. It refers to the right way of doing things.

4.2 Tikanga is a framework that guides our interactions and relationships with all things in our world, human and non-human. From our perspective, there is no clear distinction between physical and metaphysical realms. Tangible and intangible elements transcend one another. They are inseparable and interdependent.

4.3 Tikanga markers that guide our engagement with our tupuna whenua and moana include:

Whakapapa (Genealogical Connections)

Whanaungatanga (Kinship)

Mana (Authority and Responsibility)

Kaitiakitanga (Guardianship)

Tapu (Restriction as opposed to Sacredness)

Utu (Reciprocity)

Ea (Balance)

Noa (Ordinary or free from Restriction)

4.4 The markers do not amount to a prescriptive method. Rather, they inform what is appropriate in context. The dynamic nature of tikanga allows us to respond to situations and manage our relationship with Papatūānuku and her children in appropriate ways. For example, where an area of our rohe is healthy, it might be able to absorb some development. If the area is unhealthy or becomes unhealthy, we need to protect the area and allow time to heal.

4.5 Tikanga is informed by the korero of our tupuna (ancestors) and manifests in practice. This mātauranga (knowledge) is a taonga (treasure) to us. It underscores our whakapapa (genealogy) and the relationship that we have with our whenua (land), moana (ocean), wai (water) and other taonga.

- 4.6 Mātauranga is also critical to our identity, the relationship we have with our rohe and understanding and applying tikanga. For example, it informs when we need to place a rāhui (prohibition) on a particular area within our rohe.
- 4.7 We understand that the Proposed Plan treats mātauranga as something that is separate to our culture, traditions and ancestral relationship with our whenua, wai, moana and other taonga. From our perspective, this is not possible or appropriate. These elements are inextricably connected.
- 4.8 Kaitiakitanga is one of many tikanga principles that are relevant to our relationship with our environs. While looking after our rohe is one of our roles, our relationship is far greater than one of guardianship. The korero above captures this.

5. SCHEDULING SITES OF SIGNIFICANCE

- 5.1 We understand that Council wants to schedule all sites that are significant to us and that scheduled site get greater protection.
- 5.2 There are many areas within our rohe that are significant to us. Some of the mātauranga that attaches to these areas is sensitive and passed down in accordance with our tikanga. We want these areas protected, but we do not want it in a public schedule. We do not want to change our tikanga for Council's purposes.
- 5.3 It is hard for us to understand why we need to disclose our mātauranga and adjust our tikanga. We understood that applicants for resource consents had to undertake effects assessments, which include assessments of cultural effects. We have and will continue to share information on our significant sites where they stand to be affected. We prefer this option as we can share information on our own terms, in an appropriate way effectively exercising sovereignty over our data.
- 5.4 Aside from sensitive information, there is the issue of resourcing. Our hapū largely rely on volunteers to participate in RMA processes. This is

on top of the other work that we undertake for our Marae. It is difficult to resource Council mahi when our volunteers are already stretched.

6. IWI AUTHORITY

6.1 In our situation, Te Rūnanga a Iwi o Ngāti Kahu (**Rūnanga**) is recognized as the "Iwi Authority" by Council.

6.2 The Rūnanga board is made up of representatives from different hapū. We have no representation on this board.

6.3 The design of the Rūnanga / Iwi Authority system does not originate from or reflect traditional constructs.

6.4 Our identity as people of the whenua and moana within our rohe are articulated through our Pepeha. Our whakapapa demonstrates an ancestral line that can speak to matters relating to the whenua, moana, awa, taonga we belong to and that belongs to us. In our pepeha and whakapapa you will not find a Rūnanga being a part of that identity.

6.5 According to our tikanga, relationships between tangata whenua and the environs are developed and nurtured at a hapū level. Tikanga is developed and applied at a hapū level. Rangatiranga is held at a hapū level. Indeed, even the Te Tiriti o Waitangi guaranteed hapū rangatiranga over all their properties.

6.6 The Rūnanga does not speak for us. It cannot give feedback on cultural effects as we, as tangata whenua, are the only ones that hold the knowledge and relationships necessary to identify and articulate such effects.

6.7 To date, we have experienced several difficulties with Council or would-be consent holders liaising with the Rūnanga, only to marginalize our relevance. This has resulted in more pressure on hapū resources where awareness of a consent application is delayed or worse still, the inability to respond where we are not informed of any given resource management process. In both instances, internal and external disputes

and tensions have arisen. The approach has generated adverse effects in itself.

6.8 We acknowledge that some hapū may have a different view. They might have found a way to align the concept of an Iwi Authority with their tikanga.

6.9 We are not saying this system is not fit for purpose for all hapū – we are saying it is not fit for our hapū. It needs to be clear to plan users that not all Iwi Authorities represent all hapū so that we retain a voice in resource management processes concerning our rohe.

7. Enabling Economic, Social and Cultural Well-Being

7.1 We understand that the Proposed Plan includes enabling economic, social and cultural well-being of tangata whenua use and development of land administered under Te Ture Whenua Māori Act 1993 and returned under Treaty settlement.

7.2 Common obstacles for our hapū members is that Māori land is that there are often issues with access and connection to infrastructure and utilities. For instance, power and wastewater. Often our people do not have the resources for this kind of development.

7.3 Our hapū is not included in any Treaty settlement. The Ngāti Kahu Treaty claim has been underway for over 30 years. An agreement in principle was prepared. Unfortunately, the Rūnanga people decided not to go progress. While this is not a decision our Marae supported, it is a decision that we are forced to live with. Consequently, we are now involved in yet another Waitangi Tribunal process, which will likely continue for many years to come.

7.4 Any initiative to progress our economic, social or cultural well-being via activities that might require a resource consent would likely involve general land – whenua that is accessible and connected to infrastructure and utilities.

- 7.5 From a cultural perspective, our relationship with the whenua within our rohe continues. According to tikanga, our hapū continue to exercise rangatiranga and mana motuhake over this space. This is our tūpuna whenua. Western classification systems do not change this.
- 7.6 We tautoko the proposition that tangata whenua well-being should be enabled in resource management processes. We consider that this should apply to all customary land. It seems perverse that the Proposed Plan could operate to impose higher thresholds to achieving well-being for hapū like ours – ones that have not had the benefit of advancing settlements and Māori land accessibility and connection.

8. General

- 8.1 It is important that the Proposed Plan provides clear guidance to would-be consent applicants and Council employees on cultural considerations.
- 8.2 All too often, Council progresses consents on a non-notified basis, with little to no consideration of cultural matters. We cannot think of one occasion where a consent applicant approached our hapū to discuss cultural impacts ahead of applying for a consent.
- 8.3 Deficient processes and guidance have resulted in our hapū protesting, occupying areas and initiating legal proceedings. These actions come at a emotional, economic and personal cost to our hapū. In our view, all of the actions could have been avoided if proper processes were undertaken.



Karena Hita