
Te Korowai o Te Tai o Marokura
(Kaikōura Coastal Marine
Guardians)

Draft Submissions Analysis

THE lawless
edge

25 June 2008

Introduction

Thirty-six submissions were numbered and analysed. The ideas in every submission were classified using Buzan mind-mapping and the result coded into a database. A summary of results is recorded below grouping the matters raised into a logical framework. Numbers in (brackets) indicate the submission numbers that were the source of the ideas reported.

The primary topics identified were:

- | | | |
|----|------------------------------|--------|
| 1. | Te Korowai process | Page 1 |
| 2. | What people value | Page 2 |
| 3. | Vehicles and freedom camping | Page 3 |
| 4. | Fisheries management | Page 3 |
| 5. | Marine reserves | Page 3 |
| 6. | Wildlife management | Page 3 |
| 7. | Public awareness | Page 4 |
| 8. | Research | Page 4 |
| 9. | Coastal land | Page 4 |

1. *Te Korowai process*

Nine submissions commented on the Te Korowai process and what it needs to be successful.

Only positive comment was received about (1, 3, 28) the **Guardians' leadership** of the process.

One submission (1) commented on the **egg model** of Te korowai saying the balance of power between agencies and locals appeared healthy and appropriate.

Seven submissions (1, 3, 19, 26, 28, 30, 32) commented on the **overall strategy process**.

One recommended the Guardians explicitly consider "**what/if**" scenarios. It recommended a process called "Back to the Future" developed by Tony Pitcher and currently being used in Golden Bay. He describes this as "*The development of quantitative, multi-criteria evaluation frameworks and rapid appraisal techniques for assessing the status of fisheries, management instruments and management goals in a scientific, evidence-based and replicable fashion.*" <http://pitcher.t.googlepages.com/>

Another (3) commented on the need to fit in with **other management processes** and referred particularly to the Government's national marine protected areas process.

Others asked for wide **consultation** and **balance** "*To get the balance right between creating access to a resource, while retaining its integrity and*



character.” (19) This submitter also sought for consideration of both current and future generations.

Two submissions (26, 32) sought that Te Korowai take a **long-term view** and go beyond current issues of livelihood.

One (27) commented on a desire for the **gifts and gains process** to be equitable and for the work to date of the paua industry to be recognised.

Submission (30) called for a **science based process** to offset sensationalised claims.

One submission (3) questioned why the process was addressing such a **large area** and how the results would be given effect.

2. *What people value*

Every submission commented on what they valued about the Kaikoura coast.

This fell into two broad areas:

- The natural character of the coast
- Uses that people can make of this environment.

In terms of natural character people commented on the following aspects they value about the Kaikoura coast:

- That it is largely **undeveloped** (2, 11, 17, 19, 26)
- That it is largely **unpolluted** (2, 4, 23)
- Its visual **beauty** (2, 5, 11, 13, 14, 15, 22, 24, 29, 30, 32, 36)
- Its **variety of landform** (11)
- Its **biodiversity** (11, 15, 16, 26, 27, 31, 33)
- Its **diverse geology** (13, 26)
- Its **wildlife** (2, 5, 9, 15, 31)
- Its **people** (15).

In terms of use-value people identified the capacity of the coast to provide for:

- **Commercial fishing** particularly paua fishing (1, 3, 6, 12, 24, 27, 34)
- **Diving** (2)
- **Recreational fishing** (4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 13, 14, 19, 20, 21, 22, 27, 35)
- **Marine sports** including rock-pooling, picnicking, surfing, swimming, kayaking, boating (6, 7, 9, 21, 22, 23, 35)
- **Research opportunities** (11)
- Its **easy access** and camping opportunities (14, 17, 27, 32, 35)
- **Ecotourism potential** (26, 29).

3. *Vehicles and freedom camping*

One submission (2) commented on a need to control **vehicles on beaches**.

Eight others (6, 7, 9, 10, 11, 21, 22, 23, 30) were concerned about the effects of uncontrolled **freedom camping**, particularly issues of rubbish and waste.

4. *Fisheries management*

Fisheries management issues drew more comment in submissions than any others.

Eleven submissions (2, 4, 7, 10, 19, 25, 27, 30, 36) called for reductions in **bag limits** or in some cases **size limits** (8, 15). These were linked to fears of **over-fishing** (5, 14, 15, 16, 17, 22, 29, 31, 32). Depletion was attributed by some (15, 16, 28) to **by-catch** and by others to (17, 28, 29) to **poaching**. There was also concern about some fishing methods with calls for an end to **set-netting** (12, 25, 28, 36), **purse seiners** (25) and **trawling** (25).

Others felt the issues might be addressed by **licensing amateur fishers** (4, 16). Some singled out **Asian fishers** as a problem (8, 9, 14, 23) and one person to suggest **signs in a range of languages** (12). One (24) wanted specific protection for small intertidal shellfish

Four submitters (15, 18, 26, 35) wanted reduction in **quota** for commercial fishers.

The most frequent concern was about **enforcement** of the rules (15, 16, 20, 21, 24, 27, 30, 34, 36) and specifically the lack of locally based **fisheries officers** (12, 23, 24, 29).

5. *Marine reserves*

Opinion amongst 14 submissions (5, 11, 13, 15, 18, 19, 21, 26, 27, 29, 31, 32, 33, 35) was quite split on the matter of **marine reserves** with 11 wanting one or more marine reserves and the other three having concerns about the use of this tool.

One submission (31) expressed concern about **enforcement** in any reserves created by the process.

6. *Wildlife management*

Most of those that commented on wildlife management were concerned about the build up of **seal numbers** on the Kaikoura coast (7, 8, 9, 10, 20, 21, 22, 23, 30). These submitters sought controls on numbers including culls.

Others wanted recognition of the **value of wildlife** and one saw them as stakeholders in the process (15, 35, 36). Some wanted more **protection for dolphins and whales** (31, 35)

7. *Public awareness*

Two submitters asked for enhanced process to improve **public awareness** (31, 36) about the coast, mentioning the idea of a Friends of the Coast group and a regular newsletter.

8. *Research*

One submitter (11) wanted the Guardians to “*Encourage and support scientific research that will under-pin sound decision-making.*”

9. *Coastal land*

Seven submissions commented on aspects of management of coastal land. Issues covered were:

- **Re-forestation** (13, 26)
- **Hazards**, with an offer to support the Guardians technically in this area (13)
- **Protecting access** (32 and others mentioned in section 2)
- Providing **toilets** (23)
- Sustaining a **low density of occupation** of the coastal strip (35, 36)
- Preventing **coastal pollution** (29, 35, 36)

10. *Where to from here?*

These submissions will be taken into account as the Guardians develop a strategic plan for the Kaikoura coast. It is recommended that this summary is released to the media to stimulate further submissions and that this submissions analysis is updated when the submissions period closes on 30 June 2008.

Peter Lawless
Facilitator