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Abstract

This thesis investigates the participation of Māori (New Zealand's indigenous people) in the impact assessment process. Traditionally, Māori have had limited involvement in the management of New Zealand's environment. One possible solution to this could be through the adoption of a collaborative management framework. Unfortunately, there is limited information and research on tools that could facilitate collaborative management between iwi and applicants for resource consent (including, developers, planning consultants and local authorities). Therefore, this research attempts to fill a gap in current literature and to investigate the potential of the cultural impact assessment as a tool for collaborative management.

Despite some criticisms of collaborative management, there are examples where this form of communicative planning has resulted in a very positive outcome for indigenous groups. Therefore, the specific aim of this research is to analyse the extent to which cultural impact assessments can be used as a tool to promote collaborative management between iwi and applicants.

In achieving the research objectives of the thesis, the theoretical background of collaborative management and impact assessment theories are explored. In addition, democracy and participation theories are also investigated. In particular, in the discussion of these theories emphasis is placed on the potential involvement of indigenous peoples. The thesis argues that the application of collaborative management via the use of cultural impact assessments may potentially increase Māori involvement in planning.

Analysis of collaborative management and impact assessment theories is supported by empirical research. This includes; 1) an exploration of the New Zealand setting for the two theories, 2) a content analysis of cultural impact assessments from eight different iwi authority in New Zealand, and 3) a case study analysis of two iwi organizations that have an established system for undertaking cultural impact assessments (Kai Tahu ki Otago and the Wellington Tenths Trust).

The research finds that cultural impact assessments are very similar to other impact assessment reports. However, they should be viewed as evolving documents, as there are some areas of the assessment process that need to be improved upon.

The research concludes by suggesting that cultural impact assessments do have the potential to be a tool for collaborative management between iwi and applicants. Further research and education in relation to the content, value and process of cultural impact assessments is required. It is also argued that increased resourcing, training and legislative requirements are needed to further increase Māori participation in planning.
Acknowledgements

I would like to thank the following people for all their support and kindness in the preparation and completion of my thesis:

➢ Thanks to Michelle Thompson-Fawcett for her advice and belief that I could actually do it. The transition from a scientific background to writing a social science thesis has definitely been a massive challenge. Your patience throughout the year has been greatly appreciated.

➢ Most of all I would like to thank my parents, Diane and Larry, who have supported me through my university years and put up with all my (and my friends) antics. But most of all thanks for your endless supply of love, advice (yes, Dad I was listening) and support. Also to my little brother and sister, Craig and Angelique, you guys are amazing, thanks for making me laugh and all the fun times we have had over the years.

➢ Jo Lanham and Ruth Johnston, my office buddies for the year, what can I say, I wouldn’t have been able to complete the year without you. So many good times spent in the little box we have come to know as our office. This year has been a true test of our friendship, thanks for the Thursday lunches, my newfound addiction to coffee and chocolate, and always cheering me when times became stressful. How will I survive without seeing you guys 24 hours a day???

➢ All my friends I have made over the past five years in Dunedin, the girls at Hyde Street 2002 and 2003, the Fireballs, the Trouts, the planners, my trusty Blenheim friends, “Lune Ball”, you guys have made my time in Dunedin full of so many laughs, lets hope for many more to come.

➢ My MRRP classmates of 2002 and 2003 I have had two challenging years, and couldn’t have asked for a better bunch of people to get through these with. Always makes me laugh when I think of Wellington, Stewart Island road trips and Brisbane!!
# Table of Contents

Abstract ............................................................................................................ ii  
Acknowledgements ......................................................................................... iii  
Table of Contents............................................................................................. iv  
List of Figures.................................................................................................. ix  
List of Tables ................................................................................................... ix  
Glossary ........................................................................................................... x  

1 Introduction Chapter .................................................................................... 1
  1.1 Indigenous Involvement in Planning ....................................................... 1
  1.2 Collaborative Management .................................................................. 2
  1.3 Impact Assessment Theory .................................................................. 3
  1.4 The Research Problem ....................................................................... 4
  1.5 Research Question and Objectives ...................................................... 5
  1.6 Motivations Behind Research ................................................................. 7
    1.6.1 Personal Motivations ................................................................... 8
  1.7 The General Methodological Approach ............................................... 9
  1.8 Secondary Research ........................................................................... 10
    1.8.1 Literature Reviews .................................................................... 11
    1.8.2 The New Zealand Context ......................................................... 11
  1.9 Primary Research ............................................................................... 12
    1.9.1 Review of the Content of the Cultural Impact Assessments ....... 12
    1.9.2 Case studies- Kai Tahu ki Otago and the Wellington Tenths Trust 12
  1.10 Research Structure .............................................................................. 13
  1.11 Terminology ....................................................................................... 15

2 Collaborative Management ......................................................................... 16
  2.1 Introduction .......................................................................................... 16
  2.2 The Emergence of Communicative Planning ....................................... 18
## 3 Impact Assessment Theory

3.1 Introduction 34

3.2 What is an Environmental Impact Assessment? 36

3.2.1 The Role of the Public in the Environmental Impact Assessment Process 37

3.2.2 Public Involvement in the Environmental Impact Assessment Process 38

3.2.2 Legal Requirements for Indigenous People's Involvement in Environmental Impact Assessment 41

3.3 Where do Social Impact Assessments Fit In? 43

3.3.1 Social Impact Assessment Structure 44

3.3.2 Social Impact Assessment and Planning 47

3.3.3 Importance of Including Culture 48

3.3.4 Western versus Indigenous World Views 50

3.3.5 Limitations for Indigenous Involvement 53

3.4 Synthesis of Chapters Two and Three 56

3.5 Conclusion 58

## 4 The New Zealand Context

4.1 Introduction 59

4.2 Māori World View 60

4.2.1 Māori Resource Management 63

4.3 Collaboration in New Zealand 65

4.3.1 Legislative Obligations 65
# Table of Contents

4.3.2 Collaboration in Practice 67  
4.3.3 Components for Successful Collaborative Management 70  
4.4 Cultural Impact Assessments in New Zealand 71  
4.4.1 Cultural Impact Assessment – the Beginning 72  
4.4.2 Cultural Impact Assessment Legislative Requirements 73  
4.4.3 A Tool for Collaborative Management? 74  
4.5 Conclusion 75

5 Content Review of Cultural Impact Assessments 77  
5.1 Introduction 77  
5.2 Methodology 79  
5.2.1 A Structured Approach 80  
5.2.2 Component Identification 83  
5.3 Summary of Component Recognition 86  
5.3.1 Recognition of Component One 88  
5.3.2 Recognition of Component Two 89  
5.3.3 Recognition of Component Three 90  
5.3.4 Recognition of Component Four 91  
5.3.5 Summary of the Component Recognition 91  
5.4 A Structured Approach to Cultural Impact Assessments 92  
5.5 Conclusion 93

6 The Cultural Impact Assessment Process 95  
6.1 Introduction 95  
6.2 Methodology 96  
6.2.1 The Use of Case Studies 97  
6.2.2 Data Collection 98  
6.2.3 Semi-Structured Interviews 100  
6.2.4 Email and Phone Interviews 101  
6.2.5 Data Analysis and Interpretation of Interviews 101  
6.3 Background of the Two Case Studies 102  
6.4 6.3.1 Kai Tahu ki Otago 102  
6.3.2 The Wellington Tenths Trust 105
# Table of Contents

6.3.3 Conclusion 107

6.4 The Cultural Impact Assessment Process 108

6.5 Cultural Impact Assessment Initiation 108

6.6 Involvement of Iwi 112

6.6.1 Kai Tahu ki Otago 113

6.6.2 The Wellington Tenths Trust 114

6.6.3 Conclusion 115

6.7 Cultural Impact Assessment Structure 115

6.7.1 Kai Tahu ki Otago 116

6.7.2 The Wellington Tenths Trust 119

6.7.3 Comparison of Cultural Impact Assessment Structure 120

6.8 RMA Obligations 122

6.9 Incorporation of Cultural Impact Assessments into Environmental Impact Assessments 125

6.10 Synthesis of the Cultural Impact Assessment Processes 127

6.11 Conclusion 130

7 Evaluation of the Cultural Impact Assessment Process 132

7.1 Introduction 132

7.2 The Value of Cultural Impact Assessments 133

7.2.1 Increasing Maori Participation in Planning 133

7.2.2 Partnerships 135

7.2.3 Knowledge 137

7.2.4 Collective 139

7.2.5 Documentation of History 142

7.2.6 Value for Money? 143

7.2.7 Conclusion 146

7.3 Limitations of the Cultural Impact Assessment Process 146

7.3.1 Resourcing and Capacity of Iwi to Respond 147

7.3.2 Time Limitations 150

7.3.3 Impact Identification 152

7.3.4 Conclusion 154

7.4 National Improvements 155
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7.4.1 Education</td>
<td>155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.4.2 Training</td>
<td>158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.4.3 Legislation</td>
<td>159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.4.4 Conclusion</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.5 A Tool for Collaborative Management?</td>
<td>161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.6 Conclusion</td>
<td>166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Conclusion and Recommendation</td>
<td>168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.1 Introduction</td>
<td>168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.2 Research Objectives and Conclusions</td>
<td>169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.3 Recommendations for Cultural Impact Assessment Use</td>
<td>172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.4 Research Limitations</td>
<td>174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.5 Recommendations for Future Research</td>
<td>175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.6 Conclusion</td>
<td>176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>References</td>
<td>177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appendix A</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appendix B</td>
<td>VII</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appendix C</td>
<td>XI</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
List of Figures

Figure | Page
---|---
1.1 Triangulation method used within this thesis | 9
1.2 The research structure for this thesis | 14
2.1 Structure of Chapter Two’s literature review | 17
2.2 My interpretation of Arnstein’s ladder of citizen participation | 29
3.1 Steps of the environmental impact assessment process | 40
3.2 Summarised steps of a social impact assessment | 45
3.3 Framework that combines the collaboration and impact assessment theories | 57
5.1 Approximate locations of the iwi organisations from which cultural impact assessments were obtained | 78
6.1 Approximate territorial boundaries of Kai Tahu ki Otago | 104
6.2 Approximate territorial boundaries of the Wellington Tenths Trust | 106
6.1 The cultural impact assessment process | 129

List of Tables

Table | Page
---|---
2.1 Berkes’ modification of Arnstein’s ladder of citizen participation | 30
5.1 The reviewing structure for cultural impact assessments | 82
5.2 A summary of issue identification for key questions in Component One | 84
5.3 A summary of issue identification for key questions in Component Two | 84
5.4 A summary of issue identification for key questions in Component Three | 85
5.5 A summary of issue identification for key questions in Component Four | 86
5.6 The review of the 10 cultural impact assessments | 87
6.1 Summary of those interviewed in Otago and Wellington | 99
Glossary of Māori terms

The following concepts have been used throughout this research and aid in the understanding of Māori culture, tradition, and beliefs. This glossary attempts to define some of these concepts, so they can be described as closely as possible to their full meanings. This is because, for some concepts, there are no direct English translations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Atua</td>
<td>Gods.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hapu</td>
<td>Subtribe, subdivision of tribe of iwi.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iwi</td>
<td>Tribe, Māori people. The largest political unit in Māori society.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kai moana</td>
<td>Seafood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kai Tahu*</td>
<td>Southern Māori tribe, otherwise known as Ngai Tahu.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaitiaki</td>
<td>Guardian, protector, caretaker, trustee to protect sacred places and people.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaitiakitanga</td>
<td>The ethic of guardianship or stewardship over the environment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kanohi ki kanohi</td>
<td>Eye to eye contact, traditional medium of communication.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaumatua</td>
<td>Elder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaupapa Māori</td>
<td>Māori philosophy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Māori</td>
<td>The indigenous race of New Zealand.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marae</td>
<td>Meeting ground, area of whanau or hapu, focal point of settlement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mauri</td>
<td>Life essence, life principle, life supporting capacity. Mauri makes it possible for everything in the environment to exist.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Word denotes Southern Ngai Tahu dialect, where 'ka' replaces 'nga'
| **Papatuanuku** | Earth mother. |
| **Rahui** | A type of tapu that restricts the use of certain resources or areas, allowing them to replenish and rejuvenate naturally. |
| **Ranginui** (Rakinui)* | Sky father. |
| **Rangitiratanga** | Self-determination, decision-making rights, chiefly authority. |
| **Roopu** | Group, society |
| **Runanga** | Appointed body, which administers tribal affairs, assembly, council. |
| **Tangata whenua** (Takata whenua)* | People of the land, New Zealand Māori. |
| **Tai whenua** | land, district |
| **Taonga** | Treasures, inclusive of water, lands, fisheries and forests. |
| **Tapu** | Sacred, forbidden, restricted is closely linked to mana and the power of the gods. It is also used to indicate ritual prohibitions and restrictions. |
| **Te reo Maori** | Māori language. |
| **Te taha wairua** | Spiritual value. |
| **Te taha hinegaro** | Mental value. |
| **Te taha tinana** | Physical and economic value. |
| **Tikanga** | Custom, protocol. |
| **Tino rangitiratanga** | Associated with the absolute sovereignty of the Māori. |
| **Waahi tapu** | Area of cultural and/or historical significance to iwi, hapu or whanau. |
| **Whakaaro** | Think, opinion, feeling or concept. |
| **Whanau** | Family, or extended family. |

* Word denotes Southern Ngai Tahu dialect, where 'ka' replaces 'nga'
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Introduction

1.1 INDIGENOUS INVOLVEMENT IN PLANNING

The term indigenous peoples "internationalises the experiences, the issues and the struggles of some of the world's colonised peoples" (Smith, 1999:7). A key struggle that has faced these peoples since colonisation is their estrangement from managing the environment. As Christensen (cited in Paci et al., 2002:112) argues, indigenous peoples have "managed natural resources for thousands of years, creating management authority that must be reaffirmed in current legislation". Indigenous groups want to play an integral and meaningful role in making decisions and planning for the future (Emery, 2000). As a result, internationally, over the last 30 years, indigenous groups have become more actively involved in the planning process. Many countries now see the involvement of these groups as an ethical and legal requirement. However, the reality is that commitment to these requirements is not always evident, as indigenous communities' cultural and spiritual values are continually neglected in relation to planning (Paci et al., 2002).

Throughout the world, developments and policy changes continue to impact and transform aboriginal communities and their environments. International programmes, such as the Rio Declaration (1992) have recognised that environmental issues in planning are best managed by an increased participatory approach. Specifically, principle 22 of Agenda 21 promoted an increasing awareness of indigenous peoples and the necessity for their rights to be further incorporated into the planning process.
Currently, there is a gap in the literature in relation to the strategies available to indigenous people that enable their active and meaningful participation in the planning process. This highlights the need for further research in relation to different mechanisms and tools, which may support the involvement of indigenous groups in planning in general and, specifically, in relation to this thesis, in the impact assessment process. One possible way of incorporating their views and of increasing the participation and input of indigenous peoples in planning is through the adoption of collaborative management.

1.2 COLLABORATIVE MANAGEMENT

The use of the natural environment and its protection involves the interaction of many different societal groups, however, until recently (as mentioned previously) the views of indigenous groups were, in effect, ignored. One way of overcoming this challenge is to adopt a collaborative management framework. Collaborative management is based on the participation of all those individuals and groups who have a stake in a resource, working together, sharing decision-making and formulating better environmental outcomes (Berkes et al., 1991). Thus, it advocates that parties who have different values and views on a problem explore and respect each others differences, as together they have a much richer and more complete perspective of an issue (Gray, 1989). As Fisher and Ury point out, “agreement is possible precisely because interests differ” (cited in Gray, 1989:12).

Collaborative management is heavily influenced by communicative theory and the broader principles of collaboration theory, however, it is also believed to be a type of co-management (see Figure 2.1, in Chapter Two). Collaboration theory has become popular over the last 20 years, and has been advocated by many theorists, including, Healey and Forester. Forester believes that collaboration “serves as a discovery process where people can act together and find new solutions” (cited in Saarikoski, 2000:681). Tipa (2002), on the other hand, believes that collaborative management is a ‘true’ form of co-management (this idea is further explored in Section 3.5) and that it is best suited to the empowerment and participation needs of indigenous peoples. For these reasons and others that are further discussed in Chapter Two, it is applicable to examine
the use and implementation of cultural impact assessments in the context of collaborative management theory.

In spite of its strengths, the notion of collaborative management does have some limitations in both theory and practice, with respect to planning. These problems include; its potentially draining effect on time and financial resources, possible power issues, and the ability for stakeholders to be involved throughout the entire process. It is important that these issues are acknowledged. (Chapter Two further discusses the benefits, opportunities and weaknesses of collaborative management theory and this is useful as it gives context to the central analysis of the cultural impact assessment process).

1.3 IMPACT ASSESSMENT THEORY

Thus, the notion of collaborative management and its ability to potentially increase the participation of indigenous groups is central to impact assessment theory and practice. Impact assessments are planning tools that identify and predict the associated effects of a proposed human action, and evaluate how such an action will be managed (Spalding et al., 1993). Environmental impact assessments are defined broadly so that they should also consider the biophysical, socio-economic and cultural impacts of the proposed activity (Morgan, 1998). Unfortunately, the scientific nature of environmental impact assessments has, generally, worked to exclude rather than include social and cultural impacts (Gagnon et al., 1993). In addition, many environmental impact assessment reports are unclear about cultural impacts and the implications that an activity could have on indigenous people (Thomas, 2001).

Social impact assessments evolved in the 1980s because of the need for ongoing investigation into the effects of major developments or policies on communities. The social impact assessment is an evaluation within a comparative framework of the effects, good and bad, of a proposed development or activity (Geisler, 1993). Generally, cultural impacts are also included in a social impact assessment and, in some instances, are included in separate reports. In the past, social impact assessment practices have been limited in the extent to which they actively involve indigenous people in the process. This is supported by
numerous authors who comment that indigenous environmental knowledge does not play a significant role in either the environmental or social impact assessment process (Howitt, 1989; Nottingham, 1990; Edelstein and Kleese, 1995; O'Faircheallaigh, 1999; Paci et al., 2000). Thus, it is important to research potential strategies and planning tools that could be adopted to increase the participation of indigenous peoples in planning.

One way to resolve this issue is to let indigenous people assume responsibility for identifying and assessing the effects of an activity themselves, and this process could be achieved via the use of cultural impact assessments. Prior to analysing the details of what makes a cultural impact assessment, it is important firstly to discuss the New Zealand context and the specific issues that limit the involvement of Māori (New Zealand's indigenous people) in planning.

1.4 THE RESEARCH PROBLEM

In New Zealand, Māori (like other indigenous peoples around the world) have also experienced problems participating actively in planning. Consequently, disputes over the ownership and management of resources in New Zealand are a frequent occurrence. In general, a major obstacle for adequate inclusion of Māori arises from the lack of understanding among local authorities and applicants have of Māori cultural beliefs and traditions, and of the implications of the Treaty of Waitangi and Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA). Lack of funding, capacity and resources are other factors that limit the involvement of tangata whenua in planning (James, 1993). However, the consistent pressure placed by Māori for their rights to be addressed and listened to has enabled their views to be increasingly heard in planning (Nottingham, 1990).

From a planning perspective, it seems that various communicative tools may be beneficial in bringing about such empowerment. This present research examines the use of cultural impact assessments in terms of their potential contribution to achieving empowerment via collaborative mechanisms.

Therefore, cultural impact assessments are a possible solution to the limited involvement of Māori in planning. These assessments could be used as tools, which facilitate sharing the responsibility of decision-making with all, involved
in the process – iwi, applicants, planning consultants and local authorities. As such, they would be used to evaluate how proposed developments might affect the cultural conditions of indigenous peoples.

The literature on cultural impact assessments is very scarce, because the cultural impact assessment is a relatively new concept. As previously outlined, most countries incorporate the values and beliefs of their indigenous peoples into environmental impact assessment reports and these have a broader focus than cultural impact assessments. However, in New Zealand in some instances, cultural impact assessments are undertaken separately from the environmental impact assessment.

It is appropriate to apply the concept of the cultural impact assessment to the theory of collaboration, because collaboration is a central feature of impact assessment theory and practice. Potentially collaborative management is a way of recognising the partnership rights promised to Māori in 1840 under the Treaty of Waitangi. More recently, the RMA sought to integrate resource management issues and attempted to provide for a partnership of Māori and Pakeha values (Nuttal, 1996). This was a change from previous legislation that had, effectively, ignored the Māori world view. The RMA recognised the requirement to include Māori environmental philosophies (Sections 6(e) and 7(a)) and address the issues of the Treaty of Waitangi (Section 8) in planning. However, in practice, there is still a real need for Māori values and interests to be further included in the planning process (Nuttal, 1996).

1.5 RESEARCH QUESTIONS AND OBJECTIVES

As stated, there is a limited amount of literature that explores the role and value of cultural impact assessments in planning. Consequently, this research aims to reveal whether cultural impact assessments are a tool for increasing the participation of Māori in the impact assessment process, and more generally, planning. Thus, the primary research question this thesis seeks to address is:
Are cultural impact assessments a tool for collaborative management between iwi and local authorities, developers or planning consultants, in New Zealand's planning regime?

Four research objectives have been developed to address this research question:

1) To evaluate the theoretical underpinnings of collaborative management and the impact assessment theories, with the goal of formulating a framework that can be applied to cultural impact assessment use in New Zealand.

It is necessary to explore the theoretical underpinnings of both collaborative management and impact assessment theories in order to understand how the research problem can be addressed in theory. Despite the extensive amount of literature on collaborative management theory, there is a lack of information on tools, such as cultural impact assessments, that can be used to achieve this. In addition, as mentioned, there is also a dearth of literature on cultural impact assessments, because they are a new concept used by only a minority of iwi in New Zealand. Therefore, the strengths and weaknesses of indigenous involvement in these impact assessment processes are investigated, with the objective of applying this knowledge to impact assessment practice in New Zealand. This leads to the second objective:

2) To review the New Zealand context of collaborative management and cultural impact assessments in practice.

The second objective involves investigating the New Zealand setting, which means exploring collaborative management and cultural impact assessment use in practice. However, prior to analysing this, it is essential that a basic understanding of the Māori world view and resource management is gained. Lack of knowledge and awareness of the indigenous viewpoint has been repeatedly identified in the literature as a key reason why indigenous participation does not occur. Objective two will also enable the required expectations of collaborative management in New Zealand’s planning regime to be evaluated. The investigation of legislative obligations to involve Māori in planning is also addressed. Overall, this objective complements objective one by adapting the research more specifically to the New Zealand context.
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3) To assess the content and quality of cultural impact assessments from throughout New Zealand.

It is important to evaluate cultural impact assessments, as this enables their contents and structure to be compared and contrasted to those of environmental and social impact assessments. This study also aims to increase awareness and understanding of the process and structure of cultural impact assessments in New Zealand. While, some iwi authorities have undertaken cultural impact assessments for a considerable amount of time, there is very little literature regarding the specific details relating to the evaluation of the cultural impact assessment process.

4) To analyse the process and value of cultural impact assessments as a participatory tool for promoting collaborative management.

It is important that the process and value of cultural impact assessments is investigated in order to determine whether they have the potential to be a tool for collaborative management in practice. This analysis also gives an indication of iwi and applicants' expectations of the cultural impact assessment process itself.

Thus, this research investigates a potential tool that may serve to increase Māori participation in planning. The first objective sets the scene and investigates the theoretical underpinnings of collaborative management and impact assessment theory. The second objective investigates the New Zealand setting for these two theories. Objectives three and four evaluate the content, structure, process and value of assessments.

1.6 MOTIVATIONS BEHIND RESEARCH

The primary research question, to investigate cultural impact assessments as a collaborative tool between iwi and developers, was formulated as a result of extensive discussions with representatives from Kai Tahu ki Otago. Kai Tahu ki Otago identified a number of concerns in relation to the wider community's lack of awareness of the implementation and value of cultural impact assessments in planning. A possible reason for this concern is that iwi authorities have had no guidance or documentation in relation to initiating or undertaking cultural
impact assessments. In particular, Kai Tahu ki Otago wanted the value of cultural impact assessments to developers, planning consultants and local authorities, to be investigated further.

There are many documents and legal requirements that require Māori to be consulted and involved in planning. However, there is no requirement for an applicant to commission an iwi authority to undertake a cultural impact assessment. Consequently, from discussions with key informants from Kai Tahu ki Otago and various literature searches, the research objectives of this thesis evolved to also include a review of the content and structure of cultural impact assessments from around New Zealand. Furthermore, a comparison between the cultural impact assessments of different iwi would allow the quality of these reports to be analysed. From these findings, recommendations would be formulated and it was hoped that these would contribute to a greater involvement of Māori in planning.

1.6.1 Personal Motivations

Many people within New Zealand believe only those who are of Māori descent are qualified to study Māori issues and concerns. Stokes (1987:121) suggests that those who research the Māori world have “knowledge and participation in the Māori world”. Stokes (1985) also asserts that it is essential that researchers bring an inside perspective when exploring Māori concepts. Through my parents, I belong to two major tribal groups, Pakeha and Māori (Ngati Kahungunu). I have been brought up to respect and value my diverse ethnic background and this understanding has been invaluable for this research. In addition, I believe it is important for those who research Māori issues to operate comfortably in both cultures, as it is essential that the views and information gathered is represented correctly.

Unfortunately, Ngati Kahungunu has not co-ordinated resource management work yet. This work is usually handled at the local level by marae and in some cases, tai whenua. Thus, it is important that my research covers an area, which will in turn help Ngati Kahungunu become more informed about the cultural impact assessment and planning processes.
Having examined the motivations for undertaking the research, it is now important to determine how the objectives of this research are to be achieved.

1.7 THE GENERAL METHODOLOGICAL APPROACH

Prior to addressing the research process, it is important to identify any key issues and to provide justifications for the research strategies employed. As mentioned, the broad approach of this study involves investigating the potential of cultural impact assessments as a participatory tool to increase Māori involvement in planning.

A qualitative research strategy has been adopted as this was considered the most appropriate. This is because this study is largely based upon the views and beliefs of key informants from case study localities, who are involved in the cultural impact assessment process. Furthermore, qualitative data has proved to be a very successful technique for gathering the views of minority groups and indigenous peoples (Smith, 1999).

The qualitative data has been gathered using a triangulation method. Triangulation is where information is gathered from a range of sources. The variety of methods used throughout this research include: literature searches (collaborative management and impact assessment theories), reviews of the content of cultural impact assessments, and case study analysis, as illustrated in Figure 1.1.

![Figure 1.1: Triangulation method used within this research (adapted from James, 2000).]
This combination of methods is of significant benefit to the research because the multiple sources of data complement each other and each adds a different dimension to the research (Sarantakos, 1998). In the present research, it is appropriate to use a triangulation of methods because of two main factors.

Firstly, literature pertaining to the use and implementation of cultural impact assessments is scarce. Consequently, it is very hard to review literature on cultural impact assessments since there is limited research available. Therefore, other sources of data have been used to complement the findings of the review of cultural impact assessments.

Secondly, a review of the content of cultural impact assessments alone would not provide enough information on the true implications of the process. For example, other factors contribute to the quality of cultural impact assessments. These factors include whether or not an iwi has the capacity to undertake cultural impact assessments and whether or not that iwi is adequately resourced. Therefore, interviews with iwi, iwi officials, developers, local authorities and central government representatives complement the other primary data gathered. Accordingly, it is more beneficial to use a variety of approaches in this circumstance because this increases the accuracy and validity of the findings. The methodological approach splits the research into secondary and primary research components. These are discussed in more detail below.

1.8 SECONDARY RESEARCH

The secondary research comprises two main components: a review of literature on the theories of collaboration and impact assessments, and a review of the New Zealand context for cultural impact assessments. An investigation of secondary sources is employed to gather an overview of the two theories and to evaluate how these can be applied to the New Zealand context. Stewart and Kamins (1993) write that secondary research helps to define the agenda for subsequent primary research.
1.8.1 Literature Reviews
The review of literature draws mainly upon the works of academics and professionals over the last 15 years and covers two distinct areas of inquiry. Firstly, it investigates the communicative theory and the shift towards the increased participation of societal groups in planning. As this research outlines, collaborative management is heavily influenced by communicative theory. In addition, the literature review also explores the strengths and limitations of collaborative management theory in relation to indigenous peoples. It also compares and contrasts collaborative management to co-management, and justifies why this research is based on collaborative management.

Secondly, the literature review explores the concept of impact assessments and investigates the process of indigenous peoples' involvement in them. Environmental and social impact assessments are examined in order to explore the strengths and weaknesses of the impact assessment process in relation to indigenous groups. The literature used stems mainly from overseas case studies, such as, studies from Canada and Australia because, as has been pointed out, there is a dearth of information about the involvement of Māori in New Zealand's impact assessment process.

1.8.2 The New Zealand Context
It is important for this research that the implications of the two theories - collaborative management theory and impact assessment theory are applied to the New Zealand context. This section explores the Māori world view, Māori resource management techniques, collaborative management in the New Zealand setting, cultural impact assessments, and the associated legislative requirements. The overall aim of the discussion is to formulate the components that are required for successful collaborative management. This will enable these components to be applied to current cultural impact assessment practice in New Zealand.
1.9 PRIMARY RESEARCH

The primary research of this thesis involves the following methods: a review of the content of cultural impact assessments from eight different iwi organisations in New Zealand, and case study analyses of Kai Tahu Ki Otago and the Wellington Tenths Trust. The above methods have been adopted to evaluate the content, process, value and limitations and potential future improvements of the cultural impact assessment process. Those involved in the research include key informants ranging from iwi, developers, planning consultants, local authorities and central government. Thus, a comprehensive research approach was required in order to collect a wide range of views from stakeholders involved in cultural impact assessment development and use. These methods have been integrated throughout Chapters Five and Six, in order to link them directly with the results achieved.

1.9.1 Review of the Content of Cultural Impact Assessments

Due to the limited amount of information on cultural impact assessments, there currently is no recognised approach for reviewing the contents of cultural impact assessments. Hence, it was decided that an adaptation of Morgan’s (2000) 'structured approach' for reviewing environmental impact assessments would be used. This was modified to specifically suit the cultural context of cultural impact assessment reports, thus allowing the contents of cultural impact assessments to be compared and contrasted to other impact assessment reports. Further details of this reviewing approach are found at the beginning of Chapter Five.

1.9.2 Case Studies – Kai Tahu ki Otago and the Wellington Tenths Trust

The majority of research into public participation is done using the analysis of case studies (Sarantakos, 1998). Hence, it was applicable for this research to adopt the case study approach, which involves a series of key informant interviews. The two organisations, Kai Tahu ki Otago and the Wellington Tenths Trust, were chosen because they could provide the information required to achieve an in-depth analysis of current cultural impact assessment approaches. More details of these methods are found in Chapter Six, Section 6.2.
1.10 RESEARCH STRUCTURE

This thesis is based on the premise that the use of cultural impact assessment as a collaborative tool may lead to the increased participation of Māori in New Zealand’s environmental management system. Firstly, the research investigates the philosophical underpinnings of collaboration theory (illustrated in Figure 1.2). This theory is tested against the realities of planning practice through a review of other commentators’ critiques of collaborative management. In particular, the ability for increased participation of indigenous peoples through use of a collaborative management system is analysed.

Chapter Three analyses impact assessment theory, and investigates the role of the public participation process (see Figure 1.2). Specifically, it discusses the involvement and participation of indigenous groups in the impact assessment practice, and the significance of this participation to the success of the process. It also explores the importance of culture, and the factors that limit the active participation of indigenous groups.

In Chapter Four, the New Zealand setting for collaborative management and cultural impact assessment practice is explored. The legislative obligations to involve Māori in planning are also investigated. Chapter Four also contains a content review of cultural impact assessments from eight different iwi organisations in New Zealand. This chapter also compares and contrasts the contents of cultural impact assessments to the contents of environmental and social impact assessments.

The analysis of the semi-structured interviews in relation to the cultural impact assessment process occurs in Chapter Six. Chapter Seven investigates the value of the assessment process, its limitations and any improvements that are required. There is no general discussion chapter, as the discussion is integrated throughout Chapters Five, Six and Seven. The overall synthesis of the research findings is found in Chapter Eight. This chapter aims is to determine whether cultural impact assessments are a useful tool for collaborative management. Recommendations, specific limitations and areas for future research are also included in Chapter Eight.
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Figure 1.2: The research structure for this thesis.
1.11 TERMINOLOGY

Māori words and concepts have been used throughout this thesis. A glossary that explains these terms is located on page x. The terms tangata whenua, iwi, Pakeha and applicants are used in the collective sense. Tangata whenua and iwi refer to New Zealand’s indigenous people, Māori. Likewise, Pakeha is used to represent all New Zealanders of European descent. For ease of reference, the term applicant is used to refer to developers, local authorities and planning consultants who are proposing a new activity in order to obtain resource consent.

In addition, the internationally-accepted term, environmental impact assessment, has been used instead of the term commonly used in New Zealand, assessment of environmental effects.
Collaborative Management

2.1 INTRODUCTION

The struggle for the empowerment and active participation of indigenous peoples in regard to resource management and resource use has been a major issue of international debate. In certain circumstances, a possible solution to this struggle is the adoption of a collaborative management framework. Collaborative management “is based on the participation of all those individuals and groups who have a stake in the management of the resource” (White et al., 1994:14). In this instance, decision-making is implied to be a “partnership of equals” amongst all stakeholders (Berkes et al., 1991:13).

Collaborative management is based on the broader principles of collaboration theory (Tipa, 2002) and this theory is analysed in more detail in the initial stages of this chapter. It is suggested that there is value in adopting the principles of collaborative management and that these could act as a potential guide for the implementation of cultural impact assessments in New Zealand. Although the theory of collaborative management is often contested, it is suggested that the principles of collaborative management, in conjunction with the use of cultural impact assessments, could create a more effective and participatory planning system.

The purpose of this chapter is to further explore the theory of collaborative management, specifically, its implications for the empowerment of indigenous peoples. Firstly, it is important to understand the stimuli that led to the
development of collaboration theory, because they indicate collaborative management's philosophical underpinnings (illustrated in Figure 2.1). Therefore, the chapter investigates collaboration theory's beginnings in communicative theory, following with an in-depth analysis of the implications of collaboration theory for planning practice. The academic debate over definitions of collaboration theory, and the theory's implications for the empowerment of indigenous people, are analysed (see Figure 2.1). The theory of public participation and the democratic theory are also examined, because they contribute to collaboration theory. Finally, collaborative management is compared and contrasted with the theory of co-management. Figure 2.1 illustrates that collaborative management is a type of co-management influenced heavily by communicative theory.
The review of the academic debate on collaborative management enables the formulation of a framework that forms the basis for this research is based upon. This framework combines the findings of Chapters Two and Three, and is outlined at the conclusion of Chapter Three (Section 3.5). The framework is an attempt to link the current research back to planning theory. Smith asserts that, "research adds to, is generated from, creates or broadens our theoretical understandings" (1999:37). Making links between planning theory and practice is very important in research, as it helps to narrow the existing theory practice gap. Through an evaluation of collaborative management, this thesis aims to link past theories and practices and, in doing so, to aid in increasing the participation of indigenous cultures throughout the planning system.

2.2 THE EMERGENCE OF COMMUNICATIVE PLANNING

This section explores the philosophical background of collaborative management by firstly focusing on the beginnings of communicative planning. It is essential to gain an understanding of the philosophical background of planning paradigms because it helps us to "...make assumptions and predictions about the world we live in" (Smith, 1999:38). Gaining an awareness of planning paradigms helps in determining the strengths, opportunities and weaknesses of collaborative management.

A key theorist who wrote about planning paradigms is Sandercock (1998). According to Sandercock (1998:5), since the 1940s, there have been six theory shifts within the modernistic planning paradigm: from the rational comprehensive model to advocacy planning, from radical political to equity planning, and from communicative to radical planning. Each of these shifts has resulted in different implications for public participation, and for the role of the planner in resource management. This research concentrates specifically on the movement away from the rational comprehensive model to the advocacy model, and then to the communicative model of planning.
2.2.1 Towards Communicative Planning

Planning prior to the 1970s was primarily based on the use of the rational comprehensive model. Beauregard describes it as a model whereby “planners laid claim to a scientific and objective logic that transcended the interests of capital, labour and the state” (1996:218). Solely scientific value techniques and means-orientated rationality were used to make planning decisions (Hall, 1996). This process paid little or no regard to the views of the community. As a result, communities became very dissatisfied with the rational comprehensive model and this lead to the development of the advocacy-planning model. Davidoff (1965) writes about the implications of advocacy planning in his article ‘Advocacy and Pluralism in Planning’. He believed advocacy planning would empower stakeholders, because in theory the planner would make decisions on the community’s behalf. These decisions were to be based on the information gathered using consultative techniques. However, in practice, the advocacy model remained expert centred. Planning decisions were still made by ‘elites’ and “scientists and policy-makers knew little about traditional management systems and accorded them little credibility” (Berkes, 1989:3).

In the early 1980s, the inadequacy of instrumental rationality and other planning theories of the time became the major topic of theoretical debate (Beauregard, 1996). As a result, the planning system came under increasing attack. Beauregard (1996) suggests there was an urgent need for the planning profession to move away from this state-guided decision-making. Communities were becoming highly dissatisfied with the government, government policy and the general public’s inability to actively participate in the planning process. This triggered a shift away from reliance on expert-centred decision making to a situation where communities had more meaningful involvement in the planning process. Thus, the requirement for the community to be more involved in the planning process inspired the emergence of communicative planning.

Communicative planning sought to find a solution to the state-guided planning tradition of the time. It aimed to promote the active participation of the community in planning and had an emphasis on planning from the
“bottom up”. Over time, a wide body of literature emerged, based upon the idea that planning is an interactive collective action built on experience. In particular, it paid attention to the imbalances that exist in society. These imbalances include, access to information, adequate representation and the ability for all points of view to be heard (Sandercock, 1998).

There is no one single influence that led to the emergence of communicative planning. However, it is believed to originate from the works of Habermas in the 1980s (a German sociologist-philosopher). He advocated the need for participants to engage in open debate, where they would learn about the concerns of others (Healey, 1997). Habermas believed that “communication will no longer be distorted by the effects of power, self interest and ignorance’ (Tewdwr-Jones & Allmendinger, 1998:1976). In other words, he suggested that the community had a right to be informed and actively participate in the planning process. Key theorists such as Forester and Healey base their planning philosophies on the concepts of Habermas, and reframe communicative planning to acknowledge the importance of discourse and inclusiveness (Fainstein, 2000). Forester described ‘communicative planning’ (1989) and ‘argumentative planning’ (1993), while Healey produced terms such as ‘inclusionary discourse’ (1994) and ‘collaborative planning’ (1997). Over the last decade, these terms have been used extensively in planning theory literature.

Communicative planning represents a move away from “modernity, rejecting rational instrumentalism, objectivism and positivism” (Bond, 2002:9). Healey (1997:29-30) summarises the communicative phase of planning theory into seven key headings that recognise:

- Knowledge is socially constructed
- Development and communication of knowledge takes many forms
- People learn in social contexts and through social interactions
- Relations of power have the potential to oppress and dominate
- Public policies need to spread ownership of the different ranges of knowledge and reasoning
Consensus-building practices can lead to building cultures
Context and practice are socially constituted together

These seven points illustrate the various problems that exist in society and the challenges that communicative planning has to overcome to be successful (Healey, 1998). Healey believes that communicative planning refocuses "the practices of planning to enable purposes to be communicatively discovered" (1996:239).

Forester also agrees with Healey, by asserting that the communicative turn in planning makes the profession more legitimate. It emphasises the need to move away from "professional expertise and efficiency, toward ethical commitment and equity" (Forester cited in Sandercock, 1998:97). The primary function of the planner within a communicative planning framework is to listen to all points of view and assist in gaining a consensus from all participants (Fainstein, 2000). This desire for increased public involvement arose from the lack of knowledge that public authorities and officials had about the broader community (Healey, 1998). Back in 1995, Innes had suggested that the communicative model had become so widely accepted that it could be described as an emerging planning paradigm. It is now, arguably, a planning paradigm in its own right.

2.2.2 The Democratic Theory
During the 1970s and 1980s, the democratic theory was also becoming more participation and community-orientated. The democratic theory is important because over the last decade, communicative planning theory has symbolised the need to democratise planning. The ideals of communicative planning and democracy evolved in parallel, however, limited interaction occurred between the two. Both theories have very similar attributes. For example, they both favour qualitative and interpretative modes of enquiry, and turn their backs on the use of quantitative analysis alone (Sandercock, 1998).
As with communicative planning, democracy occurs in many forms. For example, deliberative democracy involves justifying decisions through a process of free and easy discussion, therefore aiding in empowerment and the formulation of collective decisions (Gutmann & Thompson, 2000). Cheyne (1999) believes this process potentially leads to increased participation and leadership of indigenous peoples. This is because deliberative democracy allows indigenous peoples to actively participate in planning decisions. However, representative democracy has become the dominant form of democracy in more recent times. This form of democracy delegates power to a representative body and potentially eliminates the voice of minorities. Like advocacy planning, deliberative democratic theory has been rejuvenated through Habermas' works, as he also emphasised the need for increased participation throughout the democratic process.

2.2.3 Conclusion

Communicative planning is a democratic process that attempts to increase participation of the community either through representation or active involvement (Sandercock, 1998). It has evolved from a diversity of academic perspectives. As Innes (1995:184) states, communicative theorists "...are diverse, delving into many questions of practice and using a variety of intellectual lenses". His statement further highlights that the Western way of thinking has changed significantly over the years. Communicative planning has evolved in parallel to democratic theory, which has enabled a more participatory form of planning to develop. However, it is still a challenge for some cultures, such as indigenous peoples, to play an active role in planning. A possible solution to the lack of involvement of indigenous peoples is for the affected stakeholders to learn to collaborate together. Evidence from Sandercock (1998) suggests that post-modernistic planning rejects consultation over collaborative planning. Adopting a collaborative management framework is likely to increase the role and responsibility of indigenous people to protect their environments and cultural values.
2.3 COLLABORATION THEORY

The theory of collaboration has evolved over the past two decades, partly as a response to the increasing awareness of issues relating to indigenous participation in planning (Horsley, 2000). As previously outlined, collaboration is an innovation that is part of the communicative phase in planning theory (Dixon, 2001). The theory of collaboration promotes the joint management of resources and this is very important when considering indigenous involvement in planning. In addition, the theory of collaboration can be used in relation to many aspects of planning; these include resource inventory, monitoring, allocation, implementation, enforcement and decision-making (Pinkerton, 1989). This is because it also acknowledges the importance in the planning process of social, cultural and economic objectives. In particular, it gives substance to the equity and participation of minority groups (White et al., 1994). Of all planning theories, the collaboration theory appears to have the best attributes to promote the empowerment and active involvement of indigenous peoples in planning.

The following sections explore the theory of collaboration and the strengths of the collaborative management process. There is then an analysis of the constraints, and how these can be overcome to ensure that effective participation of indigenous peoples takes place.

2.3.1 Definitions of Collaborative Management

The theory of collaboration is ill-defined. Put simply, it is two or more parties combining together to formulate a collective solution to an issue. Collaborative management is defined by Horsley as a:

"...process that involves partnerships in which government agencies, local communities, resource users, non governmental organisations and other interest groups negotiate the authority and responsibility for shared management of a specific area or set of resources."

(Horsley, 2000:2)
Collaborative management is also described as a process involving the deliberation, argumentation, discussion and negotiation of a group of people in order to gain a consensus (Lawrence, 2000). Similarly, Himmelman (1994:31) defines collaborative management as “exchanging information, altering activities [and] sharing resources”. White et al., (1994) give a broader definition, describing collaborative management based on the participation of all individuals and groups that have a stake in the management of the resource. In summary, all of these definitions suggest that collaborative management involves stakeholders getting together to formulate a collective action in relation to a specific issue. Therefore, where the participation of indigenous peoples is concerned, collaborative management advocates a system that combines traditional and Western management techniques.

The key point of collaborative management is that it builds a common understanding among stakeholders. Gray (1989:5) states that the overall objective of collaboration is to create a richer, more comprehensive appreciation of a problem among the parties involved, than any one of them could construct alone. Assumptions that are commonly associated with the collaboration theory are:

- Communication and interaction are central to planning
- Public interest is a key part of the process
- Theory and practice are merged
- Information is entrenched in understandings and practices
- Planners require appropriate skills to initiate collaboration amongst parties

(Lawrence, 2000:617).

Similarly, Daniels and Walker (1996:98) assert that collaborative management “encourages parties to make progress on improving the situation as they work through issues, values, and concerns”. Thus, it contributes to more creative and collective problem solving.
The benefits of collaborative management have been illustrated in Phuket, Thailand, where a collaborative management framework helped to manage sustainable use of coral reefs. Over the past 20 years, Thailand has experienced rapid and unmanageable economic growth. In the tourist resort of Phuket, there was a need for a management strategy to halt unmanaged and environmentally damaging coastal development (Hale & Lemay, 1994). The two major money-generators for the area were (and still are) traditional fishing and tourism (Hale & Lemay, 1994). It was important that the adopted management technique incorporated the views of the indigenous peoples, tourism operators, local government and the broader community. Collaborative management was believed to be the most appropriate management technique able to achieve the objectives of: sustainable use of the coral reefs, recovery and enhancement of the coral, increased participation of the community, and a higher level of local commitment towards coral reef management. The end result of the process was the development of the Phuket Coral Protection Strategy that helps to maintain water quality, to sustain fishing and helps to reduce the damage from tourism. The strategy is a very successful multi-sector action plan for the sustainable management of Phuket’s coral reefs (Hale & Lemay, 1994). The success of the process came from community support and the community’s ability to contribute to the sustainable management of the environment.

Thus, collaborative management can be a beneficial theory for highly complex and controversial issues. The Phuket example highlights the benefits of using collaborative management. However, does collaborative management work in practice if there are numerous stakeholders with a variety of views?

2.3.2 Consensus - Is It Possible?

Most of the literature reviewed so far has illustrated the strengths of collaboration theory. However, the theory also has a number of weaknesses.

An evaluation by Voogd and Woltjer (1999) concludes that collaborative planning functions no more effectively than other conventional planning
theories. One possible reason for this is that communities are often constrained by lack of resources and limited funding; this is a key restriction for the active and continuing participation of indigenous peoples. These constraints can potentially impact on the ability for successful collaborative management to take place.

In principle, the theory of collaboration gives participants an equal opportunity to put forward ideas, raise questions, to criticize and to defend arguments (Saarikoski, 2000). In practice, the uneven distribution of power by technical expertise and authority always allows some people to dominate others. Therefore, the assumption that all stakeholders in the community have an equal say is very unrealistic.

In addition, Himmelman (1994) suggests that collaboration should only be used when mutual goals cannot be achieved in other ways, because the collaborative approach is very time consuming and often challenges traditional values. Himmelman believes that the development of a process based on open discourse does not, on its own, guarantee a collaborative process. Himmelman's research suggests that some participants' viewpoints will always dominate others. For example, Fainstein states, “the power of words depends on the power of the speaker” (2000:458). Those who are involved throughout the consultation process can commonly have powerful interests and, as a result, power structures continue to dominate the planning regime (Tewdwr-Jones & Thomas, 1998).

In summary, for collaboration to be of any benefit, it is essential that government and developers do not try to dominate the views of minority groups. Voogd and Woltjer (1999) came to the conclusion that for collaboration to be successful, it should be implemented with adaptive rational planning. While the research here draws mainly from the principles of collaboration theory, it also acknowledges the importance of politics in the planning process. Therefore, collaborative management will only be successful if an adequate political framework is in place and if the legislation exists that requires indigenous people to participate in the planning process. One
example of such a framework is New Zealand's Resource Management Act 1991 (this is further explored in Chapter Four).

In collaboration planning theory, there is also danger that substance and outcomes can suffer because of an exclusive focus on the process of consensus building. The consensus of stakeholders is not always conducive to the achievement of social, economic, and ecological objectives. This is because difficult decisions have to be made, and not all stakeholders will always support these. For example, the Javanese are a consensus seeking culture and decisions are made by consensus in a deliberative process. In addition, Boyle (1998) finds that the notion of consensus sometimes inhibits quality decision-making and leads to ineffective action or no action at all. This has also been illustrated by recent work in South Africa, which sought to establish collaborative techniques among stakeholders. Tewdwr-Jones & Allmendinger (1998) found that the results of collaboration projects were that there was an inappropriate emphasis on the process, rather than a consideration of how the discourses could be used in reality. Therefore, it is essential that emphasis is not placed on the collaboration process alone. For meaningful conclusions to be made, clear objectives and goals must be decided upon before the process begins.

The high cost of the collaborative planning procedure is the main issue that collaboration theorists are silent about (Helling, 1998). This is illustrated by Helling (1998), who used the Atlantas 2020 Vision Project as an example. This project required the commitment of $4.4 billion in resources. In this case Helling (1998) believes the collaboration process was constrained by: greater concentration on the process rather than the objectives, too much emphasis on consensus, and the lack of credibility given to the expertise of the planners involved in the process. Therefore, for the collaboration process to be effective, a project must have a timetable, and must follow a process that acknowledges technical expertise where appropriate. Lawrence (2000) also believes that collaborative planning is not well adapted to change, to structural equities, or to addressing very complex issues. It also does not
consider long-term and large-scale activities where only some affected parties are able to be present in the decision-making process.

Unresolved issues and past discrepancies can also undermine a collaborative approach. Therefore, a special effort has to occur to ensure that the underrepresented can participate fully (Helling, 1998). Thus, it is important to acknowledge that collaborative management is not always appropriate to all situations and that it has to ‘fit’ the circumstances. There is no one ideal outcome and the process must be adapted and changed to suit the individual planning requirements.

It is essential that those who go into a collaborative management situation are open to learning new ideas and respect the input of others. This is a fundamental principle when dealing with indigenous cultures, as their cultural frameworks often differ to that of the dominant culture. All too often the views of indigenous groups are fed into an already formulated decision and their participation is tokenistic. One way of ensuring that this tokenism does not occur, is to develop a partnership with indigenous groups early in the process. Furthermore, if the collaborative process is to be of any value, participants need to know how their input is going to affect the final decision, rather than simply just participating in the process.

2.3.3 Conclusion

It is important to overcome the weaknesses of collaborative management. The literature reviewed here highlights that the importance of the formation of clear objectives and goals, well-defined power relations, the inclusion of all stakeholders, and the maintenance of open minds are vital to the success of the collaborative process. More importantly, collaborative management provides an avenue through which indigenous peoples can participate in the sustainable management of resources. Before comparing collaborative management with co-management, it is important to turn attention to public participation in planning. This is because collaboration theory is underpinned by public participation theory (Lawrence, 2000).
2.4 THE IMPORTANCE OF PARTICIPATION

Typologies have been used extensively in planning literature to categorise and evaluate public involvement in the planning process. It is the much-cited Arnstein’s ladder of participation (1969) that is commonly used to represent the spectrum of power between authorities and the community (Figure 2.2). Arnstein describes participation as the means by which authorities “can induce significant social reform which enables them to share in the benefits of an affluent society” (cited in Barry, 1996:6). Each rung represents a shift in power relations from non-participation to complete citizen control.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degrees of citizen power</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(8) Citizen Control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(7) Delegated Power</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(6) Partnership</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degrees of tokenism</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(5) Placation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) Consultation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) Informing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) Therapy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1) Manipulation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Non-participation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Figure 2.2: My interpretation of Arnstein’s ladder of citizen participation

The bottom rungs of Arnstein’s ladder are manipulation and therapy, these represent levels of non-participation. Rungs three, four and five represent degrees of tokenism, whereby participants are informed and consulted but do not retain decision-making power. Unfortunately in the past, the majority of public participation in planning has taken place in the lower rungs (Step One) (Rodgers, 1999). Dugdale (1997) believes that a possible reason for this is that planners have been said to shy away from active participation because of the confrontation and conflict that may result. However, the higher rungs do represent situations where citizens have degrees of power. This thesis specifically concentrates on participation that involves partnerships (Step Six of Arnstein’s ladder) amongst indigenous peoples and developers, local government or planning consultants.
Like any model, Arnstein’s ladder of citizen participation has weaknesses. These include: ignoring the element of expertise that is required for decision-making, being outcome focused, and assuming that existing political and economic structures can accommodate the required changes of increased citizen participation (Barry, 1996). Many theorists have modified Arnstein’s ladder in an attempt to minimise these weaknesses. For example, Berkes et al., (cited in Horsley, 2000:2) modified the ‘ladder of citizen participation’ to depict degrees of co-management (Table 2.1). Each step up Berkes et al.’s ladder represents an increased participation of stakeholders in the management of resources. Collaborative management operates on many of these levels. However, it is the upper rungs of the ladder that this research concentrates on, because it is based on the premise that “true co-management goes far beyond mere consultation” (Stevens, 1998:276). This research investigates the use of cultural impact assessments and their ability to aid in the formation of valuable partnerships between applicants, local authorities and indigenous peoples. These partnerships are also commonly known as a form of co-management.

Table 2.1- Berkes’ modification of Arnstein’s ladder of citizen participation (Horsley, 2000:2).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>Partnership Type</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Partnerships/Community Boards</td>
<td>Partnerships of equals; joint decision making institutionalised; power delegated to community where feasible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Management Boards</td>
<td>Community is given opportunity to participate in developing and implementing management plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Advisory Committees</td>
<td>Partnership in decision-making starts; joint action or common objectives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>Start of two-way information exchange; local concerns begin to enter management plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Co-operation</td>
<td>Community starts to have an input into management; e.g. use of local knowledge, research assistants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Consultation</td>
<td>Start face to face contact; community input heard but not necessarily heeded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Informing</td>
<td>Community is informed about decisions already made</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Co-management also seeks to create partnerships between government and other community groups. Because they share many common principles, the distinction between co-management and collaborative management is very difficult to identify.

3.5 COLLABORATIVE MANAGEMENT VERSUS CO-MANAGEMENT

The literature presents a wide variety of definitions of collaborative management and co-management. Collaborative management has already been defined in Section 2.3. The discussion here compares and contrasts the concept of co-management with that of collaborative management. The reason for this is that collaborative management is part of the broader co-management system (Tipa, 2002).

Like collaborative management, co-management has an equally diverse range of definitions. However, it generally involves the joint management amongst stakeholders of the natural resources of an area. According to Witty (1994:22), co-management is "...a method of resource sharing that is primarily applicable to native communities". Another definition that broadens the perspective on co-management is that:

"it is a situation in which two or more social actors negotiate, define and guarantee amongst themselves a fair sharing of the management functions, entitlements and responsibilities for a given territory, area or set of natural resources."

(Borrini-Feyerabend et al., 2000: 1)'

Berkes et al., (1991:13) simplify the concept of co-management to be "...the sharing of power and responsibility between government and local resource users". They believe a more precise definition is not appropriate because co-management can occur in a range of participation levels (refer to Table 2.1). Its operation at a range of levels results in uncertainty, and this could potentially lead to marginalizing indigenous involvement in planning.
It is evident from these definitions that the concepts of co-management and collaborative management are very similar. They have the same fundamental principles such as sharing the responsibility of decision-making and encouraging people to actively collaborate. Most importantly, they both advocate decision-making by consensus and recognise the importance to the decision-making process of a holistic world view.

Nevertheless, this research adopts a similar stance to that of Tipa (2002), in recognising, from the perspectives of indigenous groups, that collaborative management is the best form of co-management. One reason for this is that collaborative management emphasises a "duality of management responsibilities" between the government and indigenous groups (ibid, 2002:76). Furthermore, the "...economic, cultural and social outcomes sought by the indigenous communities are likely to be realised" throughout the collaborative management process (ibid, 2002:80). Some of these needs include; respect and preservation of cultural identity, recognition of treaty or settlement rights, recognition of ownership or access and use of resources, the importance of incorporating the indigenous world view, and of providing an avenue which promotes the active participation of indigenous groups in planning.

The present research concentrates specifically on collaborative management via the mechanism of cultural impact assessments, between local authorities, developers and Māori of New Zealand. This is because Tipa (2002) finds that, to achieve successful collaborative management, there needs to be a commitment to the implementation stage of the planning process. Hence, cultural impact assessments are being investigated as tools that could potentially increase the participation of Māori in the implementation phase of collaborative management. Chapter Four discusses further the implications of collaborative management and cultural impact assessments in the specific New Zealand context.
2.6 CONCLUSION

The purpose of this chapter has been to explore the theoretical underpinnings of collaborative management. The results of this research suggest that collaborative management potentially has the ability to empower and increase participation of indigenous peoples in the planning process. This chapter has also summarised the importance of involving all key stakeholders in the decision-making process. While there are many constraints related to collaboration theory, collaborative management is arguably one of the best forms of communicative theory that can be applied to increase the involvement of indigenous people in planning.

Collaborative management is likely to aid in gaining a greater understanding of the different world views of Māori and Pakeha in New Zealand. There is limited research on the use of specific tools, such as cultural impact assessments, to facilitate collaborative management. This research hopes to fill this gap and demonstrate how cultural impact assessments may act as a potential tool for establishing and improving current practices of collaborative management throughout New Zealand. As a result, the next chapter investigates the theory behind impact assessments.
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Impact Assessment Theory

3.1 INTRODUCTION

The notion of collaborative management has implications for the empowerment of indigenous groups and, consequently, is important to impact assessment theory and practice (Lawrence, 2000). Unfortunately, impact assessment techniques and theory are not as well-developed as collaboration theory. As a result, impacts on indigenous people are still under-evaluated and not sufficiently accounted for within impact assessment reports (Gagon et al., 1993; O'Faircheallaigh, 1999). Therefore, it is appropriate that the implementation of cultural impact assessments is examined in terms of its potential contribution to achieving the empowerment of indigenous peoples in impact assessment and, more generally, in planning.

The central concern of this thesis is analysing the role, implementation and effectiveness of cultural impact assessments as a participatory tool that allows collaborative management to take place. Potentially, cultural impact assessments are an important instrument through which the needs and aspirations of indigenous peoples can be incorporated into the planning process. In addition, cultural impact assessments can also assess possible effects on the culture, beliefs, values and practices of indigenous peoples, within the boundaries of a proposed activity.
Unfortunately, there is a dearth of literature on cultural impact assessments, because the cultural impact assessment is a new tool and it has been undertaken by few iwi authorities in New Zealand. Generally, most overseas countries include information relating to cultural impact within a social impact assessment and sometimes only within the broader environmental impact assessment reports. Therefore, this thesis investigates the literature on indigenous people’s participation in environmental and social impact assessments, with the objective of determining the strengths and weaknesses of indigenous involvement within the impact assessment process.

This present chapter establishes the general background to the impact assessment process. It concentrates on the two most relevant aspects of the impact assessment process in relation to the discussion in this thesis: public participation and, more specifically, the involvement of indigenous peoples in this process. Public participation in the impact assessment process is initially explored through a review of environmental impact assessments, as this is the base from which social impact assessments and cultural impact assessments have evolved. An in-depth analysis of public participation in the social impact assessment process is also undertaken because this is where the majority of the research on the empowerment capabilities for indigenous peoples lies (Gagnon et al., 1993). The chapter concludes with a framework based on the theoretical participatory ideals and ideal outcomes of the collaboration and impact assessment theories. These two theories form a framework, which potentially could be applied to cultural impact assessment practice in New Zealand. In doing this, Chapter Three thus addresses the rest of objective one of the research: To evaluate the theoretical underpinnings of the impact assessment theory, and formulate a framework in order to apply the collaborative management theory and impact assessment theory to cultural impact assessment practice in New Zealand.
3.2 WHAT IS AN ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT?

The environmental impact assessment process is described as a system, which assesses the potential environmental impacts of a proposal and identifies options to minimise environmental damage (Paci et al., 2002). Similarly, Morgan (1998:3) describes the purpose of an environmental impact assessment being to consider "the likely environmental consequences of a proposed action and in light of that knowledge to identify possible responses". Overall the environmental impact assessment process helps:

- Identify and understand both positive and negative effects
- Gauge the feasibility of the proposal
- Gather views of those affected or with an interest
- Remedy, avoid and/or mitigate adverse effects
- Ensure informed decision making
- Discover the basis for researching and monitoring long term outcomes

(Ministry for the Environment, 1998)

There is no universal definition of what exactly an environmental impact assessment is. Therefore, it is best treated as a generic term for a process, which seeks to combine planning, analysis, prediction, and public involvement, to ensure informed decision making takes place (Barrow, 1999). The definitions of terms such as ‘environment’ and ‘effect’ are also crucial to gaining an understanding of the nature and severity of the potential impacts of an activity discussed in an environmental impact assessment. It is important to note that in environmental impact assessments, the term ‘environment’ is broadly defined to include the biophysical, socio-economic and cultural impacts of proposed actions, policies, programmes and projects (Morgan, 1998). In this context, ‘environment’ is viewed holistically, whereby all elements of the world are interlinked. In this way, the physical world cannot be set apart from the social, cultural, economic and political forces that shape it. This highlights how important it is that an environmental impact assessment also includes the social and cultural implications of a proposed activity.
Like ‘environment’, the term ‘effect’ also has a broad definition in environmental impact assessment practice. ‘Effects’ of a proposal can be positive and negative, temporary or permanent, past, present or future and cumulative (Ministry for the Environment, 1998). Therefore, it is important that all the ‘effects’ on the ‘environment’ are identified and are remedied, avoided or mitigated within the environmental impact assessment. Unfortunately, high demands on time, funding and the ability to gain expert knowledge in the environmental impact assessment process, sometimes lead to misinterpretation of these terms, and often they are not fully investigated or articulated within the environmental impact assessment report. For example, the identification of effects on social and cultural environments has historically been tokenistic (King, 2000). One way of ensuring that social and cultural issues are included in environmental impact assessments is through public involvement. Consequently, Section 3.2.1 investigates the structure of an environmental impact assessment and the extent to which the public can participate throughout the process.

3.2.1 The Role of the Public in the Environmental Impact Assessment Process

Over the last 30 years, planning has become orientated towards the active participation of the community. This has flowed through to the required public involvement in the environmental impact assessment process. The community want their views to be given appropriate consideration and weighting throughout the environmental impact assessment process (Hucker, 1998). Public involvement throughout the process should not be undertaken merely to satisfy legal and ethical requirements for participation, but to ensure that improved environmental and social outcomes are achieved. According to Johnson (2001:5), there are five main reasons for justifying the need for public involvement in the environmental impact assessment process. These are summarised below:

1) Increasing pressure from the community to be involved
2) Necessity to satisfy legal and ethical requirements
3) Need to ensure improvements to outcomes
4) Desirability of ensuring social learning
5) Call for the empowerment of the community
Accordingly, several authors argue that the public’s involvement is also an important source of useful information that could potentially enhance the quality of decision-making in planning (Nottingham, 1990; Becker, 1993; Edelstein & Kleese, 1995; O'Faircheallaigh, 1999). In addition to improving the quality of outputs, public involvement can also increase the acceptance of decisions, and avoid conflict and postponements to the process (Wood, 1998; Johnson, 2001).

Nevertheless, the community need to feel that their involvement in the process is valued and fair, for any of these benefits to occur (Justice, 2001). Furthermore, Justice (2001) believes the other benefits of community involvement in planning include the notion that, as participation increases so does the community’s knowledge of the environment, and the awareness of different values and beliefs held by community members. Hence, it is important to investigate the extent to which impact assessments are a tool for increasing public participation and presenting the indigenous world view of the environment.

In summary, Section 3.2.1 has highlighted the idea that public consultation and participation are vital elements of the environmental impact assessment process. Consequently, Section 3.2.2 investigates how the public can be involved in the environmental impact assessment process.

### 3.2.2 Public Involvement in the Environmental Impact Assessment Process

According to Glasson et al., (1999) the environmental impact assessment process is made up of four main steps, and the community are able to participate in steps one, two and three (Figure 3.1). Wood (1995:5) holds a very similar view to that of Glasson et al., and believes, “consultation and public participation should be important inputs at each stage in the environmental impact assessment process”. Further details of the opportunities for the public to be involved at different steps of Figure 3.1 are explored below.
Steps One (project development) and Two (project assessment) involve gathering data, baseline studies, evaluation of impacts and establishing mechanisms for remedying, avoiding and/or mitigating adverse effects (Figure 3.1). Step three (environmental impact assessment reviewing and decision making) involves reviewing the content of the environmental impact assessment. Reviewing the content is important because it is a form of quality control. In some countries, such as New Zealand, external experts independent of government or councils often conduct this evaluation (Morgan, 1998). This process ensures that greater neutrality is maintained and that, overall, a better decision is made. Step four (post-decision monitoring and auditing) is essential for assessing any unexpected developments and the overall quality of the environmental impact assessment. It involves monitoring and auditing the project, policy or policy performance. However, it is the most poorly executed part of the environmental impact assessment process (Barrow, 1999). Nonetheless, the first three steps are the main avenues for public consultation and participation (Figure 3.1). For example:

Step One (project development) - Public consultation can occur with those affected or those who have an interest in the area. This enables additional knowledge and information to be gained, and this assists in the identification of the key impacts.

Step Two (project assessment) - Public consultation and participation can assist in determining the values and concerns of the public, thus helping to establish effects that need to be remedied, avoided or mitigated.

Step Three (environmental impact assessment reviewing and decision making) - The review stage enables the public to give further information and identify any gaps in an environmental impact assessment. For example, in New Zealand, the public can make submissions on consents that are notified. Other processes, such as mediation in Canada and pre hearing meetings in New Zealand, can also be undertaken prior to the public hearing related to the proposal (Morgan, 1998). These meetings address the planning concerns or issues that each party may have and in some instances solve issues prior to the hearing (Johnson, 2001).
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Figure 3.1: Steps of the environmental impact assessment process (modified version of Glasson et al., 1999:5)
Unfortunately, in environmental impact assessment practice, public involvement tends to remain minimal. Morgan (1998:151) states "...much of the public involvement tends to be at the low-control end of the spectrum: informing the public, seeking the public's preferences and values, and incorporating that information into the impact assessment". Hence, it is essential that further research on the ability and role of planning tools be carried out as a means to increase the meaningful involvement of the community in the environmental impact assessment practice. This research attempts to go some way to meeting that need through addressing the necessity to involve indigenous peoples in the environmental impact assessment process and the requirement to cement a place for their traditional environmental knowledge. Consultation between indigenous groups and other stakeholders can support and promote knowledge sharing in the planning process. This study examines the level of consultation and participation of Māori in the environmental impact assessment process.

3.2.2 Legal Requirements for Indigenous People's Involvement in Environmental Impact Assessments

As discussed, Johnson (2001) believes one of the main reasons for the increased involvement of the community in New Zealand's environmental impact assessment process is the need to satisfy legal requirements. Many authors also believe incorporation of indigenous peoples' knowledge and values into planning legislation is a key to their adequate representation in the impact assessment process (Paci et al., 2002). The Rio Declaration 1992 recognised that environmental issues are best managed with the participation of all citizens. The growing awareness of indigenous people and their rights to participate in planning is also highlighted in Agenda 21, Principle 22, which states:

"Indigenous people and their communities, and other local communities, have a vital role in environmental management and development because of their knowledge and traditional practices. States should recognise and duly support their identity, cultures and interests and enable their effective participation in the achievement of sustainable development."

(United Nations, 1992:6)
Increasingly, indigenous peoples' rights are being acknowledged in legislation and agreements throughout the world. For example, the Aboriginal Rights Act 1976 in the Northern Territory, Australia, allows aboriginal people to claim ownership rights over vacant land and manage it in a way that suits them (Chase, 1990).

Similarly, in response to a hydroelectric development, the James Bay agreement 1975 in Canada increased the recognition of the rights and cultural values of the native Inuit. The James Bay agreement set the context for future relations between indigenous peoples, and the government and developers in the Canadian territory. However, Berkes (1988) criticises the environmental impact assessment process used to gather information for the James Bay agreement. For example, when the reservoirs of the dams were filled, the mercury levels were so high that the reservoirs were not safe to fish. Thus, the environmental impact assessment did not fully protect the native Inuit, due to some inaccurate predictions. Berkes (1988) believes the combination of a lack of understanding and the complexity of the issue meant the development had many unpredictable impacts. This demonstrates that it is essential when dealing with impacts to indigenous cultures that the environmental impact assessment addresses the full implications of the development. One way of adequately addressing these effects could be to commission indigenous peoples or their agent to undertake the impact assessment on their behalf.

Internationally, there are limited legal requirements for the rights and traditions of indigenous people to be included throughout the environmental impact assessment process. For example, the Canadian Environment Assessment Act 1995 set down requirements to ensure adequate public participation occurred throughout the environmental impact assessment process (Paci et al., 2002). However, it offers very little guidance on how indigenous groups can be included in this process. Unfortunately, the Act does not require an environmental impact assessment when federal authorities fund the proposal, even when it is on reservation land (ibid, 2002). Hence, the impacts on indigenous groups and the community from these developments are often not given full weighting in large federal projects.
The United States National Environmental Policy Act 1969 requires applicants to produce an environmental impact statement. This details the impacts on the physical environment and the monitoring programmes to be initiated. Like the Canadian Act, the Policy has resulted in very little involvement of the Alaskan natives in the impact assessment process and, in many instances, the views of Alaskan natives are completely ignored (Burdge, 1999).

In summary, the literature reviewed highlights that there are limited legislative requirements to involve indigenous peoples in the environmental impact assessment process. As a result, the subsequent section will investigate social impact assessments and the ability of indigenous peoples to actively participate within these.

3.3 WHERE DO SOCIAL IMPACT ASSESSMENTS FIT IN?

During the 1980s there were calls from the community for further reform of the environmental impact assessment process to include better assessment of social impacts. This aimed to ensure that the social impacts of an activity were investigated and addressed in the planning process. A social impact assessment is described by Barrow (1999:104) as a process, which, "...seeks to assess whether a proposed development alters the quality of life and sense of well-being, and how well individuals, groups and communities adapt to change caused by development". Burdge and Vanclay (1996:59) also suggest that social impact assessment is "the process of assessing or estimating, in advance, the social consequences that are likely to follow from specific policy actions or project development".

Commonly, cultural effects are also included within a social impact assessment (Burdge, 1999). In some instances, these effects on indigenous groups are also contained within a separate cultural impact assessment report. A cultural impact assessment assesses the potential effects on the culture, beliefs, values and practices of the community within the boundaries of the proposed development or policy. Burdge and Vanclay (1996) also suggest that cultural impact assessments are concerned with the effects on archaeological
remains, holy places and culture. Unfortunately, as previously stated, little research has been done on the value and implementation of cultural impact assessments, and this has resulted in little available information on the structure and possible content of a cultural impact assessment. Therefore, it is necessary to evaluate the content and structure of environmental and social impact assessments so as to determine the general structure of an impact assessment report.

3.3.1 Social Impact Assessment Structure

The social impact assessment process follows steps that are very similar to the environmental impact assessment process. For example, Wolf (1983) splits the social impact assessment process into eight steps, ranging from scoping the problem to its mitigation (see Figure 3.2). The Interorganizational Committee on Guidelines and Principles (ICGP) also recommend the following steps:

- Develop public scoping programme
- Describe proposed action and alternatives
- Describe relevant human environment and area of influence
- Identify probable impacts
- Investigate probable impacts
  - Determine probable response of affected parties
  - Estimate higher order and cumulative impacts
- Recommend changes in proposed action or alternatives
  - Mitigation plan
- Develop monitoring programme

(cited in Morgan, 1998:56)

These steps presented by Wolf and the ICGP, are almost identical to the steps of an environmental impact assessment. They include scoping, problem identification, description of environments, investigation of probable impacts, mitigation, and monitoring programmes, while at the same time re-emphasising the importance of public participation in the impact assessment process.
Figure 3.2: Summarised steps of a social impact assessment (Wolf, 1983)
In conclusion, there is no clear distinction between the process of an environmental and social impact assessment because the material covered in both tends to overlap in many ways. Accordingly, some impact assessment authors see a social impact assessment as an integral part of the environmental impact assessment process, while others see the social impact assessment as a report on its own (Glasson, 2001). Barrow (1999) goes as far to suggest that environmental and social impact assessments deal with issues at opposite ends of the same spectrum but they often overlap. Howitt (1989) states that generally social impact assessments are given a lower status than environmental impact assessment.

However, it is more applicable to evaluate the potential strengths and weaknesses of the impact assessment process and its implications for indigenous involvement by analysing examples of social impact assessments. To date, the most compelling work on local empowerment relates to social impact assessments and indigenous peoples (Gagnon et al., 1993). In addition to the increased empowerment of indigenous groups, both social impact assessments and cultural impact assessments examine how an activity (proposed or actual) will affect the way of life and attitudes of the concerned stakeholders (Barrow, 1999).

The analysis of the literature so far implies that the involvement of indigenous peoples in the impact assessment process leads to a more effective process. Accordingly, it is important to ask whether the inclusion of cultural factors within a social impact assessment gives the views of indigenous people enough or any credibility. How is it ensured that indigenous groups participate in the process, and are impact assessments an appropriate mechanism to represent the viewpoints of indigenous groups? The following subsections evaluate issues relating to: social impact assessment and planning, the importance of including culture, Western versus indigenous viewpoints; and describe some of the limitations of the social impact assessment process for indigenous people.
3.3.2 Social Impact Assessment and Planning

Over recent times, planning and social impact assessment theory have developed in parallel to each other, because of greater pressure to empower and increase participation of communities (Dale & Lane, 1993). However, there is ongoing debate among academics about the nature of social impact assessments and their role in planning. Conflict exists between those who view social impact assessments within a specific legislative framework and those who see social impact assessments as a means of increasing participation and community involvement, especially of indigenous groups (Craig, 1990). Despite the conflict, social impact assessments have developed into a more collective process whereby different sections of the community can express their point of view and deliberate their knowledge about the impacts of proposed developments. Garcia and Daneke assert "...social impact assessment can provide an agenda to meaningful public involvement" (cited in Thomas, 2001:52).

Boyle (1998) suggests that governments need to have stronger obligations to ensure that communities' views are recognised in the planning process. He suggests that governments are accountable for ensuring the adequate participation of the community throughout the impact assessment process. Unfortunately, there is limited legal requirement internationally to undertake a social impact assessment and many changes suggested are in reaction to problems created by the current process. For example, the Berger Report was initiated to review the impact of the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act 1971 (Dale & Lane, 1993). The social impact assessment process for the Berger Report was carried out using effective participatory measures. However, the report is a prime example of too little too late, as the findings of the investigation suggest that such involvement measures should have been put in place during the original design of the legislation (Dale & Lane, 1993). This highlights that some governments need to be more visionary and proactive in regards to involving indigenous people in planning.
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The United States National Environmental Policy Act 1969 suggests that social impact assessments should come under the umbrella of environmental impact assessments. Unfortunately, even though there is a legal requirement to include social impacts, this rarely takes place. In New Zealand, there is no specific legislation that necessitates the need for a social impact assessment to be carried out as part of an environmental impact assessment. However, the Resource Management Act (1991) requires that the social effects of the development or policy be covered, especially if it is quite large (Thomas, 2001). It seems, the general feeling towards social impact assessments is reflected in Howitt's (1989:53) statement that suggests that the “social impact assessment is an implicit rather than explicit requirement of an environmental impact assessment.” In other words, social impacts are seen to be only a small part of the environmental impact assessment process.

In summary, the social impact assessment process (in theory) has the potential to encourage the empowerment and increased participation of indigenous peoples in planning (Gagnon et al., 1993). At the bottom line, indigenous people want their cultural perspective recognised as part of a legitimate intellectual system (Chase, 1990). A major obstacle for the further inclusion of indigenous views is that applicants, local authorities and the general community, have a limited understanding of what culture is and why it is important for it to be included in the impact assessment process. Therefore, it is crucial that a greater understanding of culture is further investigated.

3.3.3 Importance of Including Culture

There are many definitions of culture and no one definition is inclusive (Williams, 1994). The definition most applicable to this research is that of Mayhew (1997:110) who states that culture is the:

"Learned behaviour which is socially transmitted, such as customs, belief, morals, technology, and art...Culture is the primary factor affecting the way in which individuals and society respond to the environment."
Furthermore, Boyle states, "...in many fundamental respects, environment is a cultural issue" (1998:96). The inclusion of cultural beliefs, values and practices throughout the impact assessment process is very important because it provides complementary explanations to the scientific views sought (Boyle, 1998). Jobes also states that, "all investigations should incorporate tribal members into the analysis in order to help increase the validity of interpretations" (1986:393). Woofley also holds a similar viewpoint stating:

"Cultural values and diversity are as urgent as a biological diversity and must be manifested in scientific methods of valuing lands, resources, ecosystems and human rights or that cultural knowledge must be considered equally in evaluating and planning for future projects or activities impacting tribal lands and resources."


These definitions emphasise the urgent requirement to give cultural values and diversity, more weighting in the impact assessment process if enhanced environmental outcomes are to be achieved. However, there is little research available which assesses the extent to which cultural factors improve the social impact assessment process. Furthermore, it is often very difficult to represent cultural values in scientific modes of enquiry, because aboriginal environmental relationships vary so widely throughout the world. Thus, it is not possible to have one universal impact assessment approach.

Cultural diversity results from each culture having different values, beliefs, and knowledge of their environment. Therefore, managing the environment involving this cultural dimension requires an understanding of many of these facets (Williams, 1994). Concern is increasing over the conflict that exists between developers and indigenous groups. One of the main causes of conflict is the lack of understanding of different world views. One way of understanding this diversity and acknowledging the importance of incorporating different cultural viewpoints into an impact assessment is through consultation and collaboration.
3.3.4 Western Versus Indigenous World Views

The Western view of nature is that it has to be managed, while indigenous peoples see nature as sacred and holistic. Paci et al., (2002:118) assert that, “Every culture has a set of paradigms, a collective set of values and knowledge of the way to live and be in the world”. Historically, in planning, the views of indigenous groups are often seen as inferior or very primitive. This argument is supported by Brody (1981:252) who states that some developers and applicants in Canada “...regard the future of the region as their own, the Indians who live there as relics of the past and a liability in the present”. The use of a social impact assessment is seen as a possible solution to the growing tension between applicants and indigenous groups. This is because it was believed to be a tool for recognising the different perspectives of the world view and that “these differences can be viewed as opportunities to work together” (Emery et al. 1997:2). Therefore, the discussion now turns to exploring whether or not impact assessments are an adequate tool for assessing the effects of an activity on indigenous groups. This is a key concern because social impact assessments follow a process created by the Western world view.

Social impact assessments often reinforce the utilitarian view of society because what they propose usually benefits the majority. Unfortunately, indigenous peoples are rarely the majority, and this means that the cultural impacts of a proposed development or policy are often ignored. For example, Chase (1990) found that in the proposed site of a silica sand mine in Shelburne Bay, Queensland, Australian aboriginals were denied the ability to participate, even though they had a direct association with the area. The denial of the participation rights of indigenous groups also occurred in Montana, Canada, where Northern Cheynne were denied any say in the planning process relating to their reservation land (Jobes, 1986). In other cases, indigenous groups have participated formally in a process but the legitimacy of their claims has often been ignored.

The use of forms of inquiry that are alien to indigenous groups can limit the adequate participation of indigenous cultures. Alien forms of inquiry can
result in the misinterpretation of evidence and information presented by indigenous peoples (Craig, 1990; Edelstein & Kleese, 1995; O'Fairchellaigh 1999). Furthermore, Edelstein & Kleese (1995) argue that impact assessment serves as a tool for cultural homogenisation, forcing native people to express their values in one dominant framework. O'Fairchellaigh (1999) believes that another major obstacle for indigenous groups' participation in the social impact assessment process is their ability to overcome the technical information and expertise that is required. As a result, many indigenous groups have questioned the benefits to them of the social impact assessment process. This is particularly so if the social impact assessment has been undertaken by consultants or academics from outside the tribal groups concerned (Nottingham, 1990). For example, the Yellow Knives Dene First Nation states that, “...indigenous peoples should be given opportunity to document and present our circumstances and own evaluation of potential impacts from major developments on our people, culture and lands...” (cited in Stevenson, 1996:283). Consequently, this thesis investigates only those cultural impact assessments that have been generated by an iwi or under the guidance of that iwi, otherwise the cultural impact assessments analysed in this research cannot be assessed as a true tool for promoting collaborative management.

The oral traditions of many indigenous groups can also cause conflict when information for a social impact assessment is being gathered. This is because the data collected from an oral source is primarily qualitative, and many impact assessment practitioners prefer to use quantitative analysis. Therefore, in many circumstances, the oral information is not given fair weighting during the decision-making process (Jobes, 1986). Thus, allowing indigenous groups to gather their own information and then formulate it into an impact assessment report, may aid in the adequate representation of their views in the planning process.

The East Kimberley Impact Assessment Project (1985) in Australia is an excellent example of the success the social impact assessment process can bring when undertaken correctly. This project sought to overcome the
weaknesses of previous assessments by advocating the interests of the aboriginals, rather than only neutrally recording the predicted impacts (Wildman, 1985). The information that was gathered relied heavily on the story-telling of the past from the aboriginal participants. This highlights that the oral traditions of indigenous peoples can be successfully applied and used within impact assessments. The views of the aboriginal community were maintained throughout the impact assessment process and a strong commitment was made to acknowledge their continuing rights (Howitt, 1989).

In another example, the Shell Oil Company has also maintained continual dialogue with the indigenous people of Peru after completion of the Casimea Gas project (Manriquez, 1998). Their overall objective was to harmonise the social, cultural and environmental effects of the project and this was achieved in part by the use of a social impact assessment. Likewise, it ensured that the issues that were highlighted were from the perspectives of the indigenous peoples themselves.

Generally, the main problem of the impact assessment process is how to assign values to impacts that in some cultures override all others (Nottingham, 1990). This highlights the importance of finding research methods that indigenous people feel comfortable with, while at the same time adequately representing their point of views. For example, in New Zealand, Māori believe there exists an essential relationship between the universe, nature and humanity (Gray, 1989). Therefore any pollution from society is a reflection of pollution throughout the system. The concepts of Māori are very difficult for some developers and authorities to understand and legitimate. The cultural impact assessment can be a way of documenting the different concepts of Māori in a format that is easily understood by all (these points are further investigated in Chapter Four).

This section highlights that indigenous knowledge does have a vital role to play within the impact assessment process. The East Kimberley Project indicated that oral sources of information could be translated into impact assessment practice to acknowledge the indigenous view. Section 3.3.5 has
also illustrated the importance of giving indigenous people the opportunity to either carry out the impact assessment themselves or for them to get someone to do it on their behalf. Thus, it can be concluded that impact assessments do have the potential to be used further as a tool to increase the participation of indigenous groups in planning. Prior to making any final conclusions about the empowerment capabilities of the impact assessment process, the limitations for indigenous involvement in these reports are explored below.

3.3.5 Limitations for Indigenous Involvement
The literature on social impact assessment tends to illustrate a failure by authorities and developers to recognise the recommendations and requirements of the social impact assessment. Geisler (1993) goes as far to suggest that a social impact assessment is a necessary but insufficient tool for safeguarding the social interests of aboriginal cultures. While there has been a shift to increase the participation of indigenous cultures, many fundamental problems remain. These include the capacity of indigenous peoples to shape outcomes of social impact assessment and the failure of the social impact assessment findings to be integrated into the final decision (O'Faricheallaigh, 1999). The ultimate goal is to have a system whereby indigenous knowledge and Western science complement one another to achieve sustainable development.

Numerous authors note that the impacts to indigenous communities are still under evaluated and are not sufficiently taken into account during the planning process (Gagnon et al., 1993). O'Faricheallaigh (1999) writes, for example, that in Australia, where indigenous people are able to participate, they have still been unable to influence outcomes in the decision making process. Ross (1989) also states that the input of indigenous peoples is unlikely to be given formal recognition because it is a small part of the broader assessment process. This suggests that the realities of social impact assessment use in planning practice are not as broad and open as they are in theory. Wildman (1985:149) goes as far to suggest that, "social impact assessment has promised much but delivered little that is new or innovative".
A major assumption throughout the impact assessment process is that negative effects can be mitigated. However, in certain circumstances, cultural viewpoints do not provide for compromise and consequently are often ignored. This highlights the importance of investigating a wide range of options and adequately exploring the affects of the activity or policy on indigenous groups.

Another possible reason for the lack of integration of indigenous peoples’ views into the impact assessment process is the lack of awareness that many judges, lawyers and planners have about the true implications of the cultural effects that a development may have. In Hawaii, the proposal to use a sacred volcano (Pele) for geothermal energy purposes is a prime example of a situation where the cultural views of the native Hawaiians were ignored and not given any weighting when they contrasted to the views of the State (Edelstein & Kleese, 1995). The negative impacts of energy production were not remedied, avoided or mitigated, and the native Hawaiians received no compensation for their loss. This is because to the effects to Pele practitioners were ruled to be ‘intangible’ and thus could not be used as an argument to stop the development. Nonetheless, it has not stopped native Hawaiians from campaigning to have their cultural views recognised. Unfortunately, their values have still not been given the true weighting they deserve (ibid, 1995).

There are circumstances where indigenous groups have carried out the social impact assessments themselves. For example, the Cold Lake Indian Band were dissatisfied with the results of a social impact assessment that assessed an oil sand project that was to be located near their reserve land (O’Faircheallaigh, 1999). The results of this process were that the effects of the development on the Cold Lake Indian Band were adequately assessed and detailed recommendations were formed. However, no clear indication was given as to how these recommendations were weighted and put into effect (O’Faircheallaigh, 1999). Thus, failure to ensure that social impact assessment findings are integrated into the planning process is another common weakness of social impact assessment practice.
Furthermore, lack of resources such as financial resources and technical expertise, in addition to the limitations previously discussed, further alienate indigenous groups from participating in the planning process. However, the biggest limiting factor is that of time. Impact assessments usually occur over a short time period, which does not usually give indigenous groups enough time to gather the required information. This is especially so as indigenous decision making processes can be quite protracted (O'Faircheallaigh, 1999). Therefore, it is important that indigenous peoples are involved from the start of a proposal, thus minimising the issue of time.

There is a limited amount of information on what tools and strategies can be used to increase the participation of indigenous peoples in planning. Therefore, the investigation of the ability of tools, such as cultural impact assessments, to achieve collaborative management is very topical. The literature review within this section highlights that there is no single best approach to impact assessment practice. Thus, there is no simplistic impact assessment model that ensures the active participation of indigenous peoples in planning takes place.

In summary, there are many limitations for the active involvement of indigenous groups throughout the impact assessment process and those need to be recognised when undertaking research. These include, the weighting, knowledge and awareness given to the indigenous world view, the limited amount of financial resources and technical expertise that some indigenous groups may experience, and the time limitations of the impact assessment process.

What does this mean for New Zealand, and are cultural impact assessments a solution to the current problem that exists internationally? Nottingham (1990) writes that many Māori have a cynical view of the social impact assessment process especially when someone who is not an iwi member is commissioned to undertake the work. Therefore, it is very applicable
that the cultural impact assessment process is evaluated in terms of its ability to increase Māori satisfaction and participation in the impact assessment process.

3.5 SYNTHESIS OF CHAPTERS TWO AND THREE

One of the aims of this thesis is to contribute to the growing body of literature on both collaborative management and impact assessment theory. The framework developed here draws on the most applicable ideals of these two theories. These include, increased participation, empowerment, increased knowledge, and initiating and building partnerships (Figure 3.3). This framework will be used to apply the two theories to the New Zealand setting, thus determining whether or not cultural impact assessments have the potential to be a tool for collaborative management. There has been very little research on tools that can be used to promote collaborative management amongst indigenous groups, and developers, local authorities and planning consultants. Therefore, the content, process, value, limitations and future improvements of the cultural impact assessment process are also investigated within this research (Figure 3.3).

In summary, this research aims to fill a gap that currently exists within planning literature and will provide information on a subject where, until now, little investigation has taken place. Overall, its main objective is to investigate a potential tool that will enable effective collaborative management to take place, whilst also empowering and increasing the participation of Māori in planning (Figure 3.3).
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Collaborative Management → Impact Assessment Theory and Practice

- Increased Participation
- Empowerment
- Partnerships
- Increased knowledge

Research objectives

- To review the New Zealand context of collaborative management and cultural impact assessment practice (Chapter Four)
- To assess the content and quality of cultural impact assessment in New Zealand (Chapter Five)
- To analyse the process and value of cultural impact assessments as a tool for promoting collaborative management (Chapters Six and Seven)

Structured approach for reviewing cultural impact assessments

A tool that promotes collaborative management

Increased empowerment and participation of Māori in planning

Figure 3.3: Framework that combines the collaboration and impact assessment theories
3.5 CONCLUSION

This chapter has investigated the impact assessment process, concentrating on the different avenues for indigenous involvement. It also highlights the links that exist between collaborative management and impact assessment theory. The collaboration and impact assessment theories have moved in parallel paths to increase the participation of indigenous groups and to advocate planning from the bottom-up. As with the collaboration theory, the impact assessment theory also has many limitations that constrain the active participation of indigenous people. Some of these include a lack of awareness of the indigenous world view, the weighting and value given to cultural impacts, and the limited amount of resources, capabilities and time that restrict indigenous people from participating effectively in the planning process.

This research combines both collaborative management theory and impact assessment theory in order to investigate their application to the New Zealand setting and, more specifically, to the cultural impact assessment process.
The New Zealand Context

4.1 INTRODUCTION

The previous two chapters formulate a framework based on the participatory ideals of the collaborative management and impact assessment theories. It is important to apply these ideals to the New Zealand setting so as to understand the limitations and opportunities of the two theories in cultural impact assessment practice (objective two of this research).

For effective collaborative management to occur among iwi, developers, local authorities and the general public, an appreciation and understanding of Māori culture, traditions and beliefs, must be held by all who take part in the process. The way Māori conceptualise the world is very similar to the way other indigenous cultures understand their world, in that they assume a personal interrelationship with the environment. Te Puni Kokiri (1993:9) state, “the goal, therefore, of indigenous environmental management is continued vigilance in the observation and monitoring of the environment so that humans may dwell within the design of the natural world”. This contrasts to some Western views of the environment in which these natural resources are only valued in relation to their meaningfulness to humans (Te Puni Kokiri, 1993).
Thus, Māori concepts fit into what Sandercock (1998) suggests as “other ways of knowing”, as they do not always directly translate into the dominant culture or Western environmental philosophies. Yet many Māori environmental philosophies and practices still retain their vitality and meaning in today’s society. Hence, applicants who have an understanding of Māori culture bring informed debate to the planning process. Gaining an appreciation of Māori beliefs and practices in relation to resource management may assist in facilitating the necessary partnerships from which collaborative management could develop. This potentially could increase the involvement of tangata whenua in planning and help to further integrate Māori and Western environmental philosophies.

It is essential that the dual management systems of New Zealand, (Western and Māori), be acknowledged in order to achieve better environmental outcomes. This is reaffirmed by Durie (1995:33) who states, “one culture should not be judged by the standards of another...each must be appreciated on its own terms”. Bearing this in mind, this chapter begins by presenting a broad generalisation of the Māori world view. This is because a major barrier to the active participation of Māori in planning is from the lack of understanding and knowledge of Māori cultural beliefs and traditions. Section 4.2.1 briefly discusses traditional Māori resource management practices, and this is followed by an analysis of collaborative management and the cultural impact assessment practice in New Zealand (Section 4.3).

4.2 MAORI WORLD VIEW

Iwi and hapu in New Zealand hold different perspectives of the Māori world view (Challenger, 1988). Although common characteristics do exist among iwi and hapu in their understanding of the world, each may have their own interpretation of the creation story and specific events, both historical and contemporary (Gale, 1996). For example, there are numerous approaches to the creation story. Therefore, the term ‘Maori world view’ cannot be viewed as a generic term, as it is subject to a high degree of regional variation.
Creation plays a fundamental role in the construction of the Māori world view (James, 1993). For Māori, all elements of the natural world are linked by mutual descent from the gods as the progeny of Papatūanuku (earth mother) and Ranginui (sky father). The creation of various gods, demigods and people is also linked to the natural world. Thus, embedded in Māori thought is the relationship between the universe, the natural world and humanity. Recognising the spirituality and relationship of Māori with their gods helps in gaining an understanding of the Māori world view.

The relationship between Māori, the ancestors and the gods is a two way process. The environment protects mankind, and in return, Māori have a sense of responsibility for environmental gifts as appointed guardians, stewards and kaitiaki (guardians) of the environment. In contrast, much of Western philosophy is driven by the notion that the earth's resources are principally available for human use and consumption. This highlights why there is often conflict between Māori and Pakeha over the management and use of New Zealand's natural resources.

The Māori world view also contrasts to Western philosophy because it is multi-dimensional and integrative. All aspects of the universe are understood to have,

- te taha wairua (spiritual)
- te taha hinegaro (mental)
- te taha tinana (physical and economic)

(James, 1993)

Therefore, Māori assign a spiritual, mental, physical and economic value to every aspect of the natural environment. It is the spiritual value given to specific features of the environment that is central to Māori philosophy.
Traditionally, in the Maori world view, everything in the natural world possesses its own inherent value, known as mauri or essential life force. Mauri is the life principle in all objects and unites all aspects of the environment together (Patterson, 1999). This energy resonates and vibrates from the universe to Papatuanuku and throughout the whole of creation. The presence of mauri in all things leads to greater respect for natural resources and aids in managing the environment through the principle of guardianship. For example, when weaving flax, the flax can only be cut from the outer leaves, to ensure that the inner core remains intact. In addition, the remains of the flax have to be returned back to the mother plant (Ulrich-Cloher & Johnston, 1999).

However, mauri is an extinguishable value. Thus, the loss of mauri can occur if resources are degraded or polluted, to the extent that they lose their life-supporting capacity. Māori resource management tools, such as tapu (tools that are sacred or forbidden, tapu can also be used to represent prohibitions or restrictions (Patterson, 1992)) and rahui (a type of tapu that restricts the use of certain resources over a certain period of time, allowing them to replenish and rejuvenate), ensure that, to a certain extent, the deprivation and pollution of a natural resource is prevented. By placing tapu or rahui on fauna or flora, Māori can ensure, to some degree, that a life-supporting capacity is maintained. Hence, the protection and nurturing of the mauri of any resource is essential for its well-being and survival. This highlights the significant amount of concern that Māori feel towards the protection of the spiritual life force of the natural environment. In summary, Māori view the environment in a holistic manner, whereby everything in the natural world is interrelated.
4.2.1 Māori Resource Management

In addition to the holistic manner in which Māori view the environment, humans have been given a degree of authority to safeguard it (Yoon, 1986). Similarly, Walker (1982:69) asserts:

"...although the mythology of the Māori established the primacy of man over natural resources of the earth-mother, myths, spiritual beliefs, and customary usage indicated that man was not above nature."

This highlights the notion that Māori believe they have responsibility as kaitiaki (guardians) of the natural environment, to ensure that it is safeguarded for future generations. In addition, the practice of kaitiakitanga, or the ethic of stewardship, or guardianship, over the natural environment, also emphasises the protective care that Māori feel towards it. In other words, Māori believe they are part of and related to nature, rather than being separate from it. This idea is congruent to some Western views, that see humans as superior over the earth's resources, and that the environment is something to be owned.

Traditionally, there were many environmental techniques available to Māori to aid in the management of natural resources (as outlined earlier), these include, tapu and rahui. Tapu is one of the ways to sustain the life-supporting capacity or mauri of the environment. In the context of this research tapu is used to indicate ritual prohibitions and restrictions (Walker, 1990).

One of the most useful applications of tapu for resource management purposes is rahui (Walker, 1990). Rahui is used in an attempt to prohibit a resource from either being exploited or depleted (Mead, 1997). For example, if a resource was in fear of being depleted, a rahui could be instituted to permit only seasonal collection, or to allow only certain members of the iwi, such as the elders, to gather the resource. Therefore, this restriction aids in promoting the resource to replenish itself naturally. If a resource was to become depleted,
or polluted, this would alter its mauri. For example, in the case of water, "waimate" or dead water, is the water that completely lost its mauri. The loss of mauri could result in the loss of the traditional practice of mahinga kai (food gathering area). This practice cannot be resumed until the mauri of the resource is restored. Therefore, any level of pollution or degradation to the environment has wide implications that go far beyond just the loss of a resource (Mead, 1997). Thus, rahui can be used as an example of one of the techniques used by Māori to preserve and sustain natural resources for future generations. This sustainability ethic is very applicable to the Western environmental management of today, and the opportunity exists for this knowledge to be further integrated into New Zealand’s planning system.

In conclusion, the Māori world view is very complex. This section has briefly discussed the creation story and resource management ethic of Māori, in order to provide an insight and basic understanding of the origins of the Māori world view. It is important that the philosophy behind this world view is understood, as this understanding can serve to promote the benefits of including Māori views in the planning process. Gaining an understanding of the creation story, facilitates increased knowledge and awareness of the relationship Māori have with Papatuanuku and the role of tangata whenua in the natural world (Gale, 1996). Furthering knowledge and understanding of the Māori world view may help to create a base from which collaborative management and impact assessment processes can develop.

The investigation of the Māori resource management ethic also highlights that effects on the environment cannot be measured purely using scientific techniques, but must also incorporate spiritual and cultural value losses. In Section 4.3, the use of collaborative management in practice is explored, in terms of its ability to incorporate Māori environmental, spiritual and cultural values into the planning process. Collaborative management in New Zealand is further explored using case study examples from Waiapu and Taharoa Domain Reserve Management Plan (Section 4.3.2).
4.3 COLLABORATION IN NEW ZEALAND

There is a growing pressure from Māori for their rights under the Treaty of Waitangi to be recognised. The Treaty formally acknowledged the right of Māori to manage their environment. In particular, Article Two acknowledges tino rangtiratanga (sovereignty) of iwi and hapu (subtribe) over resources that include lands, fisheries and other taonga (treasures). It was inherent under the Treaty’s terms that the customary values of Māori be respected and provided for (Waitangi Tribunal, Mangonui Report, 1998:60). In addition, tangata whenua as kaitiaki of their environment should share the responsibility for its protection. These underlying principles of the Treaty have the potential to be used to promote an understanding amongst decision-makers and iwi (Crengle, 1993). However, historically, participation of Māori in planning has been limited (James, 1993). Yet, collaborative management is one possible tool for addressing those rights promised to Māori under the Treaty of Waitangi and for ensuring that more active participation occurs.

4.3.1 Legislative Obligations

Tangata whenua have particular responsibilities as kaitiaki to the atua (gods), ancestors and future generations, to protect and sustain the natural environment. As with other indigenous cultures around the world, this commitment is difficult to achieve unless there is legislation or an agreement that acknowledges Māori environmental rights (illustrated in Sections 3.2.2 and 3.3.3).

The Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA) is New Zealand’s primary Act for managing the environment. The RMA accords special status to Māori interests. Applicants (for resource consent), including developers, planning consultants and local authorities, who are proposing a new activity are required to avoid, remedy, or mitigate adverse impacts on Māori. The RMA recognises this through the principles of the Treaty of Waitangi, Section 8. Recognition is also given to Māori cultural and spiritual interests in Section
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6(e) and 7(a). Currently, in planning a key way of incorporating Māori views and the impacts of a proposal on Māori is through consultation. However, in practice, consultation is not enough to provide for traditional Māori authority and promises made in relation to the management of the environment in the Treaty of Waitangi. Therefore, a system needs to be developed whereby decision-making is implied to be a “partnership of equals” (Berkes et al., 1991).

Section 6(e) of the RMA states that the relationship of Māori and their culture and traditions with their ancestral lands, water, sites, waahi tapu (a place of cultural, spiritual or historical significance to Māori), and other taonga shall be recognised and provided for in relation to managing, developing and protecting the environment. Unfortunately, applicants for resource consent have not always addressed the relationship of Māori with their environment. This is even though, under the RMA, there is an obligation for them to recognise and provide for matters of national importance. These matters of national importance include, the relationship of Māori and their culture and traditions with their ancestral lands, water, sites, waahi tapu, and other taonga. In addition, applicants for resource consents are required to also take into account the principles of the Treaty. In spite of this obligation, Māori often find that, in the planning process, the principles of the Treaty are often ignored (James, 1993).

The RMA has not promoted the creation of adequate working relationships, whereby the aspirations of each of the partners, Māori and Pakeha, are adequately met (Nuttal, 1996). Horsley (2000) believes that there are two main reasons for this. First, there is reluctance on the part of government and non-government agencies to move away from the time-honoured ‘consultation’ model. Second, more funding for iwi is required. Lack of adequate financial resources is repeatedly identified by iwi as the most significant barrier to their full participation in planning (Crengle, 1993; James, 1993). A possible solution to the limited involvement of some iwi in
planning in New Zealand might be the adoption of a collaborative management framework. Tipa (2002) suggests that collaborative management is a practical means by which iwi, applicants, local authorities and the community are genuinely able to fulfil the statutory intentions of the RMA. Section 4.3.2 discusses the benefits of the process and ongoing partnerships that can be built via such an approach.

4.3.2 Collaboration in Practice

Collaborative management has the potential to be used in New Zealand as a mechanism to address the growing pressures for a joint system (Māori and Pakeha) of maintaining the environment. The use of a collaborative management framework is one way of addressing the need to further include Māori in planning. This is because collaborative management provides an avenue for tangata whenua to actively participate in management and decision-making in relation to resource use and allocation in New Zealand. This section evaluates two case study examples of collaborative management in the New Zealand setting.

A successful example of collaborative management is the Waiapu project, which began in 1998 in the east coast region of Gisbourne. It involved a joint partnership between Ngati Porou and Manaaki Whenua-Landcare Research. The Waiapu catchment is an area that has been severely modified and degraded and it required an integrated management strategy to protect the environment and surrounding area (Harmsworth & Warmhoven, 2002). The coastal environment along Gisborne's east coast is continuously changing and this has considerable impacts on Māori values and resources, such as kai moana (sea food) along the coast. For example, some of these changes have included decreasing numbers in the stocks of kai moana (sea food) and, in places, loss of access to some of the mahinga kai sites. The purpose of the research was to develop an improved knowledge base and understanding of
the Waiapu catchment through linking the ideas of Māori and Western science together. Thus, the research involved determining key impacts on the area and formulating possible solutions to these.

The end result of the project was the formation of partnerships between scientists, iwi, researchers, Māori elders, and the Māori community (Clark & Quinn, 2001). A system was established that integrated mainstream science and Māori knowledge together to formulate a positive catchment management strategy. Information from iwi was gathered using a Kaupapa Māori research approach, this included using Māori interviewing techniques, holding hui and use of teo reo Māori (Harmsworth, 2001). Harmsworth and Warmenhoven, (2002) believe that, “a combination of knowledge forms (i.e. Māori and mainstream science) helps to understand the possible success or failure of any action, such as a restoration project.”

Thus, a comprehensive knowledge base has been built up on the Waiapu catchment that has combined the knowledge and ideas of Māori and Western science. However, similar to the limitations of indigenous involvement explored in, Chapters Two and Three, the Waiapu project has experienced some resourcing and staffing difficulties. This is due to Ngati Porou’s high turn over of staff and the fact that the research was allocated less than one-third of its original budget.

Nonetheless, the Waiapu project is a prime example whereby Māori and Western science can be integrated together in an attempt to achieve sustainable catchment management. Its success highlights the importance of: building and maintaining partnerships, working together to formulate visions and goals, belief and commitment to the Māori world view, and the significance of incorporating tikanga into all stages of the research and gathering information in a culturally appropriate manner. For example, this latter process was achieved by holding hui and the use of teo reo Māori. The Waiapu Project also emphasises the need for adequate resourcing and funding
for the collaborative management process. While, the successes of the Waiapu project have been evaluated from the perspective of iwi, the following case study example explores the use of a collaborative management framework from the perspective of a district council.

The successes of the collaborative management process are also evident for the Kaipara District Council and local iwi, Te Roroa and Te Kuihi, in regard to the development of the Taharoa Domain Reserve Management Plan (Wall, 2002). Councillor Jack McKerchar (cited in Wall, 2002:30) stated “...a partnership is about sharing the decision making from the very outset whereas consultation involves the other party only after policies have been decided upon”. The Taharoa Domain is an area of great cultural, historical and economic (tourism and forestry) significance to iwi and the local community (Kaipara District Council, 2002). As a result, the Kaipara District Council decided to give local iwi, Te Roroa and Te Kuihi, a partnering role in the formation of the Domain Reserve Management Plan.

The Kaipara District Council initiated the process by approaching Te Roroa and Te Kuihi, and asking them what role they would like to play in the process. Love (Wall, 2002:30) stated, “The reality is that the most productive approach is open, unencumbered dialogue between the local authority and Māori concerned to establish a sense of equality in their relationship”. Councillor McKerchar believes the importance placed on forming a relationship right from the outset of the process was the key to the success of the programme. McKerchar (Wall, 2002:32) stated, “Looking back, all of us at the council now recognise that gaining their buy-in and commitment at this objective setting phase was a major contribution to the overall success of the plan”. The importance of establishing a partnership with Te Roroa and Te Kuihi is also highlighted within the Taharoa Reserve Management Plan itself. Aim one of the report was “to establish an equal organisational partnership between tangata whenua and council to govern the domain” (Kaipara District Council, 2002:7).
The outcome of the project is a Reserve Management Plan that provides a framework for the governance and management of the Taharoa Domain (Kaipara District Council, 2002). The Kaipara District Council believe the report reflects a balance of opinions and views amongst the many stakeholders of the Taharoa Domain. The meaningful and enduring understanding between iwi and the Kaipara District Council has also been a positive result of this process (Wall, 2002:36). Overall, the Kaipara District Council do not believe that the collaborative management approach added any additional costs or slowed down the process, as no counter claims against the plan were made by iwi (Wall, 2002).

The collaborative management initiative by the Kaipara District Council is a prime example of a council being proactive rather than reactive to a situation. The collaborative management process provided a blueprint of how to involve Māori in planning. It has also highlighted the importance of, initiating and building partnerships, letting Māori decide the role that they would like to play, involving Māori from the outset, and making a commitment to represent and give weighting to the Māori world view in the planning process.

However, this case study has only provided comment from the council’s perspective. Thus, this research combines the findings from this example with elements of the discussion in Chapter Two and the Waiapu project findings to formulate the components that are required for successful collaborative management in the New Zealand context. These can then be applied to cultural impact assessments in Section 7.5, to determine if cultural impact assessments have the potential to be tools for collaborative management.

4.3.3 Components for Successful Collaborative Management

These two case studies have illustrated, from the perspectives of both iwi and a council, the successes that the adoption of a collaborative management framework can bring to the formulation of an integrated management system.
Key factors that can be attributed to the success of the collaborative management framework for the Waiapu project and the Taharoa Domain Reserve Management Plan, include:

- Initiating, building and maintaining relationships
- Involvement of iwi from the outset of the project
- Giving Māori the opportunity to decide the role they want to play in the process
- Understanding the importance of incorporating the Māori world view and willingness to learn and respect the other parties' perspectives
- Working together with the overall objective of obtaining better environmental outcomes
- Decision making by a collaboration process
- Adequate resources, such as human capacity and funding.

These components will be applied to the cultural impact assessment process in New Zealand to determine whether or not cultural impact assessments are a tool, or have the potential to become a tool, for promoting collaborative management. Section 4.4 investigates the cultural impact assessment process as practiced in New Zealand to determine whether it is a potential mechanism for achieving these components for collaborative management.

4.4 CULTURAL IMPACT ASSESSMENTS IN NEW ZEALAND

In planning, as stated there is limited research on possible tools, such as, cultural impact assessments, that could be used to promote collaborative management between Māori and applicants for resource consents. In addition, Chapter Three finds that there is no simplistic model that will ensure the active participation of indigenous people in the planning process. To put this situation in context, this section investigates the background to cultural impact assessments in the New Zealand setting.
In New Zealand, a cultural impact assessment is part of a broader environmental impact assessment regime. Cultural impact assessments are a systematic assessment of the values and issues associated with a particular resource or area for iwi. Internationally, these impacts on indigenous people are included within social or environmental impact assessments. However, in New Zealand, the use of cultural impact assessments as a resource management tool is becoming increasingly popular. Yet, currently only a minority of iwi throughout the country are undertaking cultural impact assessments (possible reasons for this are further explored in Chapters Six and Seven).

In general, the findings of cultural impact assessments are usually integrated into the final environmental impact assessment. Dale and Lane (1993) believe that it wasn’t until the 1990s that cultural perspectives were included in impact assessments. The development of cultural impact assessment reports has been a way of documenting and incorporating the views of iwi in the planning process. If undertaken adequately, cultural impact assessments have the potential to be a tool to recognise and provide for the principles of the Treaty of Waitangi and for those matters that should be considered when preparing an assessment of environmental effects (specifically clause 2(a) of the RMA).

4.4.1 Cultural Impact Assessments— the Beginning
Specific information on cultural impact assessments is scarce. As previously discussed in Section 4.4.1, the cultural impact assessment is a concept that is mainly used only in New Zealand and do not seem to have been a topic of research. Nottingham (1990) believes that cultural impact assessments are becoming more common in New Zealand because of the increasing pressure of Māori to be involved in the planning process. Therefore, it can be assumed that this increasing pressure from Māori has resulted in the production of a separate impact assessment report, known as a cultural impact assessment.
An early example of a cultural impact assessment occurred in Waahi in 1974. Here, it was proposed that a coal-fired power station be located near one of the most important marae for Tainui (Nottingham, 1990). The marae would be physically separated from the Waikato River by a road to and from the power station. In addition to this separation, Tainui were also worried about the loss of a valuable food source from the river. In particular, they were concerned about the effects of the development on eel populations (Stokes, 1978). Unfortunately, there was no direct consultation with Māori (Stokes, 1978). As a result, the Centre for Māori Studies undertook an in-depth analysis of the potential effects of the development on the Waahi iwi, under the iwi’s guidance. The report allowed the views and aspirations of the iwi to be expressed and accounted for (Nottingham, 1990). This report was, in effect, a forerunner to the cultural impact assessment process. Since the proposed development of the coal-fired power station, the RMA has been enacted, and this places a stronger obligation for resource consent applicants to involve iwi in the planning process. The extent to which the development of cultural impact assessments has led to an increase of Māori involvement in planning is explored below in Section 4.4.2.

4.4.2 Cultural Impact Assessment Legislative Requirements

In New Zealand, the RMA brought in a mandatory requirement for local authorities to assess the environmental effects of applications for resource consents. More specifically, the 4th Schedule of the RMA includes matters that should be considered when preparing an environmental impact assessment. Clause 2(a) of the RMA states that any person preparing an assessment of environmental effects should consider, “any effect on those in the neighbourhood and, where relevant, the wider community including any socio-economic and cultural effects”. Therefore, the RMA places an obligation on applicants as part of their environmental impact assessment to include impacts to Māori and their culture (Nottingham, 1990). However, the RMA does not indicate what constitutes an ‘acceptable assessment’ (Morgan, 1998).
Despite the recognition given to Māori in the RMA, there is considerable resistance from some developers and local authorities to involve and give adequate consideration to Māori views in planning \cite{ibid, 1990}. As Chase \cite{1990:15} writes, “the aboriginal perspective demands recognition as a factual basis of investigation, free from bias at government, developer, or consultant levels”. A Ministry for the Environment report \cite{1999a:45} states that “it is ‘particularly wise’ to consult with Māori if they have an interest in the issue”. The Environment Court also states that it is good practice to consult with Māori, particularly where matters affect Sections 6(a), 7(e) and 8 of the RMA \cite{Ministry for the Environment, 1999a}. Nevertheless, the duty to consult or conduct a cultural impact assessment is not a mandatory legislative requirement.

The RMA is very similar (in respect to assessing the effects on indigenous people) to international legislation such as the Canadian Environmental Assessment Act 1995 and the United States National Environmental Policy 1969, in that there are limited legislative requirements to include indigenous peoples in the process. In addition, in New Zealand there is no form of quality control for cultural impact assessments. It would be advantageous to the cultural impact assessment process for a range of forms of quality control to be developed to aid in maintaining the integrity and worth of these assessments. Furthermore, it is up to the developer, planning consultant or local authority, as to how much of a cultural impact assessment is integrated into the final environmental impact assessment report that is presented to the decision-making authority. Therefore, further investigation needs to take place to examine the weighting that the cultural impact assessment is given in the planning process.

4.4.3 A Tool for Collaborative Management?

So far, this chapter has highlighted that there is an increased need to further involve Māori in planning. It is important to recognise that there are deep differences in perspectives and that these should be viewed as further
opportunities to work together. Collaborative management via the mechanism of cultural impact assessment has been identified as one way of increasing the awareness and participation of iwi in planning.

As previously outlined, cultural impact assessments are able to provide iwi with an avenue for representing the predicted impacts and effects of a proposal. Therefore, potentially, cultural impact assessments are a tool that may lead to further integration of these aspects into the impact assessment process. In addition, the RMA places an indirect obligation on resource consent applicants to consult with Māori. Thus, the commissioning of a cultural impact assessment could be one way of satisfying this requirement.

In theory, cultural impact assessments could be a tool for collaborative management. However, there is much that is unknown about the cultural impact assessment process. Is the cultural impact assessment process similar to environmental and social impact assessments? Is the cultural impact assessment process a way of empowering iwi? What is the value and what are the limitations of the process for both iwi and applicants? Does the commissioning of a cultural impact assessment fulfil the components required for collaborative management as outlined in Section 4.3.3 of this research? Therefore, further investigation of the content and process of cultural impact assessment practice is required before any conclusions can be reached about its potential to satisfy the collaborative management components.

4.5 CONCLUSION
There is an increased need to further integrate the views of Māori into the impact assessment and, more generally, into the planning process. A major obstacle for Māori participation currently is the lack of understanding of Māori cultural beliefs and traditions. Te Puni Kokiri (1996) suggests that one way of overcoming this problem is to consult local iwi. However, it has been identified in this research that, in practice, consultation is not enough to provide for traditional Māori environmental management and the principles
of the Treaty of Waitangi. Thus, this research is based on Sandercock's (1998) argument that postmodern planning rejects consultation over collaborative management. The literature from Chapter Two has combined understandings from the findings of the Waiapu project and the Taharoa Domain Reserve Management Plan to formulate a set of components that are required for successful collaborative management in New Zealand. These components were formulated with the objective of evaluating the cultural impact assessment process's ability to fulfil these. However, this chapter also highlights that there is little information available on the cultural impact assessment process. Thus, further investigation of the cultural impact assessment process is required before any conclusions can be made (and, indeed, this information needs to be gathered).

The content of cultural impact assessment reports is further explored in Chapter Five, while Chapters Six and Seven investigate their process and value, their limitations and suggest improvements to the process.
5

Content Review of Cultural Impact Assessments

5.1 INTRODUCTION

Chapter Three identifies that cultural impact assessments are used to evaluate how developments or policies potentially affect the culture, beliefs, values and practices of indigenous groups. This chapter focuses on addressing objective three of the research: to assess the content and structure of cultural impact assessments. These findings are then compared and contrasted to the content and structure of environmental and social impact assessments.

In order to compare cultural impact assessments with other impact assessment reports, cultural impact assessments have been gathered from eight different tribal authorities in New Zealand. In total, 10 cultural impact assessments have been gathered, one cultural impact assessment has been gathered from each iwi, plus an extra one from each of the case study localities (discussed further in Chapters Seven and Eight). The approximate locations of these tribal authorities are illustrated in Figure 5.1. Unfortunately, because the literature on cultural impact assessments is scarce, there is no standardised or conventional tool that can be used to review their content. As a result, this research modifies Morgan's (2000) 'structured approach' to reviewing assessments of environmental effects in New Zealand, and, combines it with information gained from the literature review (Chapter Three) to formulate a reviewing structure specifically for cultural impact assessments.
Chapter Five

Content Review of Cultural Impact Assessments

Figure 5.1: Approximate locations of the iwi organisations from which the cultural impact assessments were obtained.
As noted in Chapter Three, an essential part of the environmental and social impact assessment process is reviewing the quality and content of the assessment reports (Figure 3.1, step 3). This aids in ensuring that the integrity and value of the impact assessment is maintained, thus, a structured approach is formulated to apply to cultural impact assessments. In addition to assessing the contents of a cultural impact assessment, a sound reviewing structure can also act as a guide for other iwi who may want to use or improve their use of cultural impact assessments.

The chapter begins by discussing the methodological approach used to review the 10 cultural impact assessments. The reviewing tool (known as the structure) is presented in Table 5.1. Section 5.2 explores how the structure’s components were identified. The chapter concludes by comparing the various components of a cultural impact assessment to those of an environmental and social impact assessment report.

5.2 METHODOLOGY
Morgan (2000) developed a ‘structured approach’ to reviewing the assessment of environmental effects in New Zealand. He suggests that the structured approach enables greater consistency in the review of environmental impact assessments. Furthermore, he believes that the reviewing tool he developed should aid in establishing a standard for impact assessments and make the public more aware of the process and what is expected from the assessment of environmental reports submitted in New Zealand. Similarly, it is very important that a reviewing structure is developed to assess the content and structure of cultural impact assessments to ensure they aim, as a minimum, the same standards as other impact assessment reports. Therefore, the first step in reviewing the content of the 10 cultural impact assessments is to determine indicators that should be identified within the reviewing tool. As with environmental impact assessments, a cultural impact assessment “...would only be truly effective as an environmental management tool if the assessments were of sufficient quality...” (Morgan, 2000:1). Thus, the development of a reviewing tool is a significant aid in maintaining the quality of cultural impact assessments.
Yet, Morgan's (2000) 'structured approach' is not suitable for use in this research in its existing form because it covers many aspects of the impact assessment process that are not applicable to cultural impact assessments, and does not cover other aspects specific to cultural impact assessments. Accordingly, aspects of the reviewing tool have been modified to more specifically suit the context of cultural impact assessments. A synthesis of the literature indicates four key components that it maybe useful for a cultural impact assessment to contain. Section 5.2.1 further explores and describes these components that have been combined to formulate a useful approach for the review of cultural impact assessments.

5.2.1 A Structured Approach
The reviewing tool has been divided into four key components including, description of the proposed activity and its setting, coverage of effects, mitigation and communication of information. Each of the components has been further divided into key questions, and the cultural impact assessments will be assessed against these.

Component One: Description of proposed activity and its setting
The structure commences by analysing the description of the proposed activity and its setting (see Table 5.1). As with environmental and social impact assessments (reviewed in Chapter Three), it is important for cultural impact assessments to identify clearly and describe the associated effects on iwi of an applicant's proposal. This can be achieved through detailed analysis of historical ties and discussing the value and traditional association of an area for iwi or hapu. Furthermore, this component also assesses the extent to which direct links are made between the environment (social, cultural and environmental) and the iwi and hapu. For Māori, all elements of the world are linked from a mutual descent through the gods as progeny of Rakinui (sky father) and Papatuanuku (earth mother) (previously discussed in Chapter Four) whereby people are not separated from the rest of the natural world. Therefore, it is beneficial for the cultural impact assessment to represent this holistic world view, by describing the direct links with the environment and the implications of the proposal in relation to it.
Component Two: Coverage of effects
The increased involvement and participation of the public and, more specifically, Māori has been a central theme throughout this thesis. Therefore Component Two starts by assessing whether there has been meaningful involvement of iwi in the preparation of the cultural impact assessment (Table 5.1). It is important to assess this aspect of the cultural impact assessment process because, generally, someone within the iwi undertakes the assessment on behalf of everyone else. In addition, Component Two also covers the prediction of effects of the development or proposal, evaluation and assessment of the significant impacts, and evaluation of the evidence that has been used to support these predictions.

Component Three: Mitigation
The Third Component seeks to evaluate the mitigation of adverse effects and how these measures are addressed (Table 5.1). Mitigation measures are an important aspect of impact assessment reports and a key factor in maintaining the environment. Nevertheless, some iwi or hapu, such as Kai Tahu ki Otago, do not identify mitigation within their cultural impact assessments. This is to ensure the final decision on mitigation measures is always left up to the runanga, after collaboration meetings with the proponent have taken place (further discussed in Section 6.8.1).

Component Four: Communication of information
Finally, Component Four relates to how well the cultural impact assessment communicates information (Table 5.1). Appropriate communication is required in order to ensure that the adequate dissemination of information takes place. This is essential for the success of cultural impact assessments because they are targeted at a wide range of users, both Māori and Pakeha. Therefore, it is critical for a cultural impact assessment to follow a clear and logical format.

In summary, the four components have been combined together to formulate a reviewing structure for cultural impact assessments. To determine the extent to which the 10 cultural impact assessments (from eight different iwi) contain
these components, a detailed review of each of the cultural impact assessments was carried out. In combination, the identification of all of the components could potentially lead to a more effective cultural impact assessment process, whereby the value and integrity of the assessments is maintained.

Table 5.1 - The reviewing structure for a cultural impact assessment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Description of the proposed activity and its setting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>How clearly is the environmental, cultural and social setting and associated values identified in the description?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>To what extent are the direct links of the proposal to the environment (inclusive of cultural and social aspects) clearly identified in the description?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2</th>
<th>Coverage of effects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Is there evidence of a meaningful involvement of the runanga, iwi or hapu within the cultural impact assessment?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Are clear and sound predictions made about possible cultural impacts on the iwi/hapu affected?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Are the base of predictions clearly stated throughout the cultural impact assessment (e.g. methods and supporting data)?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Do the predictions generally provide information about the nature, severity, likelihood and spatial impacts such that the implications of any cultural impact can be clearly understood?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Do the predictions take account of indirect impacts, long-term impacts and cumulative impacts?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Does the cultural impact assessment seek to link, and integrate, impacts on different parts of the environment, to provide an overall picture of the impact of the proposal?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3</th>
<th>Mitigation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Does the cultural impact assessment consider possible mitigation measures?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Are mitigation measures adequately addressed throughout the cultural impact assessment?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4</th>
<th>Communication of information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>To what extent does the cultural impact assessment follow a clear and logical format?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Is the cultural impact assessment clearly and simply organised, providing a coherent and useful study?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>How clearly is impact information summarised in a form that caters for the wide range of users of the cultural impact assessment (developers, iwi, planners, councillors and general public)?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Is the overall impact of the proposed activity on the iwi involved set out in an understandable form?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Have graphics/illustrations etc been used to aid understanding of information in the assessment?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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5.2.2 Component Identification

Tables 5.2 to 5.5 illustrate the methods used to evaluate the different components of the reviewing structure being applied to cultural impact assessments in the present research. The key questions within each component are assessed on a simple scale using 'A', 'B', 'C', and n/a (non-applicable) where appropriate. 'A' signifies that the key question of the component has been well recognised in the cultural impact assessments, 'B' means there is indirect or limited recognition of the component, and 'C' indicates when the cultural impact assessment fails to acknowledge the component at all. In order to be able to establish the differences between assessments that have a good, limited, or non-existent recognition of the key questions of each of the components, a pilot sample was undertaken on randomly-selected cultural impact assessments. The pilot study enabled a clear distinction to be drawn between the grading of each of the questions and for initial familiarisation with the content of the cultural impact assessments to take place. For example, for question eight in Table 5.1, to gain an 'A', the indirect, long term and cumulative effects had to be explained in detail in an assessment. Where these effects were stated with little explanation, or one of the effects was sufficiently explained and no explanation was given for the other effects, such as the indirect, long term or cumulative effects, a 'B' was given. The cultural impact assessments that did not mention the indirect, long term or cumulative effects received a 'C'. The 10 cultural impact assessments were each reviewed three times and this structure was used to reduce inconsistencies and ensure that the correct grade had been allocated to each of the questions within an assessment. This is because the questions relating to each of the components were located in different parts of the assessments. A summary of the identification of each of the components is shown in Tables 5.2 to 5.5 below (see appendix A for the grading details of each specific question).
Table 5.2-A summary of issue identification for key questions in Component One

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSED ACTIVITY AND SETTING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Explicit detail of both the environmental and cultural settings, and direct links between the environment and iwi and hapu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>General recognition of the environmental and cultural settings and direct links with the environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>No recognition of the environmental and cultural settings nor direct links</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Explanation: The cultural impact assessments were allocated an ‘A’ or ‘B’ for question one on the basis of whether the environmental, cultural and historical setting had been explicitly discussed. For example, an ‘A’ was given to those cultural impact assessments that clearly explained the environmental setting and recognised direct links with the environment (Table 5.2). In addition, the environmental setting needed to be clearly described at the beginning of the cultural impact assessment to set the scene and to clearly portray the importance of the area to the reader. Those cultural impact assessments that gained a ‘B’ either did not explicitly discuss the environmental setting and/or did not integrate and link the effects of the proposal in a holistic manner.

Table 5.3-A summary of issue identification for key questions in Component Two

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>COVERAGE OF EFFECTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Explicit coverage of the effects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Limited acknowledgement of effects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>No recognition of coverage of effects</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Explanation: Cultural impact assessments scoring an ‘A’ in all of the questions (questions 3 to 8 in Table 5.1) of Component Three had to include explicit coverage of the effects of the proposal (see appendix A for the grading details of each question). For example, for Question 3, cultural impact assessments had to acknowledge the involvement of either iwi, hapu or runanga throughout the development of cultural impact assessment to gain an ‘A’ (Table 5.3). For example, involvement of the iwi, hapu or runanga could be represented by stating that huis had been held and/or interviews...
had taken place, in order for the cultural impact assessments to be completed.

In Question 7 (Table 5.1), to gain an 'A' the impact assessment had to include explicit detail of the implications to the environment. For example, it was not enough for the cultural impact assessment to suggest that the marae trustees were concerned the proposal would have adverse effects, rather the detail of the specific indirect, cumulative, and long-term effects had to be documented. No recognition of the above effects resulted in a 'C.'

It is important that a cultural impact assessment seeks to link and integrate the impacts on the different parts of the environment, to ensure that an overall picture can be gained (Question 8). Cultural impact assessments that recognised the different impacts of the development but fail to integrate and explore in detail the specific impacts of the proposal received a 'B.' Those that did not recognise any links or specific details of the impacts were graded a 'C.'

Table 5.4-A summary of issue identification for key questions in Component Three

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>MITIGATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Mitigation measures considered and adequately addressed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>General recognition of mitigation measures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>No recognition of mitigation measures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>na</td>
<td>Not applicable to present mitigation in the report</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Explanation: Where a cultural impact assessment was graded an ‘A’ this indicated that mitigation measures had been considered and adequately addressed (Table 5.4). For example, safety was considered a big issue in one of the cultural impact assessments. One possible mitigation measure addressed was that some of the areas could be fenced off and pedestrian crossings could be installed. Whereas, cultural impact assessments that scored a ‘B,’ only partly recognised and addressed mitigation measures in their report. For example, one mitigation measure was the avoidance of direct impacts on the waterways of a proposed site. To gain an ‘A’, further
detail of how the avoidance would occur and how it could be addressed was required. Assessments that did not include mitigation were graded as non-applicable. Some iwi choose not to include mitigation measures within their cultural impact assessments because they believed it was one way of the iwi retaining their negotiation power (further discussed in Section 6.6).

Table 5.5-A summary of issue identification for key questions in component four

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>COMMUNICATION OF INFORMATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Cultural impact assessment has good communication of information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Limited communication of information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>No communication of information</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Explanation: Where a cultural impact assessment communicated information in a clear and integrated manner, an ‘A’ was given (Table 5.5). An integrated approach is a key to producing a report that caters for, and is accessible to, a wide range of users. For example, for question 15 those cultural impact assessments that included photos and illustrations to complement the findings might score an ‘A’. The inclusion of photos and maps in the appendix of the assessment report with no direct citing within the cultural impact assessment, only scored a ‘B’ (Table 5.5). Cultural impact assessments that scored a ‘C’ in question 15, failed to incorporate pictures, photos or maps.

5.3 SUMMARY OF COMPONENT RECOGNITION

The following table (Table 5.6) contains the results from the review of the 10 cultural impact assessments from eight different iwi groups in New Zealand (two were analysed from each of the case study locations and the case studies are discussed further in Chapter Seven). The purpose of this review is not to compare the grades given to the different cultural impact assessments but to analyse the extent to which the ideal components of an impact assessment have been achieved and where possible improvements can be made.
### Table 5.6: The review of the 10 cultural impact assessments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cultural impact assessments from different tribal authorities in New Zealand</th>
<th>Kai Tahu ki Otago (1)</th>
<th>Kai Tahu ki Otago (2)</th>
<th>Wellington Tents Trust (1)</th>
<th>Wellington Tents Trust (2)</th>
<th>Ngati Wai</th>
<th>Taiahi</th>
<th>Tuwharetoa</th>
<th>Kapakapapaui</th>
<th>Te Runanga Ngai Tahu</th>
<th>Te o Marama</th>
<th>Overall findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Description of the proposed activity and its setting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) Clarity of environmental and cultural values identified</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Extent of direct links with the environment identified</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Coverage of effects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) Evidence of meaningful iwi involvement indicated</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) Clear and sound predictions identified</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) Methods and supporting data detailed</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6) Nature, severity, and spatial impacts explained</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7) Indirect, cumulative and long term impacts identified</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8) Integration of environment identified</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Mitigation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9) Mitigation measures considered</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10) Mitigation measures adequately addressed</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Communication of information</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11) Clear &amp; logical format provided</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12) Simply organised identified</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13) Ability to cater for a wide range of users identified</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14) Overall impact set out in understandable format indicated</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15) Appropriate use of photos, graphics and maps identified</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Key:**
- **Good recognition**
- **In between good & limited recognition**
- **Limited recognition**
- **No recognition**
Sixty different iwi and hapu in New Zealand were approached to see if analysis of their cultural impact assessments could take place within this research. However, many of those contacted were too under-resourced to undertake the assessments and many did not have any knowledge about the cultural impact assessment process (see Section 6.2.1 for more details). Thus, only cultural impact assessments from eight different iwi organisations were obtained.

The cultural impact assessments used in this thesis cover a range of different sizes and proposals. These include: a large infrastructure development, developments near or on the waterways, road network expansions, and a small subdivision consent. Due to the wide range of issues and the different sizes of each of the reports, when reviewing the content of the cultural impact assessments these factors such as size and type of proposal were also taken into consideration. Specific details of each of the reports could not be disclosed because the reports had to remain non-identifiable. In addition, some of the cultural impact assessments contained confidential information. Therefore, it was important that they were retained as silent files. Sections 5.3.1 to 5.3.5 discuss further the recognition of each of the four components illustrated in the 10 cultural impact assessments, from Table 5.6.

5.3.1 Recognition of Component One
Component One was appropriately addressed in the majority of the cultural impact assessments. The first question of Component One was fully recognised in nine of the cultural impact assessments (Table 5.6). Each of the assessments gave an in-depth analysis of the historical, cultural, legislative and environmental setting of the proposed area for development. The remaining cultural impact assessment did not recognise the full implications of the proposal and only covered the setting and direct links in its conclusion. As a result, it was not clear to what extent the proposal would affect iwi or what its specific details were. On the whole, however, all of the cultural impact assessments had an excellent historical account of the traditional ties and the associated values of the proposed development area for the iwi concerned.
5.3.2 Recognition of Component Two
The adequacy of the coverage of the questions in Component Two was not as comprehensive as for Component One. The extent to which these questions were covered in the cultural impact assessments was mixed (Table 5.6). However, all provided evidence of having meaningful iwi involvement. For example, one of the Wellington Tenths Trust reports stated:

"Several formal hui have been held over the past few months to aid in the dissemination of information to iwi as well as site visits to the proposed redevelopment areas to view proposed plans and assess the impact the proposal will have on iwi. Informal meetings have also taken place between the interested parties to try and work through the various issues that have been identified."

Another cultural impact assessment indicated the involvement of iwi, hapu or runanga through the discussion of various written submissions and interviews that had taken place to compile the cultural impact assessment.

In general question 4 of Component Two was well answered and many of the assessments made clear and sound predictions about the impacts of the proposal. The predictions were judged by the extent to which they were discussed, the level of detail in their discussion, and the number of impacts predicted (when judging consideration was given to the size of the proposal). However, many of the assessments failed to provide evidence of these predictions. Predictions could have been supported with the use of additional data and findings from other sources. For example, data from scientific reports, from the National Institute of Water and Atmospheric Sciences, could have complemented the predictions and impacts. In addition, statements from iwi members that included historical and traditional accounts of an area could have been further integrated into the assessment to back up the predictions made.

The nature, severity and spatial impacts were only recognised by 50% of the cultural impact assessments. The other 50% of the cultural impact assessments failed to give detailed recognition to these impacts and, as a result, were graded 'B' (Table 5.6). Another key area that many of the cultural
impact assessments did not address properly was the indirect, cumulative and long-term impacts of the proposal. For example, one cultural impact assessment illustrated that development would cause negative social impacts, however, there was no further elaboration as to what social impacts would actually result. An example, which fully covered the cumulative effects was in the Ngai Tahu assessment. For instance, the assessment that considered the protection of a natural area also discussed the effects that maybe caused by additional visitor levels to the area. These included, the increased need for rubbish facilities and the possible introduction of giardia, and the increased demand for services to be supplied to visitors, which in return would have negative effects on the environment.

Overall, the majority of the cultural impact assessments failed to fully recognise the linking and integrating requirement of an impact assessment report (Table 5.6). In addition, many of the assessments reviewed did not provide methods and supporting data; acknowledge indirect, cumulative or long term impacts; and did not use photos, graphics or maps to assist in communicating information. The possible reasons for this are further explored in Chapter Seven. However, in general, the cultural impact assessments reviewed did provide clear arguments, had evidence of meaningful iwi involvement, made clear and sound predictions, addressed mitigation measures and communicated information with clarity and logic.

5.3.3 Recognition of Component Three

In general, mitigation measures were considered and adequately addressed in the majority of the cultural impact assessments. For example, the Wellington Tenths Trust’s assessment on a proposed infrastructure development discussed the mitigation measures that would be required for a tangi (funeral), parking, safety, noise and for the unearthing of koiti (bones) and taonga (treasures). These issues were discussed in detail and possible mitigation measures to address these were given. Yet, another cultural impact assessment, also discussing the implications of an infrastructure development only stated, “avoidance of direct impacts upon the waterways on the site and eventually the X River through uptake and discharges should be avoided.
where possible". The explanation was not detailed enough to fully address the mitigation measures required.

5.3.4 Recognition of Component Four
Component Four, like Component One, was appropriately addressed in all of the cultural impact assessments (Table 5.6). The cultural impact assessments clearly communicated information and were set out in a simple, clear and logical format. In order to help readers who were unfamiliar with the Māori world view, sections of the reports were dedicated to describing key concepts and values that underpin Māori world views. Nevertheless, only a minority of assessments used photos and maps as an additional source of information (Table 5.6). Some included maps and diagrams in appendices but failed to cite them in the assessment itself. In general, the cultural impact assessments were professional and met the needs to be able to a wide range of users.

5.3.5 Summary of the Component Recognition
Overall, Table 5.6 illustrates that the cultural impact assessments clearly identified cultural and environmental values, had evidence of meaningful iwi involvement, made sound predictions, described and considered mitigation measures, and clearly communicated information. These are essential components of a cultural impact assessment. However, the areas that the majority of the assessments failed to recognise in detail were: the linking and integrating of effects, further elaboration of the nature, severity and spatial impacts of the proposed development, recognition of supporting data; and the use of maps, pictures and photographs to clearly illustrate impacts on iwi. Unfortunately, another key area in which the cultural impact assessments failed was in integrating the impacts of the development on different parts of the environment. Possible reasons for this are explored in the Sections 5.4 and 7.3.
5.4 A STRUCTURED APPROACH TO CULTURAL IMPACT ASSESSMENTS

The purpose of this chapter is to review the content of cultural impact assessments in New Zealand using a modified version of Morgan's (2000) 'structured approach'.

As Table 5.6 shows, the chosen cultural impact assessments do follow the general impact assessment process (this is further explored in the following chapter). As with some social impact assessments, the cultural impact assessments reviewed here, also often overlap with the content of an environmental impact assessment. For example, the cultural impact assessments reviewed within this research also describe the environmental setting, which is also contained within an environmental impact assessment. However, they differ by adding a cultural perspective and give explicit detail of an iwi's historical and traditional values in an area. As a result, cultural impact assessments are a very valuable tool for ensuring that an historical record of an area is kept. However, many assessments failed to directly link back to the environment and to identify the nature, severity, spatial and/or cumulative impacts of the proposal. It has been identified in impact assessment literature that factors and activities contributing to cumulative impacts can be numerous and the ways in which these interact with the environment are often poorly understood (Tollefson & Wipond, 1998). Therefore, the lack of integration of cumulative impacts is a key weakness for many impact assessment reports, not just cultural impact assessments.

In addition some of the cultural impact assessments reviewed did not integrate and link the overall impacts of the report. Possible reasons that this did not happen include the fact that iwi are under tight time-frames to complete reports, and that some iwi have limited capacity to produce detailed cultural impact assessments and to realise the full implications of an activity. As previously discussed (Chapter Three), O'Farrellough (1999) believes that a major obstacle for the active participation of indigenous cultures is their ability to obtain the technical information and expertise required in the
impact assessment process. (These limitations and other constraints of the cultural impact assessment process are explored in Section 7.3).

In general, Component Two of the structure was well-recognised in all of the cultural impact assessments reviewed. In particular, they all clearly illustrated active involvement of tribal members in the information gathering stage of the reports. Morgan (1998) comments that public involvement remains low throughout the environmental impact assessment process. Therefore, the inclusion of iwi members within this stage of the cultural impact assessments is a positive step forward to increasing participation in the impact assessment process. (The extent to which iwi members participate in the process is further explored in Chapters Six and Seven).

In summary, this chapter has illustrated that the cultural impact assessment process has the potential to be used as a tool for involving iwi in the impact assessment process. As a tool, it can used to identify their views and predicted impacts on them from the proposal. In addition, cultural impact assessments identify both positive and negative effects, gather the views of the affected parties, and provide possible ways to remedy, avoid or mitigate the adverse impacts to iwi. They are also written in a clear and logical format that could be understood by a wide range of users. However, they fail to fully recognise some key elements of an impact assessment report. These issues are further explored in Chapters Six and Seven.

5.5 CONCLUSION

The reviewing tool is only the starting point for gaining a greater understanding of the cultural impact assessment process that currently exists in New Zealand. This chapter has discussed the process involved in developing a reviewing tool for a cultural impact assessment. The structured approach to reviewing a cultural impact assessment has been formulated, combining the works of Morgan (2000) with additional information from both environmental impact assessment theory and social impact assessment theory.
Overall, the cultural impact assessments follow a very similar process to that of other impact assessments. However, the review of cultural impact assessments from New Zealand does not provide detailed analysis of the opportunities and limitations of the process. Thus, Chapter Six undertakes a detailed investigation of the cultural impact assessment process using the case studies, Kai Tahu ki Otago and the Wellington Tenths Trust.
6

The Cultural Impact Assessment Process

6.1 INTRODUCTION
Having examined the national context and the content of cultural impact assessments in New Zealand, it is now important to analyse the contexts from which these reports originate. The purpose of this chapter and Chapter Seven is to investigate the process of cultural impact assessments from two completely different tribal authorities, Kai Tahu ki Otago and the Wellington Tenths Trust (known as the Trust) (Figure 6.1 & 6.2 illustrate the different locations of each of these organisations). In doing this, Chapter Six thus addresses part of objective four of the research: analyse the process of cultural impact assessments as a participatory tool for promoting collaborative management.

Through the investigation of Kai Tahu ki Otago and the Wellington Tenths Trust, this thesis provides an in-depth analysis of the cultural impact assessment processes that are currently taking place within the two organisations. Both tribal authorities have a well-established system for undertaking cultural impact assessments and use them as a resource management tool.
Chapter Six

The chapter begins by presenting, in Section 6.2, the methodological approach, used to gather information from Kai Tahu ki Otago and the Trust. The methodological approach is integrated throughout Chapters One, Five and Six. This is because this thesis has used a range of data collection techniques, thus, integrating the methodology throughout these chapters enables the methodology to be directly linked with the results gained.

These methods of data collection include analysing the use of case studies, the history of Kai Tahu ki Otago and the Trust, data collection procedures, semi-structured interviews, and the data analysis process. Sections 6.3 through to 6.9 analyse the cultural impact assessment process for Kai Tahu ki Otago and the Wellington Tenths Trust. The analysis of the results includes the following topics relating to cultural impact assessments: a review of their initiation process, involvement of iwi, their structure, and RMA obligations, and the incorporation of the cultural impact assessment into the final environmental impact assessment. The chapter concludes with a flow diagram to represent the cultural impact assessment process. Therefore, this chapter investigates the process itself. Chapter Seven further evaluates the cultural impact assessment process through the exploration of its value, limitations and possible future improvements to it at both the local (for Otago and Wellington) and national level.

6.2 METHODOLOGY

The methods of data collection for this research comprise three main components: a literature review of the theory of collaborative management and impact assessment theory, a review of cultural impact assessments in New Zealand, and semi-structured interviews from case study locations. As previously discussed, the methodology of achieving the first two components (literature review and review of the cultural impact assessments) of data collection has already been discussed in Chapters One (Section 1.8.1) and Five (Section 5.2). Sections 6.2.1 to 6.4.3 discuss the use of case studies, the semi-structured interview technique, and the interpretation and analysis of the data presented in Chapters Six and Seven.
6.2.1 The Use of Case Studies

The use of case studies is common in social research, especially when dealing with the issue of public participation. A major strength of using case studies is that a range of evidence can be collected from many sources (Yin, 1994). For example, this evidence can include the use of documents and interviews. However, there is potential that case studies do not give a true representation of the world (Stake, 1995). Miles and Huberman (1994) suggest that this is a major "pitfall" of qualitative research, because it involves sampling using a non-representative technique. However, the purpose of this research is not to fulfil such an obligation. In other words, the main purpose of this research is not to achieve a representative sample but to investigate an area of planning where little research has taken place. The present research is an initial step in developing a greater understanding of the process, value and structure of cultural impact assessments and their potential as a tool for increasing Māori participation in planning. Thus, using this methodology enables the researcher to gain a more in-depth understanding of the issues associated with the implementation of cultural impact assessments and their ability to increase the participation of tangata whenua in planning.

Kai Tahu ki Otago and the Wellington Tenths Trust have been selected for this study because they both have in place an established system for undertaking cultural impact assessments. Sixty other iwi and hapu groups were also approached, but many were too under-resourced to implement cultural impact assessments. Among some of those that do undertake cultural impact assessments, there was a reluctance to participate in the research because of the time involved and the lack of resources, such as human capacity available. For many of these iwi and hapu, only one person was responsible for their resource management enquiries. Therefore, the majority of those contacted were already too stretched for time, and as a result did not want to participate.

Many of those iwi and hapu who do not carry out cultural impact assessments indicated a desire to gain further knowledge about the process. This is because they are interested in learning from the experiences of others and increasing...
their knowledge of the ability of cultural impact assessments to increase their participation in planning.

Logistical limitations for carrying out the research also limited the selection of the case studies to only two. These additional limitations included, restricted time frames, financial constraints and transportation difficulties. Ideally, it would have been useful to carry out a number of case studies, to evaluate further cultural impact assessment processes in greater depth than that obtained from the review of the content of cultural impact assessments in Chapter Five alone. Thus, these logistical limitations, combined with the reluctance of some iwi and hapu to be involved in this research, and the fact that only a minority of iwi and hapu groups undertake cultural impact assessments, limited the selection of case studies to only two. Further analysis of the two case studies takes places in Section 6.3. Data was collected from these organisations via semi-structured interviews, the data collection methods are explored below.

### 6.2.2 Data Collection

In the present research semi-structured interviews in Otago and Wellington were undertaken with key people involved in the cultural impact assessment process. Interviews were considered appropriate because the research involved the participation of a wide variety of groups and, because, when researching Māori, it is best to use kanohi ki kanohi, eye-to-eye contact between people who need to communicate with each other. The interviews were important for gaining an understanding of the role that each interviewee plays (discussed further below) in the cultural impact assessment process.

In total, 26 informants were interviewed. Twenty-one of the interviews were conducted in person, three via email and two over the phone. Those interviewed included iwi, iwi officials, developers, planning consultants, local authorities, and national agency perspectives (Ministry for the Environment and the Parliamentary Commissioner for the Environment) (see Table 4.1). Runanga in Otago and Wellington were emailed and asked how they would
prefer the information on their views and aspirations for the cultural impact assessment process to be gathered. In Otago, the four runanga preferred email correspondence, while in Wellington, phone interviews and email were the forms of communication preferred by iwi key informants. Therefore, the research method of this thesis had to be adapted to suit the needs of the iwi and runanga members who were being interviewed (further explored in Section 6.2.4).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LOCAL LEVEL</th>
<th>Otago</th>
<th>Wellington</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Three cultural impact assessment writers</td>
<td>• One cultural impact assessment writer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Two runanga key informants</td>
<td>• Two iwi key informants</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Two planning consultants</td>
<td>• Four planning consultants</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Four developers</td>
<td>• Two developers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Two local authority key informants</td>
<td>• One local authority key informant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• One peer reviewer of the cultural impact assessments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NATIONAL LEVEL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Key informants from</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>➢ Ministry for the Environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>➢ Parliamentary Commissioner for the Environment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Initially, it was also hoped that key informants from the Otago and Wellington regional councils would also participate in the research. However, the numerous attempts to contact people within these authorities who have dealt with cultural impact assessments were unsuccessful. Possible reasons for this are that the regional councils do not often see the cultural impact assessment in its complete form, as it is often integrated within environmental impact assessments. Hence, this collaboration and consultation process occurs prior to the submission of the environmental impact assessment to the consent granting authority.
6.2.3 Semi-Structured Interviews

The use of semi-structured interviewing was helpful in gaining an understanding of the structure, process and value of cultural impact assessments. As Stake (1995:64) suggests “the interview is the main road to multiple realities”. Minichiello et al., (1990) also describe interviews as a method by which the researcher gains access to the private interpretations that individuals hold. Lincoln and Guba maintain that the use of a human as an instrument is a “responsive, adaptable and holistic” way of gathering information (cited in Maykut & Moorehouse, 1994:26). As a technique, the semi-structured interview is able to provide insights into different debates of the cultural impact assessment process. It allows for comparison to take place between the cultural impact assessment processes of Otago and Wellington, and the analysis of the different views of iwi, developers, planning consultants and local authorities in each of these regions.

Key informants from Otago and Wellington were selected using a purposive sampling technique. Selection was based primarily on a sample of experienced and knowledgeable participants involved in the cultural impact assessment process from each of the areas (Table 6.1). Key informants were firstly contacted via email and then followed up by a phone call a few days later. Interviews were then organised at times that were most convenient for the informant. Information sheets and consent forms were sent out prior to holding the interviews (see appendix B).

At the interviews key informants were asked a different set of questions depending on the aspect of cultural impact assessment implementation they were involved in. An interview guide was developed around a list of topics derived from the review of literature (Chapter Two and Three) and based upon the identified gaps in cultural impact assessment research in New Zealand. The questions were formulated to reflect the varying nature of the information sought (located in appendix C). For example, iwi and runanga members were asked questions based upon about the strengths and limitations of Kai Tahu ki Otago and the Trust undertaking cultural impact assessment on their behalf. While, the writers of the cultural impact assessments were asked specifics
about the structure and process of the reports. In general, the questions were based upon the following subjects:

- Background involvement with cultural impact assessment
- Strengths/limitations of cultural impact assessment process
- Value of cultural impact assessments as a participation tool
- Potential improvements to the current cultural impact assessment process

The wording of the interview questions was not fixed or ordered and questions were asked according to the person who was being interviewed. This form of questioning may have reduced the comparability of interviews, however, a broader understanding of the role and views of the informants was gained via this interview process (Minichiello et al., 1990). As the interviews were the main source of information for this research, they were tape recorded and transcribed, thus, allowing for accurate analysis.

6.2.4 Email and Phone Interviews

As previously discussed, kanohi ki kanohi (eye to eye contact) is the preferred form of traditional communication among Māori. However, due to the time restrictions of the runanga and various iwi members in Otago and Wellington, some informants preferred the interview to occur via email or phone. The benefits of email and phone interviews are that they provide a neutral environment in which the respondents can answer sensitive questions. This method also allowed for greater time flexibility, as respondents were able to answer the questions when it was convenient for them. In addition, email correspondence occurred with other iwi authorities around New Zealand. Their emails discussed the issues and limitations that inhibit them from undertaking cultural impact assessments and the information gathered has have been integrated into the findings of Chapter Seven.

6.2.5 Data Analysis and Interpretation of Interviews

The data from the key informant interviews were summarized and categorized initially according to questions and, later, into specific themes. Qualitative data were separated into manageable segments so as to be analysed efficiently
(Jackson, 2001). The interviews were firstly examined separately and a coding system was used to identify the different themes throughout them. These themes included: the structure and process of cultural impact assessments, iwi and runanga involvement, RMA obligations, the incorporation of the cultural impact assessment into the environmental impact assessment, and the value, limitations, and future improvements for the assessments. Once these themes had been established, the data were then examined as a whole. The separation of data into these different themes assisted in processing and grouping similar ideas, and allowed for a more systematic procedure (Minichiello et al., 1990). Furthermore, this approach minimizes the temptation of jumping to inaccurate conclusions (Jackson, 2001). This form of analysis can be described as interpretative and descriptive because the specific themes are also related directly back to the findings in the literature review on the collaborative and impact assessment theories. Thus, the approach attempts to narrow the theory practice gap and investigate areas of the cultural impact assessment process that need to be improved. The analysis of the cultural impact assessment process for Kai Tahu ki Otago and the Wellington Tenths Trust begins by the exploration of the background structure of these organisations and their history of cultural impact assessment use.

6.3 BACKGROUND OF THE TWO CASE STUDIES

As previously outlined, this study investigates the cultural impact assessment processes of Kai Tahu ki Otago and the Wellington Tenths Trust. It is important to understand the background of the iwi organisations that these reports have originated from, as it may highlight some of the requirements needed to carry out a cultural impact assessment. The following sub-sections discuss the background and structures of the two organisations chosen, Kai Tahu ki Otago and the Wellington Tenths Trust.

6.3.1 Kai Tahu ki Otago

In 1995, the four Papatipu Runanga of Otago (Moeraki, Puketeraki, Otakou and Hokonui) produced the Kai Tahu ki Otago Natural Resource Management Plan (Kai Tahu ki Otago, 1995). As a result, the Otago Runanga developed the
consultancy office known as Kai Tahu ki Otago Ltd (Kai Tahu ki Otago, pers. Comm. 2003). The office is an independent company, owned and operated by the four runanga. Kai Tahu ki Otago is responsible for assessing and processing all resource management inquiries in the Otago region that contain aspects that may impact on iwi interests and require iwi consultation (Kai Tahu ki Otago, pers. comm. 2003). Kai Tahu ki Otago has a Memorandum of Understanding/Protocol with all councils in Otago. These include the Otago Regional and Dunedin City, Waitaki District, Queenstown Lakes District, Central Otago District and the Clutha District Councils that define the process for facilitating Kai Tahu involvement and consultation in the councils' resource consent processes (Figure 6.1 shows the approximate territorial boundaries of Kai Tahu ki Otago). It is important to note that the protocols are with the Runanga, not with Kai Tahu ki Otago (Nelson, pers. comm. 2003). Kai Tahu ki Otago are mentioned in the documents, as the runangas appointed an iwi office to facilitate consultation and information (Nelson, pers. comm. 2003).

Kai Tahu ki Otago’s staff are very experienced in iwi planning processes, environmental evaluation and cultural matters. Their expertise and knowledge in relation to environmental matters enables them to undertake cultural impact assessments for clients as part of the environmental impact assessment process for notified resource consent applications (Kai Tahu ki Otago, pers. comm. 2003). In addition, they provide an authoritative report or comment on all resource applications (both prior to and after lodging with a council) that have an element of iwi interest. The iwi office consults with the affected runanga, or whanau roopu, on behalf of the resource consent applicant. Thus, the expertise and knowledge that Kai Tahu ki Otago have regarding resource management concerns and cultural impact assessments were a key reason for their selection as a case study. The insights and experiences of Kai Tahu ki Otago were expected to aid in achieving the objectives of this research.
Figure 6.1: Approximate territorial boundary of Kai Tahu ki Otago.
6.3.2 The Wellington Tenths Trust

The Wellington Tenths Trust (the Trust) has a completely different history to that of Kai Tahu ki Otago. However, like Kai Tahu ki Otago, it also has a long history, of approximately 10 years, of using cultural impact assessments as a planning tool. The Trust is an iwi authority formed in 1888 by a judgement in the Māori Land Court. Therefore, it represents the original owners in 1839 who signed the land settlement deed with Wakefield, as recorded in the Maori Land Court in 1888 (see Figure 6.2 for approximate territorial boundaries of the Wellington Tenths Trust). It is New Zealand's oldest trust and is responsible for managing the combined assets of more than $50 million (Indigenous Peoples Abroad, 2003). The Trust was administered by the public trustee and later the Māori trustee until 1987, when it finally came into control of the beneficial owners. The present owners are the descendents of the original owners who participated in the sale of Wellington to the New Zealand company (the Trust, key informant 1) (see Figure 6.2 for location in New Zealand and approximate territorial boundaries). Therefore, the Trust itself is a land trust under the Te Ture Whenua Māori Act 1993. Under this Act, the transfer of land to Māori is customary, whether it be as customary or freehold land (Te Puni Kokiri, 1996).

The Trust represents seven iwi, and the main tangata whenua group around Wellington harbour, Te Atiawa, who originated from Nga Motu (New Plymouth). Other tribes who also arrived from the Taranaki area during the 19th century include, Tarankai tuturu, Ngati Tama, Ngati Mutunga, Ngati Ruanui, Ngati Ruahine, Ngati Maru and Nga Rauru. From these stem a number of different hapu who reside in the Wellington region. Generally these iwi are represented by the WTT, but they are also represented in Hutt Valley within Te Rununganui o Taranaki whanui ki Te Upoko o te ika. These two organisations (the Wellington Tenths Trust and Te Rununganui o Taranaki whanui ki Te Upoko o te ika), together with the tangata whenua marae make up Wellington's principle tangata whenua organisation (Love, 1997).
Figure 6.2: Approximate territorial boundary of the Wellington Tenths Trust.
Like Kai Tahu ki Otago, the Wellington Tenths Trust members are very experienced in iwi planning processes, environmental evaluation and cultural matters. They also have had a resource management plan since 1995. Most of the people that work for the Trust are volunteers and tasks are carried out in their spare time. In addition, only one person undertakes the majority of the cultural impact assessments and resource management enquiries.

The Trust is also a good example of an iwi organisation that has a history of resource management and cultural impact assessment experience. Their insights and procedures for undertaking cultural impact assessments provided a useful comparison to the processes and techniques used by Kai Tahu ki Otago.

6.3.3 Conclusion
Kai Tahu ki Otago and the Wellington Tenths Trust share many common attributes. They both have a well-established system for dealing with resource management concerns. They both have researchers who are experienced in locating historical material who have skills in a variety of fields, which include te reo Māori and environmental management. These skills give the two organisations the ability to gather the recorded histories of sites, and information relating to the traditional values and activities associated with an area. In addition, both Kai Tahu ki Otago and the Trust has an established network system that provides regular contact with their tangata whenua. These contacts are essential for identifying unrecorded sites of cultural significance and promoting the increased involvement of tangata whenua in the planning process. Examples of this include the Wellington Tenths Trust geographic information system that has recorded particular sites of cultural significance.

In addition, each organisation has an iwi resource management plan. These plans provide a very strong basis from which consultation and collaboration with iwi can be facilitated. The iwi resource management plans are documents that provide guidance on the issues, values and organisational structure of the iwi (Anich, 1995). A Ministry for the Environment key informant interviewed
for the present research believed that cultural impact assessments are a logical extension from these resource management plans. The cultural impact assessment processes of the two organisations are explored further below.

6.4 THE CULTURAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT PROCESS
The previous section highlighted the background of Kai Tahu ki Otago and the Trust, and their history of cultural impact assessment use. Therefore, this section discusses the results from the semi-structured interviews, and in doing so, centres on comparing and contrasting the cultural impact assessment process of Kai Tahu ki Otago and the Wellington Tenths Trust. Sections 6.4 to 6.9 link the findings from the case study analysis to the literature discussed in Chapters Two, Three and Four. The investigation of the cultural impact assessment process begins by exploring the initiation process of the reports (defined further in Section 6.5), involvement of iwi, an analysis of their structure, RMA obligations and the incorporation of the cultural impact assessment into the environmental impact assessment, then follows. The chapter concludes with a synthesis of the results from each of these sections. However, the analysis of the cultural impact assessment process begins with an investigation of how the reports are initiated.

6.5 CULTURAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT INITIATION
The understanding of the cultural impact assessment process for Kai Tahu ki Otago and the Trust begins by exploring the processes through which these assessments are initiated. The initiation of cultural impact assessments is the term associated with the consultation and collaboration process, which results in the commissioning of a cultural impact assessment. The ability of the cultural impact assessment process to involve iwi at the outset of a development is identified as a key component of collaborative management.

The initiation process in cultural impact assessments is very similar for both organisations. The development of a cultural impact assessment is a natural progression from discussion and consultation with the parties involved.
Currently, for Kai Tahi ki Otago and the Trust, the initiation process occurs two ways: firstly, through consultation with the iwi or, secondly, as a result of a direct request by the applicant for a cultural impact assessment to be commissioned.

In the first instance, the developer, planning consultant or local authority approaches Kai Tahu ki Otago or the Wellington Tenths Trust and discusses a proposal's implications. Kai Tahu ki Otago key informant 2 suggests that:

"We try to point out to them why it is important that these issues be addressed at an early stage in the project. If they want to carry on with the proposal, we can supply them a terms of reference, which outlines that the cultural impact assessment is a professional document, its costs, outputs and what we are going to deliver."

The applicants in Otago also support this statement. For example, the Dunedin City Council key informant 1 acknowledges, "We actually sit down and talk through the different processes. That gets you to an end point, where there is understanding from both sides". Similarly, the Wellington City Council key informant notes, "The cultural impact assessment was initiated after consultation meetings with the Wellington Tenths Trust". Therefore, the strength of the cultural impact assessment process is that goals, objectives and outcomes are discussed at the beginning of the process. Thus, the expectations of the two parties are clearly defined at the outset.

In general, if there are any major cultural interests that need to be taken into account, both Kai Tahu ki Otago and the Trust request that a cultural impact assessment be commissioned. For example, the Otago runanga request that Kai Tahu ki Otago seek a cultural impact assessment to be commissioned when the effects of the proposal are going to be major and the area has known archaeological sites or is an area of traditional or cultural significance.

Kai Tahu ki Otago and the Trust acknowledge that the second way a cultural impact assessment can be initiated is by a direct approach from the developers, planning consultants and local authorities for a cultural impact assessment to be commissioned. For example, a Kai Tahu ki Otago key
informant (2) states “now they come and say to us this development is going to be bigger than usual, we think we may need a cultural impact assessment done on it. It is good that applicants are starting to think that way”. This is a direct reflection of applicants becoming more educated on the value and practice of the reports in the Otago and Wellington regions. Again, both iwi authorities emphasise that it has taken time to build up relationships and reputations to the extent where applicants request cultural impact assessments. Thus, an attribute of the cultural impact assessment process in Otago and Wellington is that applicants are in some circumstances actively seeking to incorporate the views of tangata whenua into the impact assessment process.

However, it is only when the scale and development of the proposal has a significant affect on iwi that it warrants the need for a cultural impact assessment to be commissioned. For instance, a Kai Tahu ki Otago key informant (2) acknowledges “for the run of the mill resource consent you can’t justify having a cultural impact assessment, if there are really no issues”. Likewise, a planning consultant (1) in Otago states, “For a lot of proposals and little things, bridges and road works, cultural impact assessments aren’t necessary”. Therefore, cultural impact assessments are always going to be relative to the scale and intensity of the project that is being proposed. This is very similar to the screening phase of environmental impact assessments (in New Zealand, all proposals require an environmental impact assessment). In this phase, proposals are evaluated to determine whether or not developments require a cultural impact assessment. Therefore, another strength of the cultural impact assessment process in this research is that this screening phase avoided unnecessary assessment of developments that do not significantly affect iwi.

All of the developers, planning consultants and local authorities from both Otago and Wellington stress that cultural impact assessments are only a small part of the process, and that they should only take place after extensive consultation and discussion. For example, the Dunedin City Council key informant (1) set up a working party and additional iwi collaboration meetings
to discuss relevant issues of its proposal, (which is a large infrastructure development that involved modification of the coastal marine area) before it was even determined that a cultural impact assessment would be necessary. As a direct result of these collaboration and consultation meetings, it was agreed that a cultural impact assessment would be the most effective way of representing the impacts of the proposed development on iwi. A planning consultant (1) from Wellington suggests that in one instance, commissioning the cultural impact assessment was a mutual expectation. The cultural impact assessment was:

"...done towards the end of a lot of discussion, involvement and consultation. So the cultural impact assessment comes out at the end of that process and the people that I've been involved with seem to think that is the best way of doing it. Therefore it becomes part of a collaborative process rather than just being a special study that happens and gets thrown into the mix."

In summary, evidence from the key informant interviews suggests that cultural impact assessments for both Kai Tahu ki Otago and the Trust are an outcome of collaboration and consultation meetings between applicants and iwi. As previously, outlined in Chapter Four, applicants for resource consent have an obligation to consult with Māori. Hence, the initiation process of the cultural impact assessments for the two chosen cases studies illustrates that applicants are going one step further than just consulting with Māori. The applicants interviewed for this research are actively seeking to gain the views of tangata whenua and integrate them in the impact assessment process (the degree to which, these views are incorporated into the final environmental impact assessment are explored in Section 6.9).

Like the screening stage of some international countries' environmental impact assessments, only those activities that have significant impacts on iwi warrant the commissioning of a cultural impact assessment. This is very important for maintaining the quality and integrity of the assessments. There is danger that if cultural impact assessments are carried out indiscriminately, then their worth could be undermined. Therefore, it is essential that cultural impact assessments continue to be used only when developments have
significant impacts on iwi. Again, this reiterates the importance of collaboration and consultation prior to the commissioning of the cultural impact assessment. Therefore, the strengths of using a tool such as a cultural impact assessment for iwi, are that this is part of a process that is promoting their increased participation in planning.

In addition, all of the applicants believe that the reason the cultural impact assessments they have been involved in worked so successfully was that the two organisations were very pragmatic and realistic about the situation. One Otago developer sums it up by suggesting “at the end of the day I think Kai Tahu ki Otago could make it really awkward, a lot more awkward than they do”.

After it has been determined that a cultural impact assessment should be commissioned, the next step for Kai Tahu ki Otago and the Trust is to gather information for the reports. The results of this research suggest that the main sources of information for the cultural impact assessments are collected from the concerned iwi and runanga. As a result, Section 6.6 investigates how Kai Tahu ki Otago and the Wellington Tenths Trust involve their iwi and runanga in the cultural impact assessment process.

6.6 INVOLVEMENT OF IWI

The impact assessment literature review in Chapter Three reveals that a key area of concern of this process is the lack of public involvement throughout. Likewise, a key component of the literature dealing with the participation of Māori in planning focuses on the extent to which they are involved, and possible strategies that could be employed to increase Māori participation in the planning process. In light of this, the purpose of this section is to evaluate the processes of Kai Tahu ki Otago and the Trust to determine the nature of iwi involvement in the development of their cultural impact assessments. Firstly, the two case studies are reviewed separately, while, Section 6.6.3 contains a synthesis of the similarities and differences of the involvement procedures of Kai Tahu ki Otago and the Trust.
Chapter Six The Cultural Impact Assessment Process

6.6.1 Kai Tahi ki Otago

For Kai Tahu ki Otago, the process of involving runanga in the cultural impact assessment process begins by Kai Tahu ki Otago representatives discussing kanohi ki kanohi (eye to eye) with the runanga the issues and implications of the application. In many instances, a hui is held where all those who are interested in the application are able to express their views and share their knowledge. A Kai Tahu ki Otago key informant (2) states “So you inform the runanga about the development in simple terms and then you start asking them questions and this process usually lasts for three days”. In this respect, the methodology used to gather the information from the runanga is a combination of holding interviews and a hui. Furthermore, the hui allows the views of the runanga to be gathered via a traditional medium of communication. This means it is not necessary to use alien forms of gathering information; this is a key limitation of the impact assessment process identified in Section 3.3.6. Runanga members are also able to participate by supplying manuscripts, photos and stories. Kai Tahu key informant 1 highlights the importance of incorporating the runanga's views into the process by stating “There are people in the runanga who have a vast amount of knowledge”.

The extent to which Kai Tahu ki Otago include runanga members in the cultural impact assessment process is also highlighted within the content of the cultural impact assessment reports themselves. For example, a cultural impact assessment for a large infrastructure development contains the following comment, “A total of 40 interviews with Kai Tahu ki Otago informants and some quotes have been included as a testament to the attitudes and feelings of Kai Tahu whanui.”

They also involve the runanga in the reviewing stage of the cultural impact assessment (Step three of the environmental impact assessment process in Figure 3.1). A draft version of the report is sent to the runanga for comment and the report is not released until all four runanga have signed it off. Therefore, Kai Tahu ki Otago make a conscious effort to promote the accurate
representation of the runanga's views. A key informant of Kai Tahu ki Otago (2) states, "If we did not get it checked over by the runanga we could get in so much trouble". This thesis argues that this quality control process is essential for the success of Kai Tahu ki Otago’s cultural impact assessments. This is because these reports could potentially be used in the future to determine the interests of the runanga. Therefore, it is important that the runanga are involved in all stages of the process, because they each have different policies, aspirations, and values, and different people in the area have different memories of how their forefathers used the land.

6.6.2 The Wellington Tenths Trust

The Wellington Tenths Trust is a land trust under the Te Ture Whenua Māori Act 1992. It is the iwi authority, wainuiamata, and represents more than one tribal grouping from Taranaki. Therefore, the process of involvement and quality control contrasts greatly to the earlier process described for Kai Tahu ki Otago. Like Kai Tahu ki Otago, the Trust also holds huis and meetings with tribal members who want to participate in the process. A Trust key informant (1) notes "We have consultation hui particularly on a major project, where part of the cost of the cultural impact assessment was too set this hui up".

Like Kai Tahu ki Otago, the involvement of iwi is also made clear within their cultural impact assessments. For example, one of the Trust’s cultural impact assessments, which involved proposed modification of the coastal marine area states:

"Several hui have taken place over the past few months to aid in the dissemination of information to the Tenth’s beneficiaries as well as site visits to proposed development area and presentations from the project team."

Furthermore, the Trust key informant (1) also discusses how, on some occasions, they hire buses and take people onsite. This allows anecdotal evidence to be collected and is an opportunity for iwi to understand the full implications of the development.
The Trust also has procedures for reviewing the cultural impact assessments. Reviewing occurs via a peer reviewer at the Wellington Tenths Trust (Trust key informant 2). A peer reviewer is someone within the Trust who checks over the content and quality of the reports, to make sure they are a satisfactory representation of the Trust's views. This can be advantageous for determining whether the statements made within the cultural impact assessment represent the viewpoints and statements of the Trust as a collective. The cultural impact assessment also becomes a public document so members of the Trust have access to it and have the potential to contribute further comments.

6.6.3 Conclusion
Despite the different structures of Kai Tahu ki Otago and the Wellington Tenths Trust, the analysis of the results indicates that the cultural impact assessment process for these organisations fosters an inclusive style of planning. The key to the success of the process is that information can be gathered and shared in a non-technical manner. Iwi members are also able to participate in the planning process in an environment that they are familiar with. However, further research is required to determine how effective this process is for obtaining and representing the information of the collective. This is of particular importance for the Trust who represent seven different iwi in the Wellington area. This section has illustrated how Kai Tahu ki Otago and the Trust involve their iwi and runanga members in the cultural impact assessment process. The following section explores how this information is pulled together, through an analysis of each of the case studies cultural impact assessment structures.

6.7 CULTURAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT STRUCTURE
Chapter Five reviewed the structure of a cultural impact assessment so as to compare its contents to those of the environmental and social impact assessments. In addition, Section 6.6 illustrates how information is gathered from the iwi and runanga of the two case studies. Hence, this section evaluates how this information is incorporated into the cultural impact assessment. It compares and contrasts the cultural impact assessment structures of Kai Tahu
ki Otago and the Wellington Tenths Trust, linking them back to the issues discussed previously in Chapter Five.

6.7.1 Kai Tahu ki Otago

Kai Tahu ki Otago believe that the structures of their cultural impact assessments are very different from those of other impact assessment reports. Generally speaking, the structure of the cultural impact assessment is highly dependent on its purpose and the size of the project.

A Kai Tahu ki Otago key informant (1) states that they are commissioned to undertake cultural impact assessments for two reasons: education and resource consent purposes. For example, a cultural impact assessment can be commissioned for companies that want to raise awareness of Māori values and traditions within their organisation. Kai Tahu ki Otago key informant (3) says that the cultural impact assessment is “a tool to assist their best practice, so it is not political like a resource consent”. Thus, it seems that the structure and purpose of this type of cultural impact assessment is very different from those that address resource consent issues. For the purposes of this research, only the process and structure of cultural impact assessments for resource consent purposes are reviewed.

Kai Tahu ki Otago key informant 1 suggests that the cultural impact assessments that they undertake are directly associated with Section 6(e) of the RMA. This is because the cultural impact assessment describes the cultural association with lands, resources and other taonga (treasures). Therefore, part of a cultural impact assessment is dedicated to documenting the runanga’s historical association with the land. This is probably equivalent to describing the existing environment in an environmental impact assessment (previously discussed in Section 3.2). However, they place emphasis on the traditional association of the area rather than on simply describing the existing environment (the value of documenting history for iwi groups is further explored in Section 7.2.5).
Secondly, the cultural impact assessment investigates how this traditional association with lands, resources and taonga is potentially impacted by a particular development. This involves describing the setting and how it relates to Sections 6(e), 7(a) and 8 of the RMA. For example, Kai Tahu ki Otago key informant 1 suggests that "there are three bits in the Act that empower Māori, so you have to set the scene or the context for this". Therefore, the implications of these three sections need to be explored in the context of the development, prior to discussing the impacts of the proposal. However, Kai Tahu ki Otago key informant 2, also emphasises that they do not need to validate why they need to be involved within the impact assessment process, as this is already substantiated within the Treaty of Waitangi and the RMA. This is a key area where their cultural impact assessments have changed, because key informant 2 suggests that:

"In the early days of assessments the first part of the cultural impact assessment was spent justifying why we are taking part in this process. Looking at the Treaty and the RMA we don’t need to do that anymore."

This illustrates that, due to the obligations of the Treaty of Waitangi and the RMA, Māori are required to be involved in the impact assessment process.

As with other impact assessment reports, the process has many limitations and Kai Tahu ki Otago believe it is important that these are stated within the report. Kai Tahu ki Otago key informant (2) discusses the limitations that were encountered by them when trying to undertake a cultural impact assessment for a renewal of resource consents for a large infrastructure development. He states "Some property owners would not let us on to their site because they did not like the applicants". It is essential that the shortfalls, as in the previous example, are acknowledged within the cultural impact assessment. This then informs the applicant of what is and is not achieved by the assessment (further limitations of the ability of iwi to undertake cultural impact assessments are investigated in Section 7.3).
In contrast to the structure of environmental and social impact assessments previously discussed in Chapter Three, mitigation is not included in Kai Tahu ki Otago's cultural impact assessments. The omission of mitigation is justified by Kai Tahu ki Otago as a way of ensuring that runanga members maintain their power over mitigation measures. This power is retained because the two parties have to then collaborate together to formulate mitigation measures after the submission of a cultural impact assessment. However, this is a key weakness of Kai Tahu ki Otago’s cultural impact assessment process. It was indicated in Section 3.2.2 that mitigation is a key part of the impact assessment process. Mitigation measures offer the applicant more guidance on the needs to be addressed and open the discussion for further negotiation and collaboration to take place. For outcomes to be achieved, an organisation must have the capacity and competence within its runanga or iwi to be able to identify meaningful and appropriate mitigation measures. Hence, for Kai Tahu ki Otago, the collaboration meetings after the submission of the cultural impact assessment are an essential part of their process for negotiating mitigation measures.

Kai Tahu ki Otago believe that the structure and role of cultural impact assessments has dramatically changed over the years. Kai Tahu ki Otago key informant 3 describes cultural impact assessments as evolving documents and suggests their value in planning is becoming more widely acknowledged. In addition, evidence from the key informant interviews illustrates that there can be no one universal structure for cultural impact assessments, as the content and structure of these reports is highly dependent on the assessments size and purpose. For example, Project X, which was a large infrastructure development, was predicted to have a very significant impact on Kai Tahu. This is because it was proposed to be in an area of great importance to the iwi. Therefore this proposal required a large cultural impact assessment to be commissioned. However, cultural impact assessments for smaller proposals do not need to be as detailed as those of bigger projects.

Generally, Kai Tahu Ki Otago's cultural impact assessments contain a segment on the traditional association with the land, cultural association with lands,
resources and other taonga and the impacts of a proposed development. The cultural impact assessment structure of the Wellington Tenths Trust is investigated in the following section, to enable a comparison of the two organisations to take place in Section 6.7.3.

6.7.2 The Wellington Tenths Trust

Key informant (2) from the Trust (1) suggests a cultural impact assessment should contain a number of things. Firstly, the cultural impact assessment should discuss who it is being done on behalf of and, in the case of the Wellington Tenths Trust, who the Trust represents. Secondly, like Kai Tahu Ki Otago, the Wellington Tenths Trust key informant 1 believes the assessment should include a brief framework of the history of a particular area and its historical importance to the iwi authority. Thirdly, the assessment should discuss the area that it is affected and any associated impacts. Fourthly, the Trust suggests the assessment should also examine the cultural landscape. The cultural landscape is the link between the values that the Trust and iwi hold, including all of the spiritual and physical values associated with that area. Contrasting to the views of Kai Tahu Ki Otago, however, the Wellington Tenths Trust key informant 2 believes it is essential to include mitigation measures within the assessment report. The key informant reaffirmed this stance by stating:

"We are very clear about ensuring that there are conditions that can be realistically put into a consent and often we will get developers to agree because we want things in their contracts, particularly if you are talking about earthworks."

As previously discussed, the mitigation measures or recommendations are a key for facilitating consultation and collaboration between the different parties. These recommendations on the conditions of the consent clearly outline the stance the Trust is taking. For example, a key recommendation that is always contained for applicants who propose to do earthworks is that, at any stage bones or other taonga are unearthed, then they should not be ignored and work should cease. The Wellington Tenths Trust key informant (1) notes:
"We are called first and work does cease immediately. We need to be appropriately resourced to bring in Kaumatua [elders] who are necessary to clear the sites. That has become quite a standard consent condition in Wellington."

In some instances, the iwi may suggest things that are totally unrealistic for the applicant to achieve or they may not have any suggestions at all to deal with a particular issue. Therefore, the process allows for applicants and iwi to get together and potentially negotiate an outcome that each party is satisfied with. The Trust also supplies maps and paintings, and extra information within their cultural impact assessments. They are also very aware of the need to understand the environmental impact assessment implications.

In summary, the Trust's cultural impact assessment structure is very similar to the structure of Kai Tahu ki Otago's cultural impact assessments. The Trust's cultural impact assessments includes: a description of who the trust represents, its history and associations, the area affected and proposed impacts, an investigation of the implications for the cultural landscape, and the provision for mitigation measures.

6.7.3 Comparison of Cultural Impact Assessment Structure

The results from the key informant interviews illustrate that the two organisations use similar structures for their cultural impact assessments. In general, their cultural impact assessments cover the historical and traditional associations of the area concerned and how these associations will be impacted upon. The cultural impact assessments also explain Māori concepts included in the report. This includes identifying the multi-dimensional view (previously discussed in Chapter Four) of the environment including the incorporation of,

- te taha wairua (spiritual)
- te taha hinegaro (mental)
- te taha tinana (physical and economic)
The only significant part of the measures where the two organisations differ is the inclusion of mitigation measures. While including mitigation measures enables an applicant to respond in a meaningful manner, Kai Tahu ki Otago’s current process of holding consultation and collaboration meetings after a cultural impact assessment is submitted allows mitigation measures to be addressed. These mitigation measures either discussed in the reports or at the collaboration meetings suggest that cultural viewpoints do provide for compromise. As previously outlined in Section 3.3.6, this lack of ability for cultural viewpoints (in certain circumstances) to provide a compromise, often results in the views of indigenous people to be ignored. This again reiterates the issue discussed in Section 3.3.6, that it is essential that a wide range of options for each proposal are investigated and that effects to indigenous groups are adequately explored. The analysis of the cultural impact assessment process of Kai Tahu ki Otago and the Trust indicates that cultural impact assessments are one method for achieving this.

The analysis of the cultural impact assessment structure has illustrated that another strength of this process is that it allows for different options to be debated and negotiated between the applicants and iwi. Again, this illustrates that the cultural impact assessment process is promoting much more than just consultation with Māori in the impact assessment process.

In conclusion, the results suggest that each organisation has its own individual cultural impact assessment structure. This highlights that there is no one universal structure of a cultural impact assessment, and that these reports should be adapted to suit the different environments of each iwi and hapu throughout New Zealand. In New Zealand, Māori are increasingly becoming more involved in the planning process, and this is partly because of RMA obligations. Thus, the following section explores the ability of cultural impact assessments to be used as a tool to increase Māori participation in planning and to fulfil the RMA obligations of applicants for resource consent.
6.8 RMA OBLIGATIONS

In New Zealand, the central piece of legislation involved in the management of the environment is the RMA. The RMA requires that part of the preparation of the assessment of environmental effects should include the consultation undertaken, and any responses of the views of those consulted with as identified interested or affected parties. Chapter Three discusses how ‘environment’ is broadly defined in the Act as including ‘socio-economic and cultural effects’. While the RMA recognises the principles of the Treaty of Waitangi (Section 8) and Māori cultural and spiritual interests in Section 6(e) and 7(a), it places no mandatory requirement for applicants to consult or have a cultural impact assessment commissioned. As a result, this section explores the legislative obligations that the iwi, developers, planning consultants and local authorities perceive to be placed on the affected parties, which results in the need to commission a cultural impact assessment. The idea of cultural impact assessments becoming a mandatory requirement is also debated.

Chapter Five discussed the idea that iwi perceive cultural impact assessments as a way of assessing elements of Sections 6(e), 7(a) and 8 of the RMA. For the two case studies, the first part of the cultural impact assessment is substantially different from other impact assessments, in that it also describes the cultural association of Māori with their environment. The Wellington Tenths Trust (key informant 2), on the other hand, believes that the RMA accords Māori special rights vested under the Treaty of Waitangi. Thus, it is essential that Māori views be represented in the impact assessment process. This research illustrates that one possible way of increasing the adequate representation of Māori views in the impact assessment process could be through the commissioning of a cultural impact assessment. The Parliamentary Commissioner for the Environment key informant believes that “the cultural impact assessment is one way of fulfilling and providing for the requirements of Section 6(e) of the Act.”
However, the RMA places no mandatory requirement to consult with tangata whenua and the “wording is such that it is easy to get around it rather than be forced to deal with it” (Ministry for the Environment key informant 1). Kai Tahu ki Otago key informant 3 suggests that the wording of section 8 “may take into consideration” is a weak requirement. Both Kai Tahu ki Otago and the Trust state that it is hard to tell people that they should be consulting with tangata whenua, when there is no mandatory obligation to do so. Therefore, further opportunity exists to educate applicants and councils about the benefits of commissioning a cultural impact assessment.

The results from the applicants and planning consultants highlights mixed feelings towards the direct obligations of the RMA for carrying out a cultural impact assessment. The majority of those interviewed agree that, to some degree, the cultural impact assessment is a way of recognising and providing for the relationship of Māori and their culture and traditions in relation to their ancestral lands, water, sites, waahi tapu, and other taonga. A Wellington developer (2) agrees with the previous statement from the Parliamentary Commissioner for the Environment, by asserting that the cultural impact assessment recognises the views of the affected iwi. A planning consultant (4) from Wellington recognises that the cultural impact assessment should address the issues of Section 6(e) but should not be the only avenue for obtaining the required information. For example, a planning consultant (1) in Wellington suggests that, “cultural impact assessments’ real value, is knowing and working through the issues of avoidance, remedying, and mitigating”.

In Wellington a planning consultant (2) also notes that the Council’s identification of affected parties is a key factor in driving cultural impact assessments in the City. The Wellington City Council have a standard letter that requires applicants to determine or clarify whether tangata whenua may have any concerns, and a cultural impact assessment is a good way to ensure that this process takes place. The Wellington City Council and the Dunedin City Council key informant (2) also believe that, in Wellington and Otago cultural impact assessments have evolved to a stage where they are being done in ‘their own right’.
In general, all the applicants do not believe that cultural impact assessments should become a mandatory obligation under the RMA. A planning consultant notes it "would be horrific to place that obligation on applicants". If cultural impact assessments become a mandatory requirement there would have to be forms of quality control, like those for environmental impact assessments. In addition, as has been previously discussed, the results of the cultural impact assessment generally do not have a direct effect on the end result of the environmental impact assessment, as they are primarily a means of pulling together individual parts of the process. The key for the continuation of the cultural impact assessment process in Otago and Wellington is not making it a mandatory requirement. It is portraying it as a collaboration tool whereby the applicant is able to have certainty that tangata whenua issues are adequately addressed within a final environmental impact assessment.

In conclusion, cultural impact assessments are one way for applicants to meet the requirements of the RMA. However, many believe that cultural impact assessments are now important in their own right and are an excellent tool for incorporating the concerns of Māori into the impact assessment process. Unlike many indigenous groups throughout the world, to a limited extent Māori have some formal recognition within the impact assessment process (section 6(e), 7(a), and 8, and the 4th schedule of the RMA). Not only do cultural impacts need to be investigated, clause 2(a) of the 4th schedule, but also Māori as affected parties need to be consulted about the proposal (clause 1(h), which involves the identification of those persons interested in or affected by the proposal).

This thesis agrees with the view of all applicants surveyed here that cultural impact assessments should not become a mandatory requirement under the RMA or any other piece of legislation, because this has risks. The main justification for not making cultural impact assessments a mandatory requirement is that this could place pressure on iwi who are under-resourced and who do not have the capacity to undertake such research. It could also result in the mitigation measures becoming more about money than better
environmental outcomes. Therefore, it could potentially jeopardise the quality and value of the reports. In addition, care has to be taken to ensure that cultural impact assessments do not become a means to an end. In other words, it is essential to recognise that the cultural impact assessments are only a small part of the overall collaborative process.

6.9 INCORPORATION OF CULTURAL IMPACT ASSESSMENTS INTO ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ASSESSMENTS

The challenge to the applicant is to respond to the issues that have been raised within the cultural impact assessment. As discussed in Section 6.8, the RMA places an obligation on applicants to consult with iwi. This section investigates the extent to which the results of the cultural impact assessment are incorporated into the environmental impact assessment. There are two ways in which the cultural impact assessment can be incorporated into the final decision. The cultural impact assessment, firstly, can be left as a complete document in itself and be inserted into an environmental impact assessment as a separate chapter, or secondly, it can be integrated throughout the environmental impact assessment.

Some planning consultants prefer to keep the cultural impact assessment separate. For example, a planning consultant (Wellington, 2) states that the “cultural impact assessment was included as part of the application. We did not lodge until we had received it”. However, a weakness of lodging the cultural impact assessment in a separate chapter is that it becomes disjointed from the rest of the report. A Kai Tahu ki Otago key informant (2) states, “I would rather have them incorporating it into an environmental impact assessments than just attaching it as an appendix and not referring to it”. Thus, it is essential that the views and aspirations of Māori be integrated throughout the environmental impact assessment. This may lead to a better representation of environmental issues necessary for developing an environmental impact assessment. The findings of Section 6.8 also highlight that the cultural impact assessment has more weight if stronger legislative requirements are in place to involve Māori in the impact assessment process.
The second way of incorporating a cultural impact assessment into a final report is by integrating or paraphrasing it throughout the environmental impact assessment. A Dunedin planning consultant (2) notes that tangata whenua values and traditions are always acknowledged in the environmental impact assessment, but it depends greatly on the nature of the activity itself. Integrating the cultural impact assessment throughout the report can sometimes mean that an iwi authority's view is taken out of context. The Dunedin City Council key informant (2) acknowledges that in the assessment of environmental effects of Project X (a large infrastructure development), there were two pages on tangata whenua values and traditions, and the concerns of the tangata whenua were paraphrased (rewritten) linked throughout the report. The Kai Tahu ki Otago's Resource Management Plan has also been a useful document for the Dunedin City Council, and this has been incorporated into the environmental impact assessment.

When the cultural impact assessment is paraphrased (and, hence, integrated) it is important that the relationship between iwi and applicants is such that the iwi have the opportunity to check it, to ensure that what has been reported is not taken out of context. For example, a planning consultant (1) in Otago states:

"I effectively take what is said and I may paraphrase it and often what I do is draft up the section and I will send it back to Kai Tahu, because it is not really my section. It is their assessment."

The cultural impact assessment should always be appended so that any issues can be clarified if required.

Overall, by just reviewing the final environmental impact assessment will not give a true indication of the input that the cultural impact assessment has had to the final process. The reasons for this are that the cultural impact assessment is only a small part of the negotiation process. As outlined earlier, collaboration and consultation meetings occur both prior to and after the submission of the cultural impact assessment. For example, the Dunedin City Council key informant (2) states that in one project (an infrastructure development in the coastal marine area, previously mentioned) they had 10
meetings with Kai Tahu ki Otago and 10 additional meetings with the working party after the cultural impact assessment had been submitted. Hence, the cultural impact assessment process cannot be viewed in isolation, but as part of a collaborative process between iwi and applicants.

As discussed in Chapter Three, in relation to the impact assessment literature, the weighting of cultural impacts in the final decision making process is often unknown. This is particularly so, when it is submitted as part of an environmental impact assessment. This highlights an area where further research is required. Unfortunately, the scope of this study does not include an analysis of the weighting cultural impact assessments are given in the final decision-making process. Therefore, further research in this area is required.

6.10 SYNTHESIS OF THE CULTURAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT PROCESSES

The purpose of this section is to integrate the results of the case study analysis, drawing also on issues raised in the literature review of Chapters Two and Three. The purpose of the case study analysis was to explore the different cultural impact assessment processes of Kai Tahu ki Otago and the Trust. Part of this involved evaluating how the cultural impact assessment is incorporated into the final environmental impact assessment. A flow diagram (Figure 6.1) represents a synthesis of the results from this chapter and Chapter Five.

The analysis of the results highlights that the cultural impact assessment process is a key part of Kai Tahi ki Otago and the Wellington Tenths Trust resource management process. Both organisations have a well-established system and iwi resource management plan. The cultural impact assessment process is very similar to that of other impact assessment reports, and this is consistent with the findings of Chapter Five.

As mentioned, Figure 6.1 sets out the results of the case study analysis. Step one of Figure 6.1 represents initial contact with iwi. The initiation process highlights that cultural impact assessments are developed after consultation
and collaboration between the concerned parties. Step one also illustrates that Māori need to be involved right from the outset of the process. Thus, cultural impact assessments have the potential to be a tool for increasing the active participation of Māori in planning.

Section 6.9 concludes that cultural impact assessments are being undertaken only to a limited extent due to RMA obligations. In some instances, applicants commission a cultural impact assessment because of a Council’s obligations to consult with iwi. Currently, a key issue in planning is improving Māori participation in the RMA process. Therefore, the RMA needs to place a stronger obligation on applicants to consult with Māori and to actively involve them in the process. (Further improvements to the cultural impact assessment process are investigated in Chapter Seven).

Step two of the cultural impact assessment process involves identification of impacts and gathering information. Again, the results show a positive attempt to involve iwi members in the impact assessment process through holding huis or interviews with concerned iwi members. This re-emphasises the idea that the cultural impact assessment process of the two organisations researched is very inclusive. The evaluation of significant effects and the identification of mitigation methods also occur within step two. As previously outlined, the identification of mitigation measures within the cultural impact assessment is a key part of the impact assessment process.

Step three focuses on the reviewing stage of the cultural impact assessment. For Kai Tahu ki Otago, the reviewing process occurs via the runanga and the assessment is not released until all four runanga have signed it off. For the Trust, a peer reviewer checks over their cultural impact assessments. In summary, the reviewing process of the cultural impact assessment is very important for maintaining the quality of the reports and for clearly and accurately representing the views of the iwi or runanga. Chapter Five suggests that a structured approach could be used as an additional source to ensure that cultural impact assessments contain all of the required elements.
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Figure 6.1: The cultural impact assessment process
Step four involves submitting the final copy of the cultural impact assessment to the applicant. However, as discussed in Section 6.9, the submission of the cultural impact assessment is not the end of the process. Following this, collaboration and consultation meetings try to avoid, remedy or mitigate the perceived impacts to Māori. This step is very important, particularly for Kai Tahu ki Otago because they do not have a mitigation process within their cultural impact assessments. It allows the iwi and applicant to sit down together and formulate an outcome and search for mutually acceptable solutions. The key to the success of this process is building and maintaining a relationship with iwi and understanding the contrasting world view that they hold towards the environment. However, what is considered and included within the final environmental impact assessment is still the applicant's responsibility. Again, this highlights that stronger legislative requirements are needed to ensure iwi actively participate throughout the impact assessment process.

The analysis of the case studies so far suggests that cultural impact assessments are a beneficial tool for identifying the impacts of an activity on iwi. Many of the elements of the cultural impact assessment process also fulfil the requirements needed for successful collaborative management, as identified in Chapter Four. These include building and maintaining relationships, the involvement of iwi from the outset of the process, collaboration and consultation meetings and learning to understand and respect the Māori world view. However, further analysis of the value, limitations and improvements, is needed before any final conclusions can be made.

6.11 CONCLUSION

This chapter has presented part of the case study analysis, which investigates the cultural impact assessment process for Kai Tahu ki Otago and the Wellington Tenths Trust. The case studies highlight that the cultural impact assessment process is very similar to the process used in other impact assessment reports. In general, the cultural impact assessment process of Kai Tahu ki Otago and the Wellington Tenths Trust, is a tool that empowers and
effectively involves Māori in the impact assessment process. The following chapter discusses the value, limitations and improvements that are required in the current cultural impact assessment process, with the specific aim of assessing whether or not cultural impact assessments are a tool for collaborative management.
Chapter Six investigates the cultural impact assessment process for Kai Tahu ki Otago and the Wellington Tenths Trust. The purpose of this chapter is to address the remainder of research objective four and synthesise the results of this thesis in order to address the primary research problem. These objectives include:

- To analyse the value of cultural impact assessments as a participatory tool for promoting collaborative management.

- Determining whether cultural impact assessments are a tool for collaborative management.

The results from the semi-structured interviews and email correspondence from additional iwi authorities have been sorted into key categories. As previously outlined in Section 6.2.4, additional email correspondence also occurred with iwi authorities that were unable to undertake cultural impact assessments. Their limitations and views of the cultural impact assessment process are also integrated within this chapter.

This chapter begins by analysing the perceived value of cultural impact assessments from the perspective of iwi, applicants and the local authority (Section 7.2). Section 7.3 evaluates the limitations of the cultural impact assessment process and discusses possible improvements that are required to
this process at the national level. The chapter concludes by investigating the ability of the cultural impact assessment process to fulfil the components of what is perceived in this research to be those needed to achieve successful collaborative management (these were determined in Section 4.4.3).

7.2 THE VALUE OF CULTURAL IMPACT ASSESSMENTS

For a cultural impact assessment to be a truly effective tool for collaborative management, its value for both iwi and applicants needs to be clear. The results from the interviewees in Otago and Wellington perceived the value of the cultural impact assessment produced by Kai Tahu ki Otago and the Trust to be relatively high. These key identified values include: increasing Māori participation in planning, the formation of partnerships, increased knowledge, and documentation of history, gathering the views of the collective and value for money. Thus, Sections 7.2.1 to 7.2.7 address each of these identified values and evaluate how successful the cultural impact assessment process is in achieving these.

7.2.1 Increasing Māori Participation in Planning

This research shows that Māori participation in New Zealand’s planning processes has historically been limited. Section 4.3 identified that tangata whenua have special interests as kaitiaki of the natural environment. Therefore, Māori should share and be actively involved in its management and protection. This research recognises that consultation alone is not enough to provide for the rights promised to Māori within the Treaty of Waitangi and the RMA. Hence, cultural impact assessments have been identified as one way for Māori to be more involved in New Zealand’s planning process. Section 6.6 of this thesis included a detailed discussion of how the cultural impact assessment process facilitates iwi involvement, for example, through hui and interviews with the iwi concerned. Hence, the purpose of this section is to evaluate the extent to which cultural impact assessments provide an avenue for increasing Māori participation in planning.
The use of alien forms of inquiry is generally recognised as a limiting factor for indigenous involvement throughout the impact assessment process (Edelstein & Kleese, 1995). Alien forms of inquiry can include gathering information in a manner that Māori are not familiar or comfortable with. The two case studies' cultural impact assessment processes have overcome this issue by preparing their own impact assessment report based on their values and association with an area. For example, key informant 2 of the Kai Tahu ki Otago runanga says that Kai Tahu ki Otago are “focused on the task, undertaking it on a regular basis, and in tune with the legislation”. Therefore, the process enhances the advocacy and negotiation power of the iwi concerned, which in turn increases their participation in planning.

In addition, it is acknowledged by an Otago planning consultant (1) that the purpose of the impact assessment process is too remedy, avoid and mitigate adverse environmental effects. This same consultant uses the example of asking a scientist to tell him what the adverse effects were going to be to the fisheries, “so why wouldn’t I go to get Kai Tahu ki Otago and for them to tell us what the adverse effects on their culture will be”. Therefore, the cultural impact assessment highlights early on to the applicant what the possible issues for Māori might be and those worked through. Thus, Māori are able to actively participate in working toward better environmental outcomes, which is a key aim of the impact assessment process.

In summary, cultural impact assessments have the potential to be very valuable tools for increasing the participation of Māori in planning. They provide an avenue for Māori to express their concerns and share their world view with applicants in a manner that they feel comfortable with. However, a better place for the genuine iwi input in planning should be at the policy development stage, long before it gets to the point where a cultural impact assessment is needed. This is because the cultural impact assessment process is very reactionary, not visionary or proactive. Nonetheless, the opportunity exists to further develop cultural impact assessments as a tool to increase Māori participation. This leads on to another important aspect of the planning
process, which is the ability of iwi and applicants to build partnerships and work together to formulate better environmental outcomes.

7.2.2 Partnerships

The findings of this research suggest that the cultural impact assessment process for both Kai Tahu ki Otago and the Trust is useful for establishing a relationship between applicants and iwi. As previously discussed in Chapters Two and Four, one of the essential components for successful collaborative management is the ability to build and maintain a relationship between the contributing parties. The typologies of participation previously investigated in Section 3.4, provide a framework for determining the level at which Māori are involved. The cultural impact assessment process has been investigated in light of this to determine whether they are being used as a tool to increase Māori participation in planning (in the upper rungs of Arnstein’s ladder of citizen participation). Hence, the following section evaluates the ability of cultural impact assessments to aid in developing partnerships between iwi and applicants in New Zealand.

An Otago developer (1) discusses the benefits of the cultural impact assessment process by stating that:

“It was a really useful base for us to move forward with Kai Tahu ki Otago. Also if you want to establish a relationship with iwi or hapu then a cultural impact assessment is an excellent tool to achieve this. It is very useful because really what we are saying is that we want to work with you, but you need to tell us how.”

Likewise, a Wellington planning consultant informant (2) suggests that the real value of the cultural impact assessment process was in the opportunity to work directly with the Trust and in the ongoing relationship that had been built up as a result of the process. In addition, another Wellington planning consultant (4) states that, “As we work more with the Tenths Trust, our relationship with them gets stronger. Therefore they will be more inclined to trust our judgement and we be more inclined to trust theirs”. In addition, an Otago developer (3) highlights that after the commissioning of the cultural impact assessment they “now we have an ongoing relationship that will
hopefully last for years to come”. The Wellington City Council key informant also believes that the cultural impact assessment process had created a working environment with the Trust and had set the scene for other projects, which may involve them.

Overall, an Otago developer 2 sums up the views of the majority of the applicants interviewed by stating “A major strength of the cultural impact assessment process has been the partnership and ongoing relationship that has been built up between us and Kai Tahu ki Otago”. The two case study organisations believe the key to building and maintaining such relationships was for their involvement to occur right from the outset of the proposal. This is consistent with the findings in Section 6.5.

In summary, potentially, the cultural impact assessment process can be used as a key step with which to begin the formation of partnerships and collaboration, between iwi and applicants and local authorities. Pinkerton (1989) also suggests that the success of the collaborative management process is highly dependent on the relationship that is established between the two parties. Thus, the results of this research illustrate that the cultural impact assessment process for Kai Tahu ki Otago and the Wellington Tenths Trust is one possible way of facilitating the development of partnerships between iwi and applicants.

However, simply commissioning a cultural impact assessment does not guarantee that relationships and partnerships will develop. Therefore, the results suggest that the relationships formed between iwi and applicants were founded on the cultural impact assessment. However, this partnership evolved from the negotiation and collaboration process that followed after the submission of the report. To ensure that the role of tangata whenua as kaitiaki of the environment is respected, applicants and local authorities must involve iwi from the outset of a project. The Parliamentary Commissioner for the Environment (1998) also finds that the involvement of iwi from the outset gives the most productive results. The formation of partnerships and trust is one key aspect of the notion of collaborative management. Another key
component required for successful collaborative management is an increased knowledge of the Māori world view. Section 7.2.3 investigates the ability of cultural impact assessments to increase the knowledge of applicants and local authorities about the Māori world view and the impacts that a development may have on iwi.

### 7.2.3 Knowledge

The cultural impact assessment process provides an opportunity for applicants, companies and local authorities to learn and appreciate the Māori world view. Willingness to learn and respect what Sandercock (1998) suggests as “other ways of knowing” is also a key element that is required for successful collaborative management. There is a need to recognise that there are deep differences in perspectives, and that these differences should be viewed as opportunities to work together in order to formulate better environmental outcomes (Emery et al., 1997).

A great deal of misconception exists about the different Māori world views and the association of the tangata whenua with the land. This lack of knowledge and awareness is an issue that was consistently raised by all of the applicants from Otago and Wellington involved in this research. This lack of knowledge is illustrated by a Wellington planning consultant (1) who states; “that our clients value the cultural impact assessment process a lot, because as soon as you mention consultation with iwi they are typically terrified and stop in their tracks”. Thus, many of the applicants believe that the cultural impact assessment process gave them an opportunity to understand and appreciate the world view of the particular iwi that undertook the cultural impact assessment. For example, an Otago developer key informant 1 states that the “cultural impact assessments are good tools for educating applicants about the Māori view of the environment”. Therefore, the cultural impact assessment is a tool for providing clarity around what the issues are for Māori in a format that councils and resource consent applicants can easily deal with and respond to.
Many indigenous groups have become disillusioned about the effects of the assessment process because an assessment of the impacts on them is often undertaken by a consultant who does not fully understand their world view. A Otago planning consultant (2) highlights the value of a cultural impact assessment by stating that it is never possible to presume to write what the effects of a proposal are for iwi. In addition, an Otago developer (2) suggests that the cultural impact assessment:

"...is in a written form. It is a structured way of iwi taking the time out to think about what their concerns or issues are about the proposal. It also enables iwi to identify possible mitigation measures and investigate whether the proposal can go through or not."

Thus, cultural impact assessments are a beneficial tool, in that they encourage applicants and tangata whenua to focus on the issues that have been identified within the cultural impact assessment. They allow the issues to be clearly articulated so that both sides know what they are dealing with. The Ministry for the Environment key informant states that the consistent feedback they get from councils and applicants is that they don't know who to consult and how to involve Māori in the process. Thus, another strength of the cultural impact assessment process is that it offers applicants and local authorities one method for involving Māori in the impact assessment process.

In addition, cultural impact assessments provide some focus for both sides in identifying the issues and facilitating possible negotiation measures that could resolve them. A Wellington developer (1) also indicates that the cultural impact assessment is “invaluable for giving you a steer to what Māori cultural values are in relation to a particular project”. Thus, it puts in writing what the generally held beliefs for Māori are and clearly indicates what the problems are from a cultural perspective. In turn, these beliefs and issues can be taken into account when the applicants are working through the investigations and toward the final decision.

The general perception towards cultural impact assessment in the Otago and Wellington case studies is that, “it is a peg in the ground, whereas if you keep
talking sometimes nothing will happen” (Otago planning consultant, 2). The problem in relation to active participation of Māori in New Zealand is that many applicants and councils still lack knowledge of the Māori world view and why it is a necessity for Māori to participate within the planning process. Needless to say, all participants of this research agree that cultural impact assessments are being used as a tool to obtain a greater knowledge and understanding of the differing Māori world views of Kai Tahu ki Otago and the Wellington Tenths Trust. As illustrated in Section 4.2, the Māori world view was subject to regional variation. Therefore, it is important that the Māori world view is not treated as a generic term. Hence, cultural impact assessments provide an avenue for all iwi to incorporate their different views and beliefs in relation to an area into the impact assessment process. In summary, cultural impact assessments have the potential to be used as a tool to further educate applicants and local authorities of the views as a collective of Kai Tahu ki Otago and the Wellington Tenths Trust.

7.2.4 Collective

Chapter Six pointed out that, in Otago, cultural impact assessments are done on behalf of the four runanga, whereas in Wellington the Wellington Tenths Trust undertakes cultural impact assessments on behalf of the seven iwi it represents. The fact that the cultural impact assessment is done on behalf of the collective is a key value of the process for the two organisations. The involvement and empowerment of iwi is also an essential component for successful collaborative management to take place. The ability of the cultural impact assessment to be undertaken on behalf of the collective also highlights that this is one way of increasing the participation of Māori in planning.

The Dunedin City Council key informant 2 asserts that one of the major benefits of the cultural impact assessment process in Otago is that it is passed around for comment and input amongst all of the runanga. This benefit was further illustrated by an Otago developer (4) who suggests that the cultural impact assessment “pulls everything together in one place so that Kai Tahu ki Otago’s views are known as a collective”. From a developer’s perspective, the process was very efficient and easy to work through (Otago Developer key
informant 2). It means that the applicants need to talk only to one person, who in turn co-ordinates the iwi or runanga and sorts out the politics and information gathering. For example, key informant developer 3 from Otago states:

"But once we were directed to talk to Kai Tahu ki Otago, they were able to facilitate things and then we got a meeting with the runanga and it happened at the right time. It set the wheels in motion really, in terms of focusing on the site and getting the cultural impact assessment".

While the Wellington City Council key informant states that the Trust:

"...went away and employed an independent consultant who is still tied with them. So they applied specific resources external to the Tenths to pull the information together. It really covered so many hurdles at the outset."

As previously discussed in Chapter Six, both of the chosen case studies have practices in place to ensure the involvement of their iwi members in the process. For example, as outlined in Section 6.6, hui and interviews were used to gather information for some of their cultural impact assessments. In addition, Kai Tahu ki Otago's cultural impact assessments are not finalised until they have been approved by all runanga involved. The importance of the runanga approving the cultural impact assessment is highlighted by a comment made by Kai Tahu ki Otago key informant (2) who states, "they [cultural impact assessments] are not my thinking, I do not know half of the issues and I don’t know half the association with these areas". Hence, cultural impact assessments are an important tool for representing and combining the vast amount of knowledge of the iwi or runanga members.

The majority of those interviewed believe that both organisations provide an efficient service. For example, an Otago planning consultant (1) states:

"To go back in time to what happened before Kai Tahu ki Otago were set up there was no central point of collection. Kai Tahu ki Otago pull all of the runanga stuff together. This is important because the runanga are almost semi autonomous and one runanga doesn't speak for another's area".
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If a development has a significant cultural impact, the impact assessment provides an effective process that facilitates consultation with the runanga. The cultural impact assessment process also allows for someone else other than the developer or planning consultant to document the issues and impacts. Therefore, the cultural impact assessment can short-cut a potentially long process, especially if there are complicated issues involved (Kai Tahu ki Otago key informant 1). In other words, the cultural impact assessment allows the views of tangata whenua to be documented as a collective, in a manner that they feel comfortable with.

Traditionally, developers or planning consultants would only consult with certain iwi members in regard to a development. As a result, the views of only a few of the iwi are being gathered and included within the final environmental impact assessment (Wellington Tenths Trust key informant 1). From the applicants' perspective, it is often very hard to know who to consult with. Thus, the cultural impact assessment process of Kai Tahu ki Otago and the Wellington Tenths Trust offers an avenue for applicants to incorporate the views of the iwi as a collective, into the final environmental impact assessment.

However, one of the Trust's iwi member key informants (2) reports concern over the lack of ability for the Trust to represent individuals in relation to the customary rights of all the different iwi members that the Trust represents. In other words, iwi member key informant 2 suggests that, in some instances, umbrella groups such as the Wellington Tenths Trust do not serve constituent groups very well. This highlights the need for further investigation of the participation of other constituent groups within the Trust, to ensure that they are also represented in the process. A Wellington Tenths Trust iwi key informant (1) also suggests that he did not have any qualms about the cultural impact assessment being done on behalf of the Taranaki whanui, as long as the assessment was thorough and represented the views of the collective. This again highlights the importance of providing iwi or runanga with the opportunity to make comments on the cultural impact assessments to ensure that their views are represented.
One of the main strengths of Kai Tahu ki Otago and the Trust is that they undertake the cultural impact assessment on behalf of their iwi or runanga members. In other words, the two organisations provide a centralised point of call and this means that their cultural impact assessments can be an efficient tool for representing the views of the collective provided that iwi/hapu/runanga/whanui have the opportunity to check over and confirm the results of the assessments. This section highlights that further research needs to take place on the ability of Kai Tahu ki Otago and the Trust to adequately represent and involve their iwi members in the cultural impact assessment process.

7.2.5 Documentation of History

The documentation of the history of the area of proposed development is also a strength of the cultural impact assessment process. The Dunedin City Council key informant 2 suggests that cultural impact assessments "...are important to know and understand for both sides in Māori terms and in European terms". For example, in terms of iwi history of an area, the cultural impact assessment can be used to describe the kai moana that is present or gathered, the traditional association and the significance of the area to Māori. The cultural impact assessment gives iwi a starting point for pulling together information and they get paid for it at the same time (Wellington developer key informant, 1).

The documentation of history is very important for tangata whenua, as a great deal of information is shared orally from generation to generation. For many iwi including Kai Tahu and those iwi that the Wellington Tenths Trust represents, this is an issue because as their elders die, so too does a lot of knowledge about an area that has not been written down. Therefore, the loss of historical features and information relating to areas of interest is a key concern for many iwi in New Zealand. A Dunedin developer key informant (3) notes that, from the iwi perspective, the assessments provide thorough documentation, so that information is not lost. For example, a key informant from Te Runanga O Te Rarawa believes that information and loss of tikanga (custom, protocol) is a major concern in Northland. In addition, this key
informant also notes that their people are not in the habit of recording information and at times elders find the resource consent process demeaning. However, the cultural impact assessment process, which is part of the resource consent, does give iwi the opportunity to document their views in a manner that they feel appropriate. In addition, the cultural impact assessment can become a silent file in which the information is held by iwi and only basic information is released for resource consent purposes. (A silent file is one from which an iwi will only release the required information to the applicant and it remains out of the public realm). This ability to have silent files is an important issue for tangata whenua in New Zealand because a lot information and knowledge is tapu to the iwi.

Cultural impact assessments can provide a good base-line representation of the views of iwi at the time of a proposal. In addition, there is danger that the knowledge of the elders will die with them, as many young Māori in today’s society are not always following the traditional ways. Therefore, a major strength of the cultural impact assessment process is its ability to document traditional oral history. They also have the potential to decrease the likelihood that the concerns and issues of Māori are not going to slip through the planning process. Therefore, cultural impact assessments are a tool that provides iwi with the opportunity to further document their history and association with an area.

7.2.6 Value for Money?

The concept of paying for cultural impact assessments is the only part of the cultural impact assessment process where applicants and local authorities differed in their views of value. Unfortunately, tension exists amongst some applicants as to why they should pay for Māori advice in planning. This is because there are few precedents that offer any useful guides to the level of compensation that should be paid to Māori. In addition, the RMA does not provide any mechanism whereby the Māori can claim any money for the cost of the consultation (Ministry for the Environment, 1999b). As a result, some applicants believe this payment is a matter of course, whereas others find having to pay for Māori advice difficult to understand.
All of the planning consultants from Otago and Wellington suggest that Māori should be paid to participate in the process, as how else would they get recompensed for their time that they lose from participating in the process? This is consistent with the views of King (2000) who states that indigenous peoples are keepers and developers of knowledge, thus they should be compensated for sharing this knowledge. In addition, an Otago planning consultant (1) notes that, “I have no problems for them charging for their time, after all that’s what I do as a consultant”. While, an Otago developer (1) suggests:

“It is a good tool and we end paying for it, but I think we accept that the Act imposes heavy obligations on us or to any applicant to respond to those sections of the Act. Therefore it is part of the budget you have to allow for it whether you like it or not.”

Some of the applicants also believe that commissioning a cultural impact assessment makes the process run a lot more smoothly. For example, an Otago developer (2) notes that iwi could:

“...just cost us a whole lot of time and effort as the applicant and, let’s be pragmatic about it, that’s something they could do without even being seen to be obstructive but just simply standing up for their rights that are under the Treaty.”

This is consistent with the Ministry for the Environment report (1999b), “Case Law on Tangata Whenua Consultation”, which finds that many applicants and local authorities do pay for this consultation even though it is not a direct requirement of the RMA.

However, it is the developers, rather than the council workers or planning consultants interviewed, who are the most concerned about the value for money in relation to cultural impact assessments. This is because they are often constrained by tight budgets and do not understand why they have to pay when there is no legislation saying they have to do so. In addition, a developer key informant from Otago (1) states that, “one might argue of course that if we are doing one [a report] on impact on iwi, then what about other parts of the community as well”. However, Māori are given special status
under the RMA. Therefore, the impacts on Māori of a proposal must be taken into consideration in the impact assessment process. In general, most applicants do not have any qualms about paying a reasonable fee for a quality cultural impact assessment report.

It is the smaller developers who were the most negative about paying for the services of Kai Tahu ki Otago or the Wellington Tenths Trust to undertake a cultural impact assessment. The Trust suggests that this may be due to the fact that many people are very scared of involving Māori as they feel their involvement may impede the process. One developer from Wellington (2) comments that he does not perceive the value of a short report to be so high. The same developer also states that, "it is the less larger corporate who don't enter the planning process on a regular basis who are the people most affected or restricted by the costs of the report". Likewise, another planning consultant (1) in Wellington suggests that cultural impact assessments do add costs and sometimes it seems a high cost for not very much, for example, "sort of $4000 for 4 pages". While, an Otago developer (4) asserts that "There is nothing in the Act that says that they should get it done for them, so why can't they do it themselves, especially Kai Tahu ki Otago as they are so well resourced".

As previously outlined, there is nothing in the RMA that requires that a cultural impact assessment should be undertaken, however, the results from this research suggest that they are a good tool for obtaining the impacts and views of iwi. Nonetheless, some applicants report that, in some circumstances, the cultural impact assessment has only a limited usefulness in the planning process. Therefore, care has to be taken that the cultural impact assessment process does not become a moneymaking avenue for Māori. These issues highlight the importance of having a form of quality control (such as the one investigated in Chapter Five). Quality controls in turn promote greater value for money, as previously discussed in Chapter Six. Unlike other examples of collaborative planning discussed in Section 3.3.3, the production of cultural impact assessment does not result in significant additional costs to the planning process. In fact, some applicants suggest that the cultural impact assessment potentially saved them money.
In addition, both organisations suggest that the negative feelings of some developers towards paying for cultural impact assessments exists because their needs to be further education and time spent informing the community of the benefits of the cultural impact assessment process. Such education would recognise that they are specialists in their area, that cultural impact assessments are one way of obtaining the views of iwi, and that it is important that the expertise of tangata whenua is not taken for granted.

In conclusion, the main concerns of some applicants relate to cultural impact assessments not being undertaken correctly, and the possibility that they become a mandatory requirement (which indirectly means they could be another avenue for Māori to make money). In summary, there are issues in regard to the quality of some cultural impact assessments. However, the majority of those interviewed believe that the cultural impact assessment process does not add any significant costs onto to the overall process.

7.2.7 Conclusion

In general, the value of cultural impact assessments to Kai Tahu ki Otago and the Trust are perceived to be significant. Cultural impact assessments are tools for: increasing Māori participation in planning, building partnerships, illustrating the Māori world view, representing the views of the collective, and documenting history. However, a few developers noted that in some instances the value of a cultural impact assessment was variable, especially in terms of monetary value. Thus, Section 7.3 investigates possible explanations for the variability in views on cultural impact assessments and identifies other limitations for Kai Tahu ki Otago and the Wellington Tenths Trust when producing a cultural impact assessment.

7.3 LIMITATIONS OF THE CULTURAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT PROCESS

The literature reviewed in Section 3.3.6 suggests that there are many inhibiting factors that limit the ability for indigenous groups to participate in the impact assessment process. Unfortunately, some of these limitations are still evident in the cultural impact assessment processes of the two chosen case studies. The biggest limitation for the cultural impact assessment relates
Chapter Seven Evaluation of the Cultural Impact Assessment Process

to the capability and the resources required to complete a professional document. In some instances, the value of cultural impact assessments was felt in both regions to be variable over the years, and in many cases, their quality was highly dependent upon the quality and expertise of the writers who prepared the reports.

In general, applicants from Otago and Wellington are very happy with the cultural impact assessment process and, when suggesting improvements, do not want to appear critical of the cultural impact assessment processes that they have been involved in. They believe that Kai Tahu ki Otago and the Wellington Tenths Trust have to make sure that their reports are more substantial and meet the required time frames. Many also comment that the reports have excellent historical backgrounds but are a little weak on identification of specific cultural impacts. Therefore, the limitations of Kai Tahu ki Otago and the Wellington Tenths Trust in regard to undertaking cultural impact assessments are explored further below.

7.3.1 Resourcing and Capacity of Iwi to Respond

Resourcing and capacity building is a universal problem that exists for many indigenous groups participating in the planning process around the world. Crengle (1993) and James (1993) identify that lack of adequate resources is one of the main reasons for the limited participation of Māori in planning. Kai Tahu ki Otago and the Wellington Tenths Trust also recognise that this is an issue for them when undertaking cultural impact assessments.

As previously outlined, resourcing was a major factor that limits the engagement of the iwi and runanga in the cultural impact assessment process. Kai Tahu ki Otago key informant 1 agrees with these comments and states in the case of Project X (which is a very large infrastructure development) that one of the biggest limitations of the process is portraying what the runanga thinks of a development. In big developments this is an important aspect as, in many instances, the cultural impact assessment is written without actually committing the runanga to supporting or opposing the proposal.
Another major limitation for both organisations is the capacity for iwi to respond in a meaningful manner. Kai Tahu ki Otago key informant 2 states that it is often hard to predict the demand for assessments, as it varies from year to year. Therefore, it is difficult for Kai Tahu ki Otago and the Trust to predict the required staff numbers that are needed. In addition, Kai Tahu ki Otago key informant 2 also asserts, “There is a lack of skilled people to write them, as you have to produce a professional document or they will not use you again”. This highlights that there is a need to provide funding for iwi to enable them to increase their capacity and the ability of more iwi members to undertake the cultural impact assessments.

The loss of oral information over the years is another limitation to the cultural impact assessment process for the two case studies. As previously outlined, in Section 7.2.5, this loss of information is associated with the death of elders and the lack of documentation of their knowledge. A Ngati Hei key informant also comments that they have very few resources and time is precious, so they are under intense pressure. Therefore, the Ngati Hei key informant believes that this loss of information will significantly limit them from participating in the impact assessment process in the future. Also, Ngati Hei’s assessments in the past have been heavily plagiarised by other iwi who don’t have the capacity to do the reports. Therefore, unlike the two case studies chosen within this research, in many instances some iwi are unable to complete a cultural impact assessment, or have an iwi resource management plan.

The Dunedin City Council key informant 1 acknowledges that sometimes the quality of the reports produced by Kai Tahu ki Otago are variable, and suggests:

"Some of them can be a bit idealistic, some can be a bit simplistic. I think that sometimes that iwi struggle through capacity building, they are trying to get people who are mainly students at varsity or a recent graduate to try and do a cultural impact assessment and sometimes it is at too low of level to be of great value".

Another Otago planning consultant (2) agrees and comments that often the responsibility for writing the document falls with a graduate who does not
fully understand the issues. Likewise, in Wellington, planning consultants 3 and 4 suggest that sometimes the reports do not include quite enough information or discussion in various sections. In response, the Dunedin City Council representative (2) notes that: “Any document you could argue if another person does it could be written better, quicker, or in a different way.”

However, in relation to the quality of cultural impact assessments, like the other technical reports that make up an environmental impact assessment report, it is essential that they are prepared by professionals, specialists or advisors, or people within the iwi who are specifically trained for the task. Many developers suggest that it is often difficult to have a vast pool of these people within an iwi authority. Therefore, a way of increasing the quality of the cultural impact assessment reports would be through further training and resourcing of Kai Tahu ki Otago and the Trust members. A planning consultant in Wellington (2) also suggests that iwi groups should be “Able to pay someone who could compile information from their various experts, particularly someone who is an academic and/or a consultant”. However, this is not the solution to the capacity building problem of iwi. This is because iwi and runanga members need to be given the opportunity to be trained so they can carry out the impact assessments themselves. Therefore, a system needs to be developed that allows iwi to bring in consultants to upskill the tangata whenua, iwi and hapu with skills so that they can be trained to undertake the cultural impact assessments themselves. Otherwise, the Ministry for the Environment key informant believes that iwi are going to be no better off.

Both Kai Tahu ki Otago and the Wellington Tenths Trust key informants acknowledge that there does need to be further training and education within their organisation, particularly on better ways to write cultural impact assessments. A runanga key informant (2) from Kai Tahu ki Otago stated that iwi organisations may wish to have an independent audit undertaken to identify the depth and scope of its current skill sets and networks to ensure their cultural impact assessment processes are up to a certain standard. Another runanga key informant (1) suggests that once iwi or runanga members are trained in cultural impact assessment processes, the reports
could be commissioned by competitive tendering. This would create a stronger pool of contractors and it potentially could also increase the quality of the cultural impact assessments produced. Therefore, this may lead to the better evaluation of the effects of a proposal on iwi, and ensure that the cultural impact assessment is recognised as an important part of the impact assessment process.

The strengths of external bodies such as Kai Tahu ki Otago and the Wellington Tenths Trust are dependent on the skills and experience of their staff. This section has also highlighted the importance of only those iwi who have the capacity, adequate skills and resourcing, should attempt to carry out cultural impact assessments. In addition, it is important for the person undertaking the cultural impact assessment to have a strong background in both tikanga and environmental issues, to increase the chances of the impacts being adequately identified. It is also important to reiterate an earlier issue that the cultural impact assessment is only a small but important part of the planning process. Hence, more reliance should be put on the consultation and collaboration process than on the formalised cultural impact assessment alone.

7.3.2 Time limitations

Section 3.3.6 suggests that time is a major limiting factor for indigenous participation in planning (O'Faircheallaigh, 1999). Traditionally, impact assessments occur over short periods, and this often does not allow Māori enough time to either gather the required information or complete the report requirements. This is especially because iwi decision-making is by consensus, thus involving iwi from the outset of the project is important. Many applicants believe that time was the biggest issue when commissioning a cultural impact assessment. This is because applicants are also often limited by tight deadlines and relies on the cultural impact assessment being completed on time.

The ability of the organisations to respond on time was a key limitation raised by many applicants. For example, in Project Y (also an infrastructure development) the planning consultants had tight time frames. The Wellington
Tenths Trust unfortunately was unable to complete the cultural impact assessment in the time period allocated. As a result, Developer 1 from Wellington became highly frustrated. He also comments that, "we had to lodge applications with a really tight time-frame in mind and the Wellington Tenths Trust didn't deliver on time". However, the developer and planning consultant involved in Project Y believe that the Trust has a very good understanding of the process and is very pragmatic, but need to sort out the time delays. The Trust key informant 1 acknowledges that, "Our biggest limitation is that of time and in many instances we have very strict time pressures to complete the cultural impact assessment".

Timing is a key aspect that many applicants believe the cultural impact assessment process has to improve on. This is because many of the applicants have faced very tight due dates for submission of the final environmental impact assessment. However, the Trust are currently remedying the situation by developing templates and setting up a geographic information system (GIS). Wellington Tenths Trust key informant 1 states that, "GIS is also going to help because it will provide us very quickly with what is a significant for the site, what are the site's priorities and where our bottom line is." Time was also important for people who work at the Trust, as the majority of them are volunteers and work in their spare time. This improvement in time management is again linked to the resources and capacity of the organisation to respond to the cultural impact assessment requests. Due to the short time-frames allocated for the completion of cultural impact assessments, the applicants need to be open about the process and involve iwi right from the start. This potentially could improve the timing issue currently inhibiting the process.

Timing was also an issue for Kai Tahu ki Otago. They often find that many resource consents come through in a time period that does not allow the runanga to respond in a meaningful manner. A key informant from Te Runanga O Te Rarawa states that timing was an issue for them. Some of the marae they represent only meet once a month so responses to some requests may take a considerable time period.
In conclusion, timing is a major factor limiting the effective participation of iwi in New Zealand's planning process. Applicants must ensure that sufficient time is made available to iwi to ensure that they are adequately informed and are able to respond to the issues in a meaningful manner. This section highlights the importance of applicants and iwi discussing, in advance, time limitations and the expectations both parties have of the cultural impact assessment process. It is advantageous to the impact assessment process if iwi do not have to meet time-frames that are too tight, as this restricts the ability for them to respond in a meaningful manner. On the other hand, iwi need to recognise the necessity of meeting timelines to ensure that the cultural impact assessment is not undermined and maintains its status as a professional report. This highlights the idea that the cultural impact assessment process requires that goals and objectives for the processes for both iwi and applicants be clearly articulated at the commencement of the project. For example, this includes the setting of realistic time limitations that satisfy both the applicant and iwi.

7.3.3 Impact Identification

Overall, the findings of Sections 5.3.2 and 5.3.3 illustrate in general that the cultural impact assessments evaluated in this research fail to fully integrate and identify relevant impacts of activities or policies. This failure can be directly correlated to the earlier limitations of capacity and resourcing, and time limitations of the iwi. As noted, some developers feel that cultural impact assessments are of limited usefulness, and the reasons for this are further explored here.

Chapter Six concludes that cultural impact assessments are a good tool for identifying the historical and traditional aspects of the proposed area for development. However, direct links and integration of the impacts with the environment are not as well recognised within the cultural impact assessments. For example, it is not enough to say that the mauri was going to be adversely affected by a development. The cultural impact assessment needs to go a step further and focus more intently on the environmental impacts to determine cultural consequences, rather than just solely concentrating on
cultural impacts. A Kai Tahu ki Otago key informant (1) states, "you have to start bringing a greater level of specificity [into the cultural impact assessment] so that they can actually understand what impact of their activity is going to be for iwi". In addition, the same key informant comments:

"I still think that we are talking at a really high level and we have to bring it down to be much more specific. Even if we don't go as far as saying mitigation, I think that we have to say the outcomes we want."

Increasing the specificity of the outcomes and the effects on iwi will result in increased dialogue with the applicant. Therefore, the applicant will be able to respond directly to an iwi's concerns and offer possible mitigation measures. To ensure that there is ground for the two parties to start collaborating with each other.

Many applicants believe that the cultural impact assessment tends to be weighted more towards the tradition and historical use of the area, rather than the predicted impacts of an activity (this was consistent to the findings of this research in Chapter Five). For example, planning consultant key informant (1, from Wellington) states:

"...my view is that cultural impact assessments are not particularly substantial. They may potentially require a level of resourcing or expertise to fit with the other time-frames that run around these big projects."

In response, it is very important that the cultural impact assessment does contain a significant historical context. However, the historical information needs to be balanced with the other information presented in the cultural impact assessment. Therefore, cultural impact assessments must be considered as evolving documents. For example, an Otago developer (3) states:
“I guess over time they will evolve. They are sophisticated documents already and will continue to evolve, as people learn and report writing gets better. Probably, because we haven’t had a lot done, but I suspect there could be risks of the quality and the contents of them may differ to who is actually doing them. If the quality is low then it is no help to the iwi or the developer.”

Another big limitation acknowledged by the Kai Tahu ki Otago key informant 1 is that, sometimes, the cultural impact assessments has to be undertaken in isolation from other technical reports. For example, in Project X (a large infrastructure development) Kai Tahu ki Otago were asked to identify the effects of the scheme on cultural values but were not given any of the technical reports, such as construction reports to examine. Therefore, the cultural impact assessment was undertaken in a vacuum. One Kai Tahu ki Otago key informant (3) acknowledges, “that is part of it and a cultural impact assessment is often just seen as an add on, not as a key part of it [the environmental impact assessment].”

In summary, it was highlighted in Chapter Five that impact assessments were a good tool for identifying historical and traditional association with an area. However, they needed to improve on certain aspects that are essential for an impact assessment to contain. These include, linking and integrating the impacts and further identifying the full implications of a development on iwi. This section has illustrated that the ability of iwi to identify impacts of a proposal are often constrained by a lack of resources and the tight time frames, which are often placed on iwi to complete the cultural impact assessment.

7.3.4 Conclusion

The cultural impact assessment still has limitations in its ability to involve Māori and this is a key limitation of the impact assessment process for all indigenous groups around the world. Increasing the capacity and resources available to tangata whenua is an important area that needs to be further developed to ensure that time limitations are met and impacts are further identified within the cultural impact assessments. Currently, in New Zealand, there is a large variability in skills and knowledge of those involved in the
management of the environment. Thus, increasing the capacity and capabilities of tangata whenua, applicants, councils and councillors is a current priority. As the success of the cultural impact assessment process will be dependent on having the appropriately skilled people to undertake the reports, who have access to both financial and technical expertise. In addition, other national improvements that need to occur to the cultural impact assessment process includes: increased education, training and legislative changes. These improvements are investigated in Section 7.4.

7.4 NATIONAL IMPROVEMENTS

There are many innovations that are required at the national level to improve the current cultural impact assessment process. As outlined earlier in Sections 5.3 and 6.2.1, the majority of tangata whenua organisations in New Zealand do not undertake cultural impact assessments. This suggests that there are many limitations that exist for the ability of tangata whenua to undertake cultural impact assessments. Therefore, it is imperative for improvements of the current process to take place. As a result, the following subsections explore the need for increased education, training and legislative changes to occur, in order to promote the more active participation of Māori and the use of cultural impact assessments in planning.

7.4.1 Education

The findings of this research suggest that many iwi, applicants and local authorities in New Zealand, generally do not understand the cultural impact assessment process, or the benefits that increased knowledge of the structure, content and value of these reports could potentially bring to New Zealand's planning process. Thus, education about cultural impact assessments is a key area that needs to be developed to ensure that there is improved understanding of the process.

Councils need to actively encourage all applicants to consult with Māori over resource management issues and proposed developments that may have a negative impact on iwi. Key informant 3 from Kai Tahu ki Otago suggests that
council staff need to be further educated on the benefits of the cultural impact assessment process, stating:

"It's difficult at times because they make decisions on particular things. You don't know what background and where they come from and the knowledge they have of things Māori and what the Treaty is about."

Working with and further educating councils of the benefits of the cultural impact assessment process is one way of increasing Māori participation in planning. Cultural impact assessment increases participation of Māori by allowing them to collaborate and negotiate the outcome of a proposal with applicants. The Ministry for the Environment key informant also suggests that many councils are threatened by Māori participation. Therefore, in some ways, another limitation of cultural impact assessments is a council's willingness to promote their implementation and use. However, this mindset could slowly change once councils are further educated about the value and worth of cultural impact assessments.

As previously discussed in Section 7.2, the Dunedin City Council and the Wellington City Council find the cultural impact assessment process is very valuable to their resource consent process. The value and positive outcomes of the process could be promoted among other councils, so they too could be educated about the benefits the cultural impact assessment process can bring. It is the local government and iwi interface, which is the key to the development of cultural impact assessments in New Zealand. This is because many applicants will approach councils about how to involve iwi in the planning process. Therefore, if this relationship is good, the council will understand the importance of involving iwi and in some cases suggest that a cultural impact assessment be commissioned. Thus, councils need to encourage and invest money into appropriate tools such as cultural impact assessments to improve the participation of Māori in planning. This could occur through the establishment of grants or other assistance processes. This is of particular importance for those iwi organisations such as Ngati Kahungunu who do not currently have a resource management unit. If the
cultural impact assessment process is to be developed further, it is important for these organisations to set up resource management units and plans as a base from which to develop cultural impact assessments.

Tangata whenua groups also need to be educated further about the process and how impact assessments can be used. Sections 5.3 and 6.2.1 mentioned that over 60 iwi and hapu were contacted in this research in order to obtain cultural impact assessments from different tribal authorities. However, the majority of those contacted said that they were too under-resourced and many were only a one-person research team so were unable to undertake cultural impact assessments.

It was also acknowledged by a high number of those contacted that they do not understand the cultural impact assessment process and how these reports can be used to increase their participation in planning. The Ministry for the Environment key informant states that, in the past, much emphasis has been put on iwi management plans. Cultural impact assessments are a logical extension of these resource management plans. Thus, the next step would be for the Ministry for the Environment to produce reports and programmes to educate iwi about the benefits of producing cultural impact assessments. This in turn could potentially open the way for the use of cultural impact assessments. Following on from this, cultural impact assessments could be applied to many different aspects of planning, such as the Hazardous Substances and New Organisms Act 1996. For example, a cultural impact assessment could be undertaken by the iwi concerned in regard to the perceived impacts on them of the introduction of genetically modified organisms.

There is also a need to continue to further educate potential applicants about the cultural impact assessment process. Currently, there exists uneasiness around what cultural impact assessments are and around what Māori input is required in the process. Therefore, applicants need to gain more awareness of the cultural impact assessment process; such awareness could be achieved by
highlighting the benefits that applicants from Otago and Wellington have experienced.

This discussion illustrates that further education of the cultural impact assessment process is required among all sectors of the community that may potentially be involved in the cultural impact assessment process. Training programmes and practical guidelines could be developed to improve the skills and knowledge of council workers, applicants and tangata whenua. The findings of this research suggest that there is a genuine willingness of tangata whenua, local authorities and applicants to work together in order to achieve better environmental outcomes, and this is an excellent base from which further education and training can develop.

7.4.2 Training

It is important for any iwi organisation that undertakes a cultural impact assessment that the output of the process is the production of a quality report. Therefore, as with the need for increased education in relation to the cultural impact assessment process, there is also a need for some form of training to increase the capacity of iwi in New Zealand to undertake these reports. Section 6.9.1 suggested that regulatory solutions would be a last resort in relation to the cultural impact assessment process. Thus, further training and guidance from government departments such as the Ministry for the Environment, the Parliamentary Commissioner for the Environment and the New Zealand Association for Impact Assessment, could also be advantageous in promoting the benefits of the cultural impact assessment process.

As noted, there are many agencies that are involved in the management of New Zealand's environment. For example, the Ministry for the Environment could play a more active role, and apply the kinds of training sessions that have already been given for the RMA and iwi resource management plans to the cultural impact assessment process. However, if iwi do not have a resource management plan in existence this should still be the main priority, as cultural impact assessments are a logical extension from these plans. The New Zealand Planning Institute also organises workshops on activities such as how to
undertake and audit an environmental impact assessment and, thus, has the skills to further educate and train councils and applicants. In addition, the Parliamentary Commissioner for the Environment released in 2002 a publication "Exploring the concept of a Treaty based environmental audit framework". This looked at a Treaty audit system; again a similar publication could be prepared in relation to the cultural impact assessment process.

On the other side of the fence, iwi organisations who undertake cultural impact assessments must make sure that they have the capacity to deliver a credible report. Therefore, within these organisations, workshops and training sessions could also be organised to upskill other iwi or runanga members to the level required to undertake a quality cultural impact assessment. This may require government funding, as outlined previously a high number of iwi are greatly under-resourced.

It is important that cultural impact assessments maintain a certain professional standard, to ensure that cultural impact assessments are viewed as an integral part of the process rather than just a 'tick in a box'. Training could be provided by the Ministry for the Environment, as is the case with iwi resource management plans. In addition, the government has a crucial role to play in facilitating and supporting initiatives such as cultural impact assessments that may increase tangata whenua participation in planning.

7.4.3 Legislation

Legislative changes are required to increase Māori participation in planning. Currently, the RMA is worded in such a manner that many councils and applicants are unaware of its true implications to consult and involve Māori in the planning process. Section 6.8 highlights that, in Otago and Wellington, cultural impact assessments are only carried out to a small extent because of legislative obligations. There is widespread support amongst Māori to make the RMA 'sharper', so that it has a more practical focus in relation to tangata whenua issues (Parliamentary Commissioner for the Environment, 1998).
Section 6.8 highlights that cultural impact assessments are one way for applicants to meet the requirements of the RMA, in particular sections 6(e), 7(a), 8 and the 4th schedule. However, it is often difficult for Māori to cement a place in New Zealand’s planning framework because of the need for stronger legislative requirements that will increase their active participation in the planning process. Although the RMA has been in place for 12 years, Māori have not yet fully capitalised on the opportunities it provides (key informant 1, Kai Tahu ki Otago). The Crown needs to create clear guidelines in relation to the role of Māori in New Zealand’s planning framework. Currently, no national policy frameworks or standards exist to ensure that tangata whenua are able to participate in the planning process to ensure that their views are accommodated (Parliamentary Commissioner for the Environment, 1998). Thus, improvements could be made through additional funding and incentives to increase Māori participation in planning. In this research, the Ministry for the Environment’s key informant believes that there needs to be more seed funding for organisations to allow them to build their capacity and become self-funding like Kai Tahu ki Otago and the Wellington Tenths Trust.

For Māori participation to increase in planning, legislative changes need to occur which place a stronger obligation on applicants to consult and involve iwi throughout the process. Cultural impact assessments are one possible tool that could be used as a mechanism to increase Māori participation in this process.

7.4.4 Conclusion

Many improvements are required at the national level to the process and implementation of cultural impact assessments. These include the need for increased education, resourcing, capacity building, training and legislative changes. It appears that a top-down initiative is required to provide guidance and/or non-regulatory measures to increase awareness and to provide training on how to undertake cultural impact assessments.

A key drawback of the impact assessment process is that it is generally in react mode. Therefore, unless iwi have a resource management plan, there is no
urgency for iwi to pull information together until a resource consent is threatening an area of significance to them. Again this comes down to the lack of capacity and resources for iwi to respond to such environmental issues. The discussion now turns to investigating whether or not cultural impact assessments have the potential to be used as a tool for collaborative management.

7.4 A TOOL FOR COLLABORATIVE MANAGEMENT?

This section synthesises the results in order to answer the primary research question of this thesis: Are cultural impact assessments a tool for collaborative management between iwi and local authorities, developers or planning consultants? After investigating the content and process of cultural impact assessments and their value to various societal groups, it appears that there are limitations and further improvements required.

Various definitions of collaborative management were discussed in Chapter Two and the components and processes required for collaborative management to occur in a New Zealand context are also evaluated in Chapter Four. This chapter and Chapter Seven determine that Kai Tahu ki Otago and the Wellington Tenths Trust are very positive about the cultural impact assessment process. They both believe cultural impact assessments are important consultative and collaborative documents. A Kai Tahu ki Otago representative (1) believes that cultural impact assessments are “a tool for collaboration between the consultant and the runanga, because one of the hardest things was even getting the scale and effect of a development across to runanga members”.

However, it is unclear whether the cultural impact assessment acted as a tool for collaborative management between the applicant and iwi. In theory, it should be, because once applicants receive a cultural impact assessment they should be able to identify relevant issues. From there (if not earlier), the applicant and iwi should be able to start working together collaboratively on how to address those issues. Overall, Kai Tahu ki Otago representative 1 does not believe that the impact assessment is yet a collaborative tool and states, “I
am convinced that it is the right mechanism but the practical reality is something different again”. On the other hand, the Trust sees cultural impact assessments as more than a tool for collaborative management. The Wellington Tenths Trust key informant 1 states, “we see it as a very educative tool both for council and developers and for our own people as well”.

The cultural impact assessment process is evaluated here against the components and processes that were identified as being those required to aid in achieving successful collaborative management in New Zealand. These include:

- Initiating, building and maintaining relationships
- Involvement of iwi from the outset
- Giving Māori the opportunity to decide the role that they want to play in the process
- Understanding the importance of incorporating the Māori world view and willingness to learn and respect the other parties perspectives
- Working together with the overall objective of obtaining better environmental outcomes
- Decision-making by a collaboration process
- Adequate resources, such as human capacity and funding

These components have been determined through the investigation of collaborative management in Chapter Two, and New Zealand case study examples of the Waiapu project and the Taharoa Reserve Management Plan in Kaipara in Chapter Four. Therefore, the present section explores these components and evaluates whether or not the cultural impact assessment process fulfils these requirements for successful collaborative management.

1) **Initiating, building and maintaining relationships**

The use of cultural impact assessments as a tool for initiating and building relationships between iwi and applicants has been alluded to earlier in Section 7.2.2. A Kai Tahu ki Otago key informant (3) suggests that the cultural impact assessment “sets up the scene for further consultation and looks at what can
be done for mitigation, remedying or avoiding”. Section 7.2.2 concludes that the cultural impact assessment forms the basis from which relationships can develop. This partnership is initially founded from the cultural impact assessment process but really evolved from it as part of the negotiation process. For example, the Wellington City Council key informant comments that the success of the cultural impact assessment process is based on the, “...continuing discussions with the Wellington Tenths Trust both before and after the cultural impact assessment”. In other words, the cultural impact assessment is only a small part of the collaborative process required to actively involve Māori in planning. In fact, because developer 2 from Wellington finds the cultural impact assessment to be a very useful collaborative document he is repeating it for other applications in different areas throughout New Zealand. Otago developer 1 sums it up by asserting, “at the end of the day the cultural impact assessment built a relationship that is going to see us working in partnership for the lifetime of the development”. Therefore, the cultural impact assessment process of Kai Tahu ki Otago and the Trust was a good tool for initiating, building and maintaining a partnership between iwi and applicants.

2) Involvement of iwi from the outset of the project
To take an example, the Taharoa Reserve Management Plan (see Section 4.3.2) discusses the benefits of involving Māori at the start of the process. This early involvement is one of the main reasons that the plan was a success. The Wellington City Council key informant also states that:

“We could have gone to the Trust afterwards, after the concept design, but I would have to say, going to them before or in parallel with the other issues we were able to integrate their issues, concerns and recommendations right at the outset.”

Thus, the cultural impact assessment is a tool that facilitated the involvement of iwi right from the beginning of the process. It appears that direct negotiation and involvement of tangata whenua from the outset of the activity or policy creates a stronger opportunity for the integration of ideas and the promotion of good environmental outcomes.
3) Giving Māori opportunity to decide the role that they want to play in the planning process

The cultural impact assessment is a mechanism whereby iwi can express their concerns about a particular activity or development. Thus, it promotes the increased participation of Māori in planning. It is very important for Māori, as the Treaty partner, to have the opportunity to share their whakaaro (opinion, feeling, or concept). The cultural impact assessment process is one way of achieving this. This is because iwi are asked to participate directly in the process, rather than only being informed of the plans. Cultural impact assessments give iwi an opportunity to clearly articulate their values. In addition, if there are any errors or omissions in a cultural impact assessment, tangata whenua have to take responsibility for them. Therefore, the cultural impact assessment removes an element of risk from the consultant and client. This factor highlights how important it is that only iwi and hapu organisations with adequate capacity and resources should undertake cultural impact assessments. This ensures that a professional standard is maintained.

Another advantage for iwi of cultural impact assessment is that the preparation of a report is an expression of tino rangitiratanga and kaitiakitanga. It is a way in which the client or the developer can recognise and have particular regard for kaitiakitanga. In addition, it gives Māori the opportunity to decide what role they want to play in the process. In other words, the initial negotiation and collaboration that take place before the commissioning of the cultural impact assessment, allows iwi to determine what role that they would like to play in the process and whether a cultural impact assessment is necessary or not. Therefore, this process can also aid in reducing consultation fatigue, because only developments that have a significant effect on iwi are assessed. Consultation fatigue is a major issue for many iwi in New Zealand, as those involved in environmental management are under intense pressure to undertake a wide variety of tasks.
4) **Understanding the importance of the Māori world view and willingness to learn and understand the other parties perspective**

Section 4.1 emphasises that greater knowledge of the Māori world view is required. A key problem for Māori participation in planning is the overall lack of understanding of Māori cultural beliefs. Many applicants from Otago and Wellington comment that the cultural impact assessment is an excellent tool for representing and discussing the Māori world view in a manner and way that can be easily understood by a wide range of users.

5) **Working together with the overall objective of obtaining better environmental outcomes**

The Treaty of Waitangi formally recognises the right of Māori to have an active role in the management of New Zealand's environment. However, historically Māori have often found that their participation has been limited. Section 8.2 discusses the value of cultural impact assessments as tools to increase participation of Māori in planning, in building partnerships and in obtaining information from the collective. It is concluded that cultural impact assessments are one example of iwi and applicants collaborating together to achieve the best possible environmental outcomes. The broader discussions that take place after a cultural impact assessment is submitted encourage a shared understanding of contentious issues and ways in which these can be addressed (Tewdwr-Jones & Thomas, 1998). The cultural impact assessment also allows Māori to be more aware of the input that they have into the process. One Otago developer (4) discusses how a cultural impact assessment was used to determine the most appropriate site for a building development. However, ultimately there must be improved environmental outcomes.

6) **Decision making by collaboration**

Section 3.3.3 acknowledges that in collaborative planning, there is danger that the substance and outcomes of the process can be hindered by a focus on consensus building (Boyle, 1998). The impact assessment process allows foreseen impacts or issues to be remedied, avoided or mitigated. However, coming to a consensus is always difficult, especially because the RMA is all about having meaningful dialogue and working through issues, rather than about affected parties having to agree and form a consensus. The cultural impact assessment process provides a good base for consultation to develop.
As outlined in Section 3.3.3, Helling (1998) believes a major weakness of collaborative management is that sometimes a focus on the process and consensus building can often undermine the process. In addition, gaining consensus from the parties concerned does not always ensure that better environmental outcomes will be achieved. However, the cultural impact assessment process does not require that consensus between applicants and iwi is reached, rather, the two parties collaborate. Consequently, each party is able to share their knowledge of the area, and as a result, this collaboration may lead to better environmental outcomes.

7) Adequate resources, such as human capacity and funding

Internationally, the lack of resources and lack of capacity building are major limitations for the involvement of indigenous groups in planning. Unfortunately, (as discussed in Sections 7.3.1 and 7.4.2) in New Zealand, further resourcing and training is required in relation to the cultural impact assessment process. As reiterated by Kai Tahu ki Otago and the Wellington Tenths Trust, it is important that only iwi who have the ability to undertake the assessments are involved. This again highlights the need to produce cultural impact assessments to a certain professional standard. As outlined, there currently exists variability from iwi to iwi in their ability to respond to resource management issues. This again emphasises the need for more funding to build up the capability of these tangata whenua groups to a higher standard.

7.6 CONCLUSION

The results of this research suggest that the cultural impact assessment process has the potential to be a tool for collaborative management. The cultural impact assessment is a foundational document on which consultation and collaboration can be constructed. It is important that cultural impact assessments are not seen as a means to an end, but as a facilitation document for the purposes of exploring effects of changes in activities on tangata whenua, and they are a key part of the impact assessment process. The results of this chapter illustrate that cultural impact assessments are perceived by
those interviewed in Otago and Wellington as being a valuable tool for obtaining the views of iwi in the planning process. In addition, other values that the cultural impact assessments bring to the planning process include, building and initiating partnerships, gaining knowledge, gaining information from the collective, and documenting history.

This chapter demonstrates that the main limitations of the cultural impact assessment process relate to resourcing, the capacity of iwi to respond in a meaningful manner, time limitations and impact identification. In addition, national improvements are required to increase the participation of tangata whenua. These include recognising that further education, training and changes to current legislation are a necessity for the increased involvement of Māori in the planning process. There is a large variability amongst the resources and capacity of iwi in New Zealand. Therefore, further funding and assistance is required so that iwi can actively participate in managing and protecting the environment.

The following chapter discusses the implications of the findings from Chapters Five, Six and Seven, while linking these findings to the literature reviews and Chapter Four. A number of recommendations are put forward in an attempt to increase the understanding and awareness of the use of cultural impact assessments and to encourage their implementation in the future.
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Conclusion and Recommendations

8.1 INTRODUCTION

The need for the increased involvement of Māori in planning, and to provide further information and awareness for my iwi, Ngati Kahunugunu, about the cultural impact assessment process, provided the main motivations for the research problem of this thesis (identified in Chapter One). Through an exploration of cultural impact assessments it was hoped that greater knowledge would be gained of a tool that could be used to increase Māori participation in planning. This thesis has evaluated the process and content of cultural impact assessments in New Zealand. Its primary research question has been to investigate whether or not cultural impact assessments are a tool for collaborative management among iwi, developers, local authorities and planning consultants.

The question has been explored through the use of a number of sources. These include: a review of the collaborative management and impact assessment theories, application of these two theories to the New Zealand setting, review of the contents of 10 cultural impact assessments from within New Zealand and case study analysis of Kai Tahu ki Otago and the Wellington Tenths Trust. The triangulation method was used to increase the validity of the findings, since little is known about the cultural impact assessment process.
The previous two chapters (Six and Seven) have explored the implications of the process of cultural impact assessment in practice for Kai Tahu ki Otago and the Wellington Tenths Trust. The purpose of these chapters was to reevaluate the research questions and objectives and to synthesise the research findings in relation to cultural impact assessment practice of the two case studies. It was hoped that recommendations could be provided that may aid in improving the current cultural impact assessment process in New Zealand.

8.2 RESEARCH OBJECTIVES AND CONCLUSIONS

Each of the chapters has addressed one or part of the research objectives stated in Chapter One. The first objective of this research was to explore the theoretical underpinnings of collaborative management theory and impact assessment theory. Collaborative management was explored first by investigating the communicative theory; this was followed by an investigation of the notion of increased participation in planning, and of planning as a democratic process. The implications for indigenous involvement within collaborative management were also compared and contrasted to the co-management theory. It was determined that collaborative management is believed to represent a higher form of co-management (Tipa, 2002). Thus, it was concluded that a collaborative management framework would be best suited to meeting the participation requirements of indigenous groups in planning.

The second literature review explored the theoretical underpinnings of both environmental and social impact assessment theories. Specifically, it discussed the involvement and participation of indigenous groups in the impact assessment process, and illustrated the importance of this participation to its success. The implications of social impact assessments were discussed in more detail because a great deal of research has been undertaken on the empowerment capabilities of the social impact assessment process for indigenous groups. After reviewing both of these sets of literature, a framework (Figure 3.3) was developed to enable the two theories to be applied to the cultural impact assessment process. As previously outlined,
there is limited information on cultural impact assessment and tools such as these that could be used to promote collaborative management.

To address the second research objective, Chapter Four combined the findings of Chapters Two and Three and applied them to the New Zealand setting. This chapter commenced with a brief summary of the Māori world view and an exploration of traditional Māori resource management. These two sections highlighted the need for increased knowledge and awareness of the Māori world view. The collaborative management process specific to New Zealand was also assessed. Through the exploration of case study examples, combined with the findings from Chapter Two, a number of components were formulated to apply to the cultural impact assessment process. This determined whether or not cultural impact assessments have the potential to be a tool for collaborative management. Chapter Four also discussed the legislative obligations in New Zealand that require Māori to be involved in the planning process.

Chapter Five reviewed the contents of cultural impact assessments from around New Zealand. A modified version of Morgan's (2000) 'structured approach' was used to more specifically suit the context of cultural impact assessments. It was found that the process of cultural impact assessments is very similar to the process of other impact assessment reports. As with a social impact assessment, the contents of a cultural impact assessment will often overlap with information contained in an environmental impact assessment. Cultural impact assessments are very valuable tools for recording historical data and illustrating the traditional values of an area for Māori. However, many reports failed to cover some of the fundamental aspects of an impact assessment report. These include, making direct links to the environment, the use of supporting data, identifying the nature, severity, and spatial impacts of the activity, cumulative effects, and the integration of overall impacts. Further analysis of the process and structure, and possible reasons for these inefficiencies were investigated in Chapters Six and Seven.
Chapter Eight

The fourth objective, to analyse the process and value of cultural impact assessments as a participatory tool for promoting collaborative management, was investigated in Chapters Six and Seven. Chapter Six investigated the process of cultural impact assessments for Kai Tahu ki Otago and the Wellington Tenths Trust. This included exploring the initiation process, involvement of iwi, comparing and contrasting the different structures, RMA obligations, and the incorporation of the cultural impact assessment into the environmental impact assessment. The results suggest that the cultural impact assessment is only a small part of the negotiation and collaboration process that occurs between iwi and applicants.

Chapter Seven explored the value, limitations and some of the improvements required to the cultural impact assessment process. It was determined from the semi-structured interviews that cultural impact assessments are of significant value to both iwi and applicants in planning. Cultural impact assessments are a tool to increase Māori participation in planning, build partnerships, increase knowledge of the Māori world view, gather information from the collective, and a good way of documenting history. As is the case in relation to the limitations for indigenous groups' involvement in the impact assessment process, there are also many limitations for the involvement of Māori in the cultural impact assessment process. These include resourcing and the capacity of iwi to respond to proposals, time limitations, and the identification of significant impacts. Through the exploration of these, national improvements were also formulated. These include further education of iwi, developers, local authorities and the general public about the cultural impact assessment process, training, and legislative changes that clearly cement the role of Māori in planning.

In summary, cultural impact assessments are evolving documents and have the potential to increase Māori participation in planning. However, it must also be noted that only those iwi organisations that are adequately resourced and have the capacity to undertake cultural impact assessments should do so. This will aid in maintaining the value and quality of the assessments for all those involved in the resource management process.
The conclusions of each of the chapters have been used to answer the primary research objective of this thesis. In summary, the cultural impact assessment process has the potential to be used as a tool for collaborative management and for increasing Māori participation in planning. The cultural impact assessment is a tool, which has the potential to fulfil the components identified in Chapter Four. These components are required to achieve successful collaborative management in New Zealand. However, there are still many barriers that exist for iwi who want to undertake cultural impact assessments. These include a lack of knowledge and awareness of both the Māori world view and cultural impact assessment process, and generally a lack of resources that enable iwi to participate more actively in the planning process. Thus, Section 8.3 makes a number of recommendations for the future implementation and use of cultural impact assessments in New Zealand.

8.3 RECOMMENDATIONS FOR CULTURAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT USE

The investigation of cultural impact assessment use in New Zealand highlights that the current process requires numerous improvements. As a result, recommendations have been formulated to increase awareness and knowledge of the cultural impact assessment process. The first two recommendations are aimed at the national level. The remaining three recommendations relate to the cultural impact assessment process itself.

Recommendation One:

*Cultural impact assessment practice requires clear national guidance on the expectations, content, value and role of the process.*

The findings of this thesis highlight that stronger national guidance is required for the cultural impact assessment process. This could come (as outlined in Section 7.4.1) from either the Ministry for the Environment, the Parliamentary Commissioner for the Environment, the New Zealand Association for Impact Assessment, or the New Zealand Planning Institute. Initiatives include, training sessions, the release of tool kits similar to those the Ministry for the Environment released on iwi management plans, and
publications that could be used to further educate iwi and applicants about the cultural impact assessment process.

In addition, it would be beneficial to develop a structure to review the quality of cultural impact assessments. However, this structure would need to be adapted to the varying environments of different Māori organisations, so as to suit the wide cultural diversity amongst iwi and hapu throughout the country. The application of a structured reviewing approach for cultural impact assessments will become increasingly more important, particularly if cultural impact assessments develop into a popular impact assessment tool.

**Recommendation Two:**

*The current cultural impact assessment process requires a system to be developed to bring in consultants to upskill tangata whenua to undertake cultural impact assessments themselves.*

It has been outlined in the present research that many tangata whenua groups around New Zealand are under-resourced and lack the relevant skills to undertake cultural impact assessments. Hence, the second research recommendation is proposed. Funding for such initiatives must be provided by the government, to (potentially) increase the ability of tangata whenua to participate in planning. Thus, cultural impact assessments are one way of involving iwi, obtaining information and ensuring that the expertise of tangata whenua is not taken for granted.

**Recommendation Three:**

*Successful cultural impact assessment practice requires that Māori are involved from the outset of the development or policy.*

The present research highlights the importance of involving and collaborating with Māori early on in the process, to ensure that tangata whenua are given sufficient time to participate. It has also been identified that early involvement also aids in forming partnerships and building trust between Māori and applicants.
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Recommendation Four:
*Cultural impact assessment practice requires that goals and objectives for the process be clearly articulated at the commencement of the project.*

Failure for iwi to meet the required time frames was identified in this research as a key limitation of the cultural impact assessment process. However, clearly defined goals and, acknowledging both iwi and applicants expectations of the procedure is necessary to ensure a focused and successful outcome.

Recommendation Five:
*For cultural impact assessments to maintain their quality, only iwi groups who have the resources and appropriate training should undertake them.*

Cultural impact assessments are evolving documents and it is important that the quality of these reports is maintained. Moreover, the present research demonstrates that the content of cultural impact assessments needs to improve in relation to the key elements that an impact assessment should contain. These include further identification of the impacts, making clear and direct links with the environment, and discussing further the nature, severity, spatial and cumulative impacts of an activity.

8.4 RESEARCH LIMITATIONS

There are many limitations when undertaking research and it is important that the results of this thesis are viewed in light of these. One of the main constricting factors for this research was that of logistical limitations. These limitations included, restricted time-frames and transportation difficulties. Ideally, it would have been more useful to carry out a number of case studies. However, due to the limited number of iwi who undertake cultural impact assessments and the limited amount of time and resources of these organisations, only two case studies were chosen.

Finally, the premise of this research was to investigate a planning tool that may aid in increasing Māori participation in planning. Cultural impact assessments will only be successful if the local authority, developers and
planning consultants recognise the importance of consulting with Māori and actively involve them throughout the process. The literature has identified many common themes that limit Māori involvement in planning. Thus, an approach such as cultural impact assessments will only be adopted if the role of Māori in planning is clear and the value that such a report will bring is recognised. Historically, lack of funding has been a major limitation for the active involvement of Māori. This hinders the ability of iwi to respond to the process and to undertake a cultural impact assessment. The government and local authorities need to provide more funding and guidance to iwi about the cultural impact assessment process.

8.5 RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH

There is scope for future research into the role of cultural impact assessments in planning. This study has revealed that there is a small amount of published literature in New Zealand and internationally about the role and value of cultural impact assessments. Given that there are a number of different approaches for undertaking cultural impact assessments, iwi organisations in New Zealand would benefit from feedback and sharing past experiences of cultural impact assessment practice with each other. In addition, it is important to further investigate the weighting that cultural impact assessments are given in final environmental impact assessments, and in the decision making process, as this confirms the validity and quality of the reports. It would also be beneficial to evaluate the value that is given to traditional knowledge and analyse how it is integrated into environmental impact assessments.

Further research is required to assess whether the iwi or runanga represented by Kai Tahu ki Otago and the Wellington Tenths Trust have a satisfactory opportunity to participate in the information gathering stage of the cultural impact assessment process. In addition, this research highlights that further investigation needs to take place in relation to the ability of organisations, such as the Wellington Tenths Trust, to adequately represent the views of its constituent members in the cultural impact assessment process.
8.6 CONCLUSION

The research confirms the importance of increasing the participation of Māori in natural resource management and planning in New Zealand. It demonstrates the importance of applying the cultural impact assessment practice to collaborative management in New Zealand. Furthermore, the study highlights that the cultural impact assessment process alone will not result in collaborative management, and that it is only a small part of the process. A number of recommendations have been identified and may prove useful for improving New Zealand’s cultural impact assessment process. In summary, this research highlights that building and initiating relationships, and further education and training of iwi, developers, local authorities and planning consultants, is the key for achieving better environmental outcomes in the impact assessment process.

These findings contribute to the wider body of literature on indigenous involvement and public participation by highlighting the importance of collaborative management and its application through the tool of cultural impact assessments.

The concluding thoughts of this thesis come from Tate (cited in Barlow, 1991:iv) who states:

\[
\begin{align*}
Mā te whakaatu, ka mōhio \\
Mā te mōhio, ka mārama \\
Mā te mārama, ka mātau \\
Mā te mātau, ka ora
\end{align*}
\]

By discussion cometh understanding, 
By understanding cometh light, 
By light cometh wisdom, 
By wisdom cometh life everlasting.
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Appendix A

The following tables are the explanations for the questions used to review the content of cultural impact assessments in Chapter five.
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1. Clarity of environmental and cultural values identified

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Explicit recognition of the environmental and cultural settings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>General recognition of the environmental and cultural settings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>No recognition of the environmental and cultural settings</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Explanation: The cultural impact assessments were allocated an 'A' or 'B' for question one on the basis of whether the environmental, cultural and historical setting had been explicitly discussed. For example, an 'A' was given to those cultural impact assessments that clearly explained the environmental setting. In addition, the environmental setting needed to be clearly described at the beginning of the cultural impact assessment to set the scene and to clearly portray the importance of the area to the reader. Those cultural impact assessments that gained a 'B' did not explicitly discuss the environmental and cultural settings.

2. Extent of direct with the environment identified

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Direct links made between the environment and cultural setting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>General recognition of the direct links</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>No recognition of the direct links</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Explanation: An ‘A’ was given to the cultural impact assessments that clearly explained and recognised the direct links with the environment. Those cultural impact assessments that gained a ‘B’ did not integrate and link the effects of the proposal in a holistic manner.

3. Evidence of meaningful iwi involvement indicated

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Strong evidence of meaningful iwi involvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Limited acknowledgement of iwi involvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>No recognition iwi involvement</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Explanation: For Question 3, cultural impact assessments had to acknowledge the involvement of iwi, hapu or runanga throughout the development of the cultural impact assessment to gain an 'A'. For example, involvement of the iwi, hapu or runanga could be represented by stating that huis had been held and/or interviews had taken place, in order for the cultural impact assessments to be completed.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4 Clear and sound predictions identified</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A Clear and sound predictions made</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B Limited predictions made</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C No predictions made</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Explanation: The cultural impact assessments were graded an ‘A’ if detailed predictions were made about the proposal. The predictions were judged by the extent to which they were discussed, the detail they were discussed in, and the number of impacts identified. Therefore, the predictions made had to be relative to the size of the project. In other words, large proposals should predict more impacts than those of smaller ones. Those cultural impact assessments that scored a ‘B’ identified some impacts and did not discuss the implications in detail.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5 Methods and supporting data detailed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A Detailed use of methods and supporting data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B Limited use of methods and supporting data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C No recognition of methods and supporting data</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Explanation: For Question 5, cultural impact assessments were graded an ‘A’ if supporting data was used to back up some of the impacts and effects discussed in the cultural impact assessment. For supporting data, they could include the use of additional scientific reports. In addition, statements and interview findings could have been integrated to further back up the statements made in the reports. Those cultural impact assessments that scored a ‘B’ either failed to fully integrate additional sources of information or did not describe in detail the methods used to establish the findings on. If the cultural impact assessment did provide methods or supporting data it was graded a ‘C’.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>6 Nature, severity and spatial impacts explained</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A Explicit coverage of the nature, severity, and spatial impacts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B Limited acknowledgement of these impacts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C No recognition of these impacts</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Explanation: An ‘A’ was given to cultural impact assessments that recognised the nature, severity and spatial impacts of the proposed development. Reports were judged by the detail in which the cultural impact assessment acknowledged and discussed these impacts. Reports that were allocated a ‘B’,
either recognised only two of these impacts or did not fully discuss the full implications of the proposal on iwi. Those reports that scored a 'C' did not recognise the nature, severity and spatial impacts of the proposal.

### Appendix A

**Indirect, cumulative and long term impacts identified**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Explicit coverage the indirect, cumulative and long term impacts</th>
<th>Limited acknowledgement of these impacts</th>
<th>No recognition of coverage of impacts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Explanation:** In Question 7 (Table 6.1), to gain an ‘A’ the impact had to provide explicit detail of the implications to the environment. For example, it was not enough for the cultural impact assessment to suggest that the marae trustees were concerned the proposal would have adverse effects, rather the detail of the specific indirect, cumulative, and long-term effects had to be investigated to gain an ‘A’. Those cultural impact assessments that recognised some of these effects were only graded a ‘B’. No recognition of the above effects resulted in a ‘C’.

### Integration of environment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Explicit integration of the impacts</th>
<th>Limited integration of the impacts</th>
<th>No recognition integration of the impacts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Explanation:** It is important that a cultural impact assessment sought to link and integrate information relating to the impacts on the different parts of the environment, to ensure that an overall picture could be gained (Question 8). Cultural impact assessments that recognised the different impacts of the development but failed to integrate and explore in detail the specific impacts of the proposal, received a ‘B’. Those that did not recognise any links or specific details of the impacts were graded a ‘C’.

### Mitigation measures considered

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mitigation measures considered and adequately addressed</th>
<th>General recognition of mitigation measures</th>
<th>No recognition of mitigation measures</th>
<th>Not applicable to present mitigation in the report</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Explanation:** Where a cultural impact assessment was graded an ‘A’ it indicated that mitigation measures had been considered and adequately addressed. For example, safety was considered a big issue for one of the
cultural impact assessments. One possible mitigation measure addressed was that some of the areas could be fenced off and pedestrian crossings could be installed. Whereas, cultural impact assessments that scored a 'B,' only partly recognised and addressed mitigation measures in their report. For example, one mitigation measure was the avoidance of direct impacts on the waterways of the proposed site. To gain an 'A,' further detail of how the avoidance was to occur and how it could be addressed was required. Those iwi who indicated that mitigation was not covered in their reports were graded as non-applicable. Some iwi chose not to include mitigation measures within their cultural impact assessments because they believed it was one way of the iwi retaining their negotiation power (further discussed in section 6.7.1).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>11</th>
<th>Clear and logical format provided, and simply organised</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Good clear logical format and simply organised</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Limited clarity and logic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Format not clear, logical or simply organised</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Explanation: The cultural impacts assessments were graded an 'A' if the cultural impact assessment followed a clear and logical format and was simply organised. For example, this included linking, and guiding the reader throughout the report and logically setting out the information so that it was easy to understand and follow. Cultural impact assessments that scored a 'B' in these two questions in places lacked logic and clarity. For example, the environmental and cultural setting should be discussed at the beginning of the report, as this sets the scene and establishes why an area is important to iwi.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>13</th>
<th>Ability to cater for a wide range of users identified</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Caters for a wide range of users</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Limited ability to cater for a wide range of users</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Does not cater for a wide range of users</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Explanation: It is important for cultural impact assessments to cater for a wide range of users. Therefore, reports gained an 'A' in this question if Māori concepts were clearly explained and defined and non-technical language was used throughout the report. Those reports that were graded a 'B' did not
fully explain Māori concepts and did not give explicit detail of why an area was of significant importance for iwi.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>14</th>
<th>Overall impact set out in understandable format indicated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Clear and understandable format</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Limited extent to which impacts are set out in an understandable form</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Overall impact not set out in clear and understandable format</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Explanation: If the effects to iwi were fully discussed and explored in explicit detail, the cultural impact assessment was graded an 'A'. Those reports that gained a 'B' did not fully explore the impacts to iwi and needed to give more detail of some issues.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>15</th>
<th>Appropriate use of photos, graphics and maps identified</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Explicit coverage of the effects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Limited acknowledgement of effects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>No recognition of coverage of effects</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Explanation: For example, those cultural impact assessments that used photos and illustrations to complement the findings might score an 'A'. The inclusion of photos and maps in the appendix of the report, with no direct citing within the cultural impact assessment, only scored a 'B'. Cultural impact assessments that scored a 'C', failed to incorporate pictures, photos or maps into the report.
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Information Sheet and Consent Forms

The following are the Information Sheet and Consent Forms given to interviewees prior to the commencement of the interview.
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ARE CULTURAL IMPACT ASSESSMENTS A TOOL FOR COLLABORATIVE MANAGEMENT?

Information Sheet For Interview Participants

Thank you for showing an interest in this project. Please read this information sheet carefully before deciding whether or not to participate. If you decide to participate we thank you. If you decide not to take part there will be no disadvantage to you of any kind and we thank you for considering our request.

What is the Aim of the Project?

This project is being completed as part of a Master of Regional and Resource Planning thesis. It investigates the role and implementation of cultural impact assessments as a tool for collaborative management in New Zealand. Its immediate objective is to increase the awareness of cultural impact assessments by providing a greater understanding of:

- The content cultural impact assessments, and how they are compare to other impact assessment reports
- The value, limitations, and future improvements of cultural impact assessment practice
- The use of cultural impact assessments as an effective participatory tool for collaborative management

A longer-term objective is to increase the awareness of cultural impact assessments and clarify the role they play or their potential in resource management decision making. Participants include representatives from local iwi and other key stakeholder organisations who are involved with cultural impact assessments and their implementation. Should you agree to take part in this project, you will be asked to, participate in a semi-structured interview.

What will Participants be Asked to Do?

These activities would take approximately 30 minutes and address the following issues:

- Your perception of cultural impact assessments as a participatory tool
- The content of cultural impact assessments and their value in resource management decision-making
- Your role in cultural impact assessment implementation
- Suggestions for the improvement of cultural impact assessment use

Can Participants Change their Mind and Withdraw from the Project?

Please be aware that you may decide not to take part in the project without any disadvantage to yourself of any kind. You may withdraw from participation in the project at any time and without any disadvantage to yourself of any kind.
What Data or Information will be Collected and What Use will be Made of it?

This project involves an open-questioning technique where the precise nature of the questions which will be asked have not been determined in advance, but will depend on the way in which the interview develops. Consequently, although the University of Otago Human Ethics Committee is aware of the general areas to be explored in the interview, the Committee has not been able to review the precise questions to be used.

In the event that the line of questioning does develop in such a way that you feel hesitant or uncomfortable you are reminded of your right to decline to answer any particular question(s) and also that you may withdraw from the project at any stage without any disadvantage to yourself of any kind.

The data collected will be used to inform the work of the Kai Tahu ki Otago. Dr Michelle Thompson-Fawcett and Anita Vanstone will be the only individuals with access to the data throughout the entire process.

Results of this project may be published but any data included will in no way be linked to any specific participant. You are most welcome to request a copy of the results of the project should you wish. The data collected will be securely stored in such a way that only those mentioned above will be able to gain access to it. At the end of the project any personal information will be destroyed immediately except that, as required by the University's research policy, any raw data on which the results of the project depend will be retained in secure storage for five years, after which it will be destroyed.

What if Participants have any Questions?

If you have any questions about our project, either now or in the future, please feel free to contact either:-

Anita Vanstone  
Department of Geography  
University Number:-  
03 479 5470

or

Michelle Thompson-Fawcett  
Department of Geography  
University Number:-  
03 479 8762

This project has been reviewed and approved by the Department of Geography,  
University of Otago
ARE CULTURAL IMPACT ASSESSMENTS A TOOL FOR COLLABORATIVE MANAGEMENT?

Consent Form For Interview Participants

I have read the Information Sheet concerning this project and understand what it is about. All my questions have been answered to my satisfaction. I understand that I am free to request further information at any stage.

I know that:-

1. My participation in the project is entirely voluntary;

1. I am free to withdraw from the project at any time without any disadvantage;

2. The audio-tapes will be destroyed at the conclusion of the project but any raw data on which the results of the project depend will be retained in secure storage for five years, after which it will be destroyed;

3. This project involves an open-questioning technique where the precise nature of the questions which will be asked have not been determined in advance, but will depend on the way in which the interview develops. Consequently, although the Department of Geography, University of Otago, is aware of the general areas to be explored in the interview, the Department has not been able to review the precise questions to be used.

4. The results of the project may be published but my anonymity will be preserved.

I agree to take part in this project.

(Signature of participant) (Date)

This project has been reviewed and approved by the Department of Geography, University of Otago
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Examples of Interview Schedules:

Cultural impact assessment writers:

1) Key informants professional background and involvement with the cultural impact assessment process.

2) How was it initiated for Kai Tahu ki Otago or the Trust to undertake the cultural impact assessment?

3) What is the general structure of your cultural impact assessments and what do believe it should contain?

4) Do you believe there needs to be some form of formal training for cultural impact assessment writers?

5) How are the aspirations of the runanga included in the cultural impact assessment process?

6) What are the strengths of the iwi organisations undertaking the preparation of cultural impact assessments on the behalf of its iwi or runanga?

7) Do you believe cultural impact assessments have the potential to be a tool for collaborative management?

8) What were the limitations for you specifically when undertaking the cultural impact assessment?

9) What sorts of improvements do you think might strengthen your current approach for undertaking cultural impact assessments?

10) What suggestions do you have that might improve and enhance cultural impact assessment use and implementation in general throughout New Zealand?

11) To what extent do you think the use of cultural impact assessments boosts the potential for meaningful participation by Māori in resource management decision-making?
Iwi or runanga members

1. What are the runangas aspirations and hopes relating to the cultural impact assessment process?

2. What are the strengths of Kai Tahu ki Otago or the Wellington Tenths Trust undertaking the preparation of cultural impact assessments on your behalf?

3. What sorts of improvements do you think might strengthen the current cultural impact assessment approach of Kai Tahu ki Otago or the Wellington Tenths Trust?

4. What suggestions do you have that might improve and enhance cultural impact assessment use and implementation in general throughout New Zealand?

5. To what extent do you think the use of cultural impact assessments boosts the potential for meaningful participation by Māori in resource management decision-making?

Developers and Planning Consultants

1) Views on cultural impact assessments and background interaction with them?

2) How was it initiated that a cultural impact assessment was required for your development?

3) Do you feel that cultural impact assessments are a way of recognising and providing for the relationship of iwi with the natural environment? Why?

4) Why do you believe cultural impact assessments are becoming so prominent? Legislative obligations?

5) What value do cultural impact assessments bring to your company in the planning process?

6) Suggested improvements for cultural impact assessment use and implementation in your region.

NB- Those that were interviewed from a national perspective were asked a range of the above questions.