

Copyright is owned by the Author of the thesis. Permission is given for a copy to be downloaded by an individual for the purpose of research and private study only. The thesis may not be reproduced elsewhere without the permission of the Author.

CO-MANAGEMENT:

Kanohi ki te kanohi

OPTIONS FOR EGMONT NATIONAL PARK

CO-MANAGEMENT:

Kanohi ki te kanohi

OPTIONS FOR EGMONT NATIONAL PARK

A thesis presented in part fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of
MASTER OF RESOURCE AND ENVIRONMENTAL PLANNING

Massey University

New Zealand

Gregory Francis Pollock

1998

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS:

In completing this thesis there are a great number of people whom I would like to thank and acknowledge. The topic chosen for this thesis, collaborative management, is something that I believe is essential in planning for the future of New Zealand. The creation of working partnerships between different peoples' to ensure the ongoing sustainable management and preservation of important resources, such as the conservation estate, is critical to our future. The people I would like to pay a special tribute to are those who have formed and fostered the vision that I believe in for the future. In particular I would like to thank my parents, Helen and Bryan, my brother Chris, and my grandparents for their encouragement. Taranaki is a special place for the Pollock family, and will continue to be and I hope that this research will contribute towards the growth of a magical part of New Zealand, where I was lucky enough to 'grow up.'

To my flatmates in Auckland, Nikk, Steve, Richard, Simon, and Mary, thanks for putting up with my moaning about trying to finish my thesis and for entertaining me during my long periods of procrastination. Thanks to Mary for the proof reading. Thanks also to Kat who provided me with a great Waiheke Island 'Thesis' getaway.

Thank you to my thesis supervisor Peter Horsley for providing continual and much needed enthusiasm, guidance, and comments and for being an all round good guy.

A special thank you to those dedicated people in the Department of Conservation who made my time in Wanganui and Taranaki great fun. In particular, thanks to Rudy Tetteroo for his invaluable input, advice and knowledge and to Jeff Mitchell-Anyon for his good humour, advice and guidance. Thanks also to all the DoC field staff from Egmont National Park who helped enormously with information and goodwill. Thanks also to Rangipo Mete kingi for his vision and advice.

To all the people from Taranaki, from all the different iwi and hapu, tramping clubs and community groups I have spoken to, thank you for your input. In particular, I would like to pay a special thank you to Diane Ratahi who has provided me with very insightful ideas on the future direction of Taranaki, the place of the mountain in that future and what people will need to achieve to create for the futures they want. No reira e te Rangatira e kawea te mana o te iwi tena koe. Tena koe ano hoke tatau katoa.

Finally, special thanks to my Auckland work colleagues who have encouraged me during the past two years of writing my thesis while working. In particular, thank you

to Adrienne Young Cooper, David Hill, Wendy Macdonald and Val Brown for their encouragement to complete my thesis. Thank you also to the Auckland Regional Council, and my friends who work there. Your support has been great. In particular I would like to thank Chris Koroheke, Cheryl Holloway, Graeme Murdoch, Maari Porter, Hugh Jarvis, Noel Reardon, Louise Marra and Vaughan Payne for helping me through in various ways. Now its play time.

ABSTRACT

Egmont National Park is a very special place for those who live near or around the park. Many people, Maori and European, openly acknowledge a spiritual relationship with the mountain. Its importance cannot be underestimated. The functioning of the park ecosystem is increasingly being placed under pressure from various threats. The management of these threats is being strained due to insufficient resources from the Department of Conservation. The complexity of these threats means there is a need to look at new and innovative solutions for park management.

In order to achieve the conservation outcomes the local, regional and national communities of interest seek for Egmont National Park, there is a need to examine management arrangements. One significant outcome of such an examination is the desire for these communities to be more closely involved in park management. The Department of Conservation must begin to form such partnerships with Maori. Traditional Maori knowledge can be utilised in conjunction with western knowledge, in order to provide the best management for the park.

Consideration is given in this thesis to empowering these local communities so that they can be involved in park management. While a range of conflicts and differences within communities in Taranaki exist, there are a number of common threads. The concept of establishing consensus and co-operation to work towards a common goal is therefore by no means impossible or futuristic. This concept is termed co-management. This thesis develops options for co-management in Egmont National Park.

Developing a co-management agreement within the New Zealand context of enormous conservation threats, high interest in recreation, public access and ownership issues, means these processes must be based on a series of common principles. Therefore, this thesis builds on elements of the theory and application of co-management from overseas experience and literature and the broader New Zealand context for conservation planning. A range of principles for co-management are presented and used to develop structures and processes to enable co-management in Egmont National Park.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. CO-MANAGEMENT: PARTNERSHIPS FOR CONSERVATION	12
1.1 INTRODUCTION	12
1.2 AIMS AND OBJECTIVES:	15
1.3 NEW ZEALAND CONSERVATION ESTATE	18
1.4 TREATY OF WAITANGI	18
1.5 STRUCTURE	20
1.5.1 CHAPTER TWO - METHODOLOGY	20
1.5.2 CHAPTER THREE - CO-MANAGEMENT: THEORY AND APPLICATION	20
1.5.3 CHAPTER FOUR - NATIONAL PARKS AND CONSERVATION PLANNING PROCESSES	21
1.5.4 CHAPTER FIVE - CASE STUDY : EGMONT NATIONAL PARK	21
1.5.5 CHAPTER SIX - CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	22
2. METHODOLOGY	23
2.1 INTRODUCTION	23
2.2 METHODOLOGY AND RESEARCH DESIGN	24
2.2.1 RESEARCH METHODOLOGY	24
2.2.2 LIMITATIONS:	29
2.3 LITERATURE REVIEW	30
2.4 CASE STUDY SELECTION - MANAGEMENT PLAN REVIEW	31
2.5 INTERVIEWS	32
2.6 SUMMARY	34
3. CO-MANAGEMENT: THEORY AND PRACTICE	35
3.1 INTRODUCTION	35
3.2 DEFINITION OF CO-MANAGEMENT	37
3.3 HISTORY OF CO-MANAGEMENT	50
3.4 STAKEHOLDERS	55
3.4.1 INITIATING A CO-MANAGEMENT PROCESS: THE ROLE OF THE PROPONENT	57
3.4.2 REQUIREMENTS OF BEING A STAKEHOLDER IN A CO-MANAGEMENT PROCESS	58
3.4.3 FINDING STAKEHOLDERS	59

3.4.4	STAKEHOLDER ANALYSIS	61
3.5	SYNTHESISING WORLD VIEWS - FUNDAMENTAL PRINCIPLES OF CO-MANAGEMENT	63
3.6	PRINCIPLES OF THE TREATY OF WAITANGI	72
3.7	INTERNATIONAL SUSTAINABILITY PRINCIPLES	74
3.8	CO-MANAGEMENT: BASIC PRINCIPLES	77
3.8.1	CONSERVATION MANAGEMENT PRINCIPLES	79
3.8.2	PROCESS PRINCIPLES	83
3.8.3	RELATIONSHIP PRINCIPLES	90
3.8.4	CONCLUDING OVERVIEW: PRINCIPLES	93
3.9	POTENTIAL BENEFITS, COSTS AND OBSTACLES TO CO-MANAGEMENT.	93
3.9.1	BENEFITS	96
3.9.2	COSTS	97
3.9.3	OBSTACLES:	98
3.10	APPLICATION OF CO-MANAGEMENT	98
3.10.1	THE PRECONDITIONS FOR CO-MANAGEMENT	99
3.10.2	MECHANISMS AND CONDITIONS TO SUPPORT CO-MANAGEMENT	100
3.10.3	SCALE FOR CO-MANAGEMENT	100
3.10.4	STAKEHOLDERS IN A CO-MANAGEMENT PROCESS	101
3.10.5	GENERAL PROPOSITIONS	101
3.11	PROCESSES FOR CO-MANAGEMENT	102
3.12	STRUCTURES FOR CO-MANAGEMENT	105
3.13	SUMMARY OF KEY THEMES	108
 4. NATIONAL PARKS AND CONSERVATION PLANNING PROCESSES		 110
4.1	INTRODUCTION	110
4.2	NATIONAL PARKS	111
4.2.1	NATIONAL PARKS - DEFINITION	111
4.2.2	HISTORY OF NATIONAL PARKS- GENERAL	113
4.2.3	NATIONAL PARKS LEGISLATION-GENERAL	115
4.2.4	NATIONAL PARKS -GENERAL CONCEPTS AND MANAGEMENT ISSUES	116
4.2.5	CO-MANAGEMENT IN NATIONAL PARKS: GENERAL	122
4.3	AUSTRALIAN EXPERIENCE OF CO-MANAGEMENT - KAKADU NATIONAL PARK	122
4.3.1	INTRODUCTION	122
4.3.2	HISTORY	123
4.3.3	CO-MANAGEMENT MECHANISMS	126

4.3.4 SUMMARY	128
4.4 CONSERVATION IN NEW ZEALAND	129
4.4.1 LEGISLATIVE OBJECTIVES AND OUTCOMES	129
4.4.2 THE DEPARTMENT OF CONSERVATION	137
4.4.3 KEY CONSERVATION MANAGEMENT ISSUES:	140
4.4.4 CONSERVATION PARTNERSHIPS	140
4.4.5 NEW ZEALAND NATIONAL PARKS	143
4.5 CONSERVATION PLANNING PROCESSES	151
4.5.1 STRATEGIC OVERVIEW	151
4.5.2 INTEGRATED CONSERVATION PLANNING	156
4.6 SUMMARY OF KEY THEMES	157
5. CASE STUDY: EGMONT NATIONAL PARK	159
<hr/>	
5.1 INTRODUCTION:	159
5.2 THE PARK:	160
5.2.1 LOCATION OF THE PARK	160
5.2.2 PARK ESTABLISHMENT AND HISTORY	164
5.2.3 PHYSICAL RESOURCES	168
5.2.4 VISITOR AND RECREATION FACILITIES	173
5.3 THE PEOPLE:	174
5.3.1 INTRODUCTION	174
5.3.2 THE REGIONAL COMMUNITY	175
5.3.3 STAKEHOLDERS	176
5.3.4 TARANAKI IWI	178
5.3.5 COMMUNITY GROUPS	182
5.3.6 VISITORS	183
5.4 THE PROCESS	184
5.4.1 INTRODUCTION	184
5.4.2 LEGISLATIVE AND POLICY CONTEXT	185
5.4.3 MANAGEMENT PLAN REVIEW PROCESS:	193
5.4.4 MANAGEMENT PHILOSOPHY	196
5.4.5 ISSUES	199
5.5 CO-MANAGEMENT IN EGMONT NATIONAL PARK	200
5.5.1 INTRODUCTION	200
5.5.2 OWNERSHIP ISSUES - EGMONT NATIONAL PARK	202

5.5.3 CO-MANAGEMENT PROPOSAL - 1996	207
5.5.4 OPTIONS FOR CO-MANAGEMENT IN EGMONT NATIONAL PARK	210
5.5.5 IMPLEMENTATION	223
5.5.6 EVALUATION AND ANALYSIS OF CO-MANAGEMENT	227
5.6 THE FUTURE: CONCLUSIONS	228

6. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS **229**

6.1 CONCLUSION	229
6.1.1 CO-MANAGEMENT PRINCIPLES AND PRACTICE.	230
6.1.2 CONSERVATION PLANNING AND MANAGEMENT PRACTICE IN NEW ZEALAND'S CONSERVATION ESTATE.	231
6.1.3 NATIONAL PARK MANAGEMENT AND POTENTIAL IMPROVEMENTS RESULTING FROM CO-MANAGEMENT.	232
6.1.4 CO-MANAGEMENT IN EGMONT NATIONAL PARK	233
6.2 RECOMMENDATIONS	234

LIST OF FIGURES

FIGURE 1: A COMMON CYCLE OF ACTION INQUIRY (KEMMIS AND MCTAGGERT, 1990)	24
FIGURE 2: RESEARCH DESIGN	28
FIGURE 3: LEVELS OF CO-MANAGEMENT (SOURCE: BERKES <i>ET AL</i> , 1991)	43
FIGURE 4: PARTICIPATION IN PROTECTED AREA MANAGEMENT - A CONTINUUM (SOURCE: BORRINI-FEYERABEND (1996)	44
FIGURE 5: CREATING LINKS BETWEEN WORLD VIEWS: FROM WISDOM TRADITIONS TO IMPLEMENTATION	65
FIGURE 6: THE KEY ELEMENTS OF CO-MANAGEMENT IN RELATION TO NATURE CONSERVATION (KERURU).	70
FIGURE 7: A TYPICAL PLANNING PROCESS	103
FIGURE 8: GENERIC PHASES OF A CO-MANAGEMENT PROCESS.	104
FIGURE 9: SIMPLE REPRESENTATION OF A CO-MANAGEMENT STRUCTURE	108
FIGURE 10: THE CHANGING ROLES OF NATIONAL PARKS (ADAPTED FROM DEARDEN AND ROLLINS, 1993)	118

FIGURE 11: NATIONAL PARK MANAGEMENT PROCESS	120
FIGURE 12: PUBLIC NOTICE AND RIGHTS OF OBJECTION	131
FIGURE 13: A CONTINUUM OF DELEGATION	135
FIGURE 14: MEMBERSHIP OF THE NEW ZEALAND CONSERVATION AUTHORITY (SECTION 6D, CONSERVATION ACT 1987).	136
FIGURE 15: FUNCTIONS OF THE DEPARTMENT OF CONSERVATION	137
FIGURE 16: DISTRIBUTION OF APPROVED EXPENSES FOR DOC OUTPUT CLASSES 1996/97 (SOURCE: TABLE 12)	139
FIGURE 17: DOC PARTNERSHIPS	143
FIGURE 18: THREE KEY THEMES AND ISSUES ADDRESSED IN THE DOC STRATEGIC BUSINESS PLAN	154
FIGURE 19: PERCENTAGE OF LAND AS PROTECTED AREA IN EGMONT ECOLOGICAL DISTRICT (SOURCE: TABLE 15)	162
FIGURE 20: POPULATION CHANGES IN TERRITORIAL AUTHORITIES IN TARANAKI REGION (SOURCE: NEW ZEALAND CENSUS, 1996)	175
FIGURE 21: MAORI POPULATION BY TERRITORIAL AUTHORITY IN TARANAKI REGION (SOURCE: CENSUS, 1996)	176
FIGURE 22: STAKEHOLDERS IN EGMONT NATIONAL PARK	177
FIGURE 23: STAKEHOLDERS FORM 'PILLARS' OF CO-MANAGEMENT	178
FIGURE 24: TARANAKI IWI (SOURCE: 1996 CENSUS - IWI AFFILIATION OF PEOPLE OF NEW ZEALAND MAORI DESCENT RESIDENT IN NEW ZEALAND)	181
FIGURE 25: ORIGIN OF VISITORS TO EGMONT NATIONAL PARK (SOURCE: LAWRENCE <i>ET</i> <i>AL</i> , 1996)	183
FIGURE 26: PREPARATION OF THE WANGANUI CMS	186
FIGURE 27: EGMONT NATIONAL PARK MANAGEMENT PLAN REVIEW 1995/96	196
FIGURE 28: TIME AND CO-MANAGEMENT	212
FIGURE 29: THE TRANSITION TO SUCCESSFUL CO-MANAGEMENT (ADAPTED FROM KANER ET AL, 1996)	223
FIGURE 30: EIGHT RUNGS ON A LADDER OF PARTICIPATION (ARNSTEIN, 1969).	243

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE 1: DIMENSIONS OF PARTICIPATION (DICK, 1996)	26
TABLE 2: PEOPLE INTERVIEWED DURING CONDUCTION OF RESEARCH.	33
TABLE 3: DIFFERENCES BETWEEN STATE-LEVEL AND LOCAL-LEVEL RESOURCE MANAGEMENT (ADAPTED FROM BERKES, 1995).	46
TABLE 4: POSSIBLE CRITERIA TO DISTINGUISH AMONG STAKEHOLDERS	60
TABLE 5: EXAMPLES OF LEGISLATION CONTAINING REFERENCES TO THE PRINCIPLES OF THE TREATY OF WAITANGI:	73
TABLE 6: PRINCIPLES IDENTIFIED BY THE COURT OF APPEAL (1987)	73
TABLE 7: CONSERVATION MANAGEMENT PRINCIPLES	82
TABLE 8: PROCESS PRINCIPLES	84
TABLE 9: RELATIONSHIP PRINCIPLES	92
TABLE 10: SUMMARY OF CONSULTATION REQUIREMENTS OF CONSERVATION ACT 1987 (SOURCE: PCE, 1994)	130
TABLE 11: CONSULTATION REQUIREMENTS UNDER THE NPACT	133
TABLE 12: APPROVED EXPENSES FOR DOC OUTPUT CLASSES 1996/97	138
TABLE 13: NEW ZEALAND NATIONAL PARKS (DOC, 1996)	150
TABLE 14: STRATEGIES, VISIONS AND MAJOR ISSUES IDENTIFIED BY THE DEPARTMENT OF CONSERVATION (1992).	152
TABLE 15: PROTECTED AREAS IN EGMONT ECOLOGICAL DISTRICT (SOURCE: DOC, 1997)	162
TABLE 16: IWI GROUPS BY WAKA AND REGION (SOURCE: WAITANGI TRIBUNAL, 1996)	179
TABLE 17: SUMMARY OF CHARACTERISTICS DISPLAYED BY VISITORS TO EGMONT NATIONAL PARK (SOURCE: LAWRENCE <i>ET AL</i> , 1996)	184
TABLE 18: MANAGEMENT PHILOSOPHY FOR EGMONT NATIONAL PARK	198
TABLE 19: KEY ISSUES IDENTIFIED IN THE CMS	199
TABLE 20: SUMMARY OF ISSUES ARISING FROM EARLY CONSULTATION ON DRAFT EGMONT NATIONAL PARK MANAGEMENT PLAN	200
TABLE 21: TARANAKI IWI COMMENTARY ON MANAGEMENT PHILOSOPHY (SOURCE: RATAHI TO CARLIN, 1996).	209

LIST OF PLATES

PLATE 1: EARLY VISITORS TO THE CAMPHOUSE IN THE 1920'S.	166
PLATE 2: THE MANGOREI GORGE PAINTED BY H.W. KIRKWOOD C. 1910	167
PLATE 3: LAHAR DOMINATED LANDSCAPES IN WESTERN TARANAKI (PHOTO)	169
PLATE 4: HUMPHRIES CASTLE	169
PLATE 5: MOSSES, FUNGI AND OTHER SMALL PLANTS ARE ABUNDANT ON THE FOREST FLOOR	170
PLATE 6: FROM LAKE DIVE, THE DISTINCTIVE BANDS OF VEGETATION ZONES CAN BE SEEN.	171
PLATE 7: KERERU FEEDING ON A NIKAU PALM.	172
PLATE 8: LOWER SLOPES OF THE MANGANUI SKIFIELD	174
PLATE 9: THE STONEY RIVER AND BELLS FALLS ARE TWO POPULAR SITES WITHIN THE PARK	185
PLATE 10: LOWLAND FORESTS WERE BEING DEVASTATED BY POSSUM DAMAGE UNTIL 1080 WAS USED IN 1995/6	195
PLATE 11: THE KAITAKE RANGE AS VIEWED FROM OAKURA	211