



**Ngātiwai Trust Board Mandate Strategy
Assessment of process and analysis of submissions**

Prepared by Nici Gibbs, Fathom Consulting Ltd

for Ngātiwai Trust Board

Final: 14 October 2013 (amended 20 June 2014)

Summary

Ngātiwai Trust Board (NTB) has commissioned an independent report to assess the mandating process and summarise and analyse the submissions received on the mandate strategy. The report concludes that:

1. NTB's mandate strategy is consistent with key Crown policies for the direct negotiation of comprehensive settlements;
2. NTB has run a fair, open and transparent process to achieve a mandate. The mandating process has been flexible and appropriate to the circumstances of Ngātiwai and the voting procedure reflects New Zealand best practice;
3. The treatment of the Wai claims associated with hapū who also affiliate with other iwi is a "work in progress" that can be resolved through further research on the overlapping claims. The NTB mandate strategy acknowledges this issue appropriately and proposes further discussion between NTB and the relevant hapū and claimant groups to clarify the scope of the mandate in relation to these claims;
4. There are no completely "new" issues raised in submissions that are not already addressed – at least to some extent – in the mandate strategy. However there are a couple of points that NTB may wish to give further consideration to when responding to submitters – i.e.,
 - a) A more formal dispute resolution process for claimants who may have concerns about the way NTB is representing their interests in negotiations; and
 - b) An explicit role for the kaumātua and kuia advisory group in guiding NTB on matters relating to tikanga in the negotiation process.

Introduction

Context

1. The Ngātiwai Trust Board (NTB) is seeking a mandate from Iwi members to enter into direct negotiations with the Crown for the settlement of all remaining claims of Ngātiwai. Iwi members have been invited to vote on the resolution:

"That the Ngātiwai Trust Board is mandated to represent Te Iwi o Ngātiwai in direct negotiations with the Crown for the comprehensive settlement of all the remaining historical Treaty claims of Ngātiwai including registered and un-registered historical claims."

2. NTB has prepared a mandate strategy that has been endorsed by the Crown. The *Ngātiwai Trust Board Mandate Strategy* (19 July 2013) describes the Ngātiwai claimant community to be represented in comprehensive negotiations, the remaining Ngātiwai Waitangi Tribunal claims that will be included in the mandate, NTB's governance structure and accountability measures, and the proposed supporting structures, mandate hui and voting process. After the mandate strategy was submitted to the Office of Treaty Settlements (OTS) and uploaded to the OTS website, the Crown directed NTB to include in the mandate strategy a number of additional Waitangi Tribunal claims which appear to relate to Ngātiwai.

These additional claims are identified in the paper *Supplementary: Additional WAI Claims to be included in the Ngātiwai Trust Board Mandate Strategy* (8 August 2013).

3. OTS has invited members of Ngātiwai to provide feedback on the mandate strategy in the form of submissions. The submission process officially ran from 26 July to 16 August 2013, although submissions continued to be accepted after this date, including some submissions on the Tuhoronuku Deed of Mandate that also cover the Ngātiwai mandate strategy.

Purpose and structure of this report

4. NTB has commissioned an independent summary and analysis of the mandating process and the submissions received on the mandate strategy. The twin aims of this report are to:
 - assess whether the mandate process was fair, open and transparent and consistent with key Crown policies; and
 - ensure that NTB is aware of all issues raised in submissions and, in particular, is able to identify and respond to any new issues that have not already been addressed in the mandate strategy.
5. The report is in four main sections, as follows:
 - (1) **Assessment of process** – an outline of NTB’s mandating process and assessment of whether it was “fair, open and transparent”;
 - (2) **Summary of Submissions** – an identification of the main issues raised in submissions;
 - (3) **Analysis of Submissions** – an evaluation of how the mandate strategy addresses the issues raised by submitters; and
 - (4) **Conclusions** – conclusions on process and consistency with key Crown policies, and identification of any potential new issues for NTB to consider.

(1) Assessment of process

6. The process for establishing a mandate for direct negotiations with the Crown must be “fair, open and transparent”. This section of the report sets out the process undertaken by NTB to establish a mandate, and evaluates the process against the requirements for fairness, openness and transparency. To facilitate this assessment, the process is considered in three stages – (1) actions taken prior to formal mandate process; (2) the formal mandating process; and (3) process following achievement of mandate.

Pre-mandate actions

7. Prior to seeking a formal mandate, NTB took steps to ensure that the formal mandating process was fair and well-understood by iwi members. These steps included the appointment in January 2013 of a Treaty Claims Manager to provide clear accountability and focus for the mandating process.
8. NTB sought to update the tribal register as far as possible prior to the mandating process, including by:
 - Updating the tribal register and registration form;
 - Mailing members to confirm contact details; and

- Authenticating new registrations to ensure eligibility and fairness.

Registration efforts were continued throughout the mandate process (as discussed below). Although it is impossible to ensure that all beneficiaries are registered, the registration drive facilitated fairness and openness by enabling direct distribution of information to members.

9. NTB embarked on information sharing and consultation prior to the formal notification of the mandate strategy. These measures, which enabled the mandate strategy to address issues of interest to members, included:
 - Three information sharing hui to update members (Whangaruru, 23 March 2013; Whāngarei, 6 April 2013; and Auckland, 13 April 2013); and
 - Consultation on a draft mandate strategy from 13 April for four weeks, extended to six weeks at the request of members;
 - Preliminary engagement with some hapū, in the form of meetings with Ngāti Rehua – Ngātiwai ki Aotea, Patuharakeke, and the Chair and others of Hapū Trust for Ngāti Taka, Ngāti Korora and Te Waiariki; and
 - Revision of the draft mandate strategy to take account of feedback received.
10. NTB also developed new ways of keeping Ngātiwai informed of the upcoming mandate process, including the development of a smartphone app to enable members to register and be kept informed, and regular e-pānui. These steps would have been helpful in encouraging the engagement of younger Ngātiwai members in particular.

Formal mandating actions

11. NTB sought to provide an inclusive, fair and transparent voting process, including by:
 - Providing a single, simple resolution for members to vote on;
 - Providing clear rules on voter eligibility;
 - Continuing a registration drive during the mandate hui;
 - Enabling members to vote (via special vote) even if they were not formally registered;
 - Providing clear voting instructions in the mandate strategy and the voting package;
 - Allowing multiple voting options, including postal ballot, ballot box at hui, online vote, special vote;
 - Appointing an independent returning officer to oversee voting and confirm results;
 - Inviting TPK observers to attend mandate hui to ensure independent account of events;
 - Allowing a four week voting period, and then extending this period to eight weeks on request of members; and
 - Requiring that the voting results be notified in national and regional news media and on the website within 14 days of the close of voting.

12. These measures are consistent with a professional and transparent approach to achieving a mandate, and reflect good electoral practice. Some of the steps taken by NTB – including the use of multiple voting options and a flexible approach in relation to registration of voters – are particularly appropriate to the circumstances of Ngātiwai and indicate a desire to achieve the best possible level of voter participation.
13. NTB also took steps to ensure that potential voters were well informed of the opportunity to vote and the consequences of their vote. In addition to the comprehensive information provided in the mandate strategy itself and on the Ngātiwai website, NTB also:
- Made extensive use of newspaper, radio and television advertising to notify members of the mandate hui and inform them of the details of the hui at least 21 days in advance of the first hui;
 - Held nine mandate hui (Ngaiotonga, Matapouri, Whāngarei, Omaha, Tauranga, Wellington, Rotorua, Hamilton, Auckland) – one more than suggested by Crown guidelines for an iwi the size of Ngātiwai;
 - Held three information hui in Australia (Sydney and Brisbane) at the request of members, within the scheduled period for the mandate hui;
 - Presented a standard presentation at each of the mandate hui, helping to ensure a consistent and transparent approach; and
 - Widely advertised the extension of the voting period using a variety of media.
14. In addition, NTB in conjunction with the Crown invited submissions on the mandate strategy and undertook to analyse and respond to the submissions received. This step further enhances the openness and transparency of the mandating process.

Post mandate actions

15. The structures and processes for direct negotiations, as set out in the mandate strategy, contain numerous checks and balances to ensure accountability and transparency, including in particular:
- Accountability mechanisms in the NTB Trustee appointment and removal process;
 - The stated preference for consensus decision making by Trustees, or otherwise decisions by simple majority, as reflected in the NTB Deed;
 - Presentation of a formal NTB annual report at a publicly notified AGM, including a progress report on negotiations and audited accounts;
 - Use of other hui or wānanga as needed to update members on negotiations or progress particular pieces of work;
 - Monthly (or more frequently if required) reporting of the Treaty Claims Subcommittee to the full board;
 - Disputes procedure if a claimant group has concern about NTB's representation of their interests;
 - Clear process for mandate amendment or removal; and
 - Well-established claimant fund management mechanisms.

16. The mandate strategy adopts an inclusive and open approach to the proposed negotiations by providing opportunities for engagement of all Ngātiwai members, including through:

- Ongoing communications using a variety of media such as website, email updates, hui, smartphone app etc;
- Opportunities for all members to participate in AGM and other hui;
- Formal advisory and information sharing roles for kaumātua and hapū working directly with NTB during the negotiations;
- Claims research meetings to provide all Waitangi Tribunal claimant groups with an opportunity to participate and share information;
- Appointment of negotiators following input from kaumātua, hapū, and NTB governance and operations; and
- Ratification of initialed Deed of Settlement and proposed Post Settlement Governance Entity (PSGE) by iwi members.

17. Further conclusions on the NTB mandate process (incorporating matters raised in submissions) are set out in Part 4 of this report.

(2) Summary: main issues raised in submissions

Index of submissions

18. A full index of submissions received on the mandate strategy is attached. Each submission has been given a unique identification number. These numbers are used to identify individual submissions in this part of the report – for example **(2, 24)** means that a particular issue was raised by submitter number 2 and submitter number 24. The numbering in the index reflects the numbering used in the submission index provided by OTS.

Overview of submissions

19. A total of 90 submissions were received on the mandate strategy. Of these submissions, 48 support NTB's mandate to negotiate with the Crown and 42 oppose it. However, care should be taken in interpreting the level of support or opposition from these numbers as some submissions represent the views of an individual, whereas others are made on behalf of a marae, a group of claimants to the Waitangi Tribunal (referred to in the remainder of this report as "Wai claimants"), or a hapū. Several submissions are signed by multiple signatories **(24, 27)**. In some cases a number of submitters have used a common format, including a group of submissions in opposition **(34 – 51)** and in support **(55 – 84)**.

20. Analysis of submissions by category of submitter (Wai claimant, hapū, marae, individual beneficiary etc) is complicated by the fact that many submitters identify themselves with more than one of these categories. However, some trends are apparent:

- **Marae:** Very few of the listed Ngātiwai marae made submissions; those that submitted support the NTB mandate;
- **Hapū:** Submitters who identify themselves with Ngātiwai hapū are relatively evenly split in support and opposition, but not all listed Ngātiwai hapū made submissions;
- **Individuals:** Submissions from individual beneficiaries are relatively evenly split in support and opposition;
- **Wai claimants:** A number of submissions from Wai claimants and submitters with an interest in particular Wai claims do not want their Wai claims included within the NTB mandate. A more detailed picture of the submissions that refer to particular Wai claims is provided below.

Summary of submissions that refer to Wai claims

21. The mandate strategy proposes that 46 Wai claims will be settled through the direct negotiation process (insofar as they relate to Ngātiwai). This includes 32 claims initially identified in the mandate strategy and an additional 14 claims subsequently identified by the Crown as relating at least in part to Ngātiwai. The submitters' views on the Wai claims included in the mandate strategy are detailed in **Table 1**.

22. Of the total of 46 claims:

- Submitters explicitly oppose the inclusion of 22 claims within the NTB mandate strategy (comprising 11 of the 32 claims initially identified and 11 of the 14 claims subsequently added);
- Submitters explicitly support the inclusion of eight claims within the NTB mandate strategy, and there is potential support for two additional claims, pending written confirmation from submitters who have provided verbal feedback to NTB in relation to their claims;
- Submitters do not comment specifically on the two NTB blanket claims that form the foundation of the mandate strategy (Wai 244 and 262) but there is implicit support for the inclusion of these claims from those submitters who support NTB's mandate generally;
- In the case of one claim (Wai 1384) one of the registered claimants opposes NTB's mandate in relation to the claim (**8**), and one registered claimant (**25**) plus a number of other submitters support NTB's mandate;¹ and
- 13 of the claims were not mentioned in submissions.

23. It should also be noted that a number of submitters express a view on NTB's mandate in relation to claims not listed in the mandate strategy or the supplementary material. Although not directly relevant to NTB's mandate, the other Wai claims mentioned in submissions are identified here for the sake of completeness. Submitters oppose the inclusion of the following claims within NTB's mandate: Wai 120, 149, 256, 1148, 1248, 1479, 1959, 2060, 2337 and 2368 (**24**); Wai 619 (**2, 24**); Wai 1040 (**34 – 51**); Wai

¹ Wai 1384 is recorded twice in this breakdown (i.e., as both "support" and "oppose") causing the total number of claims that are supported and opposed in relation to the mandate [47] to exceed the total number of claims [46].

1140 (**16, 19, 87**); Wai 1517 and 1712 (**18**); and Wai 1524 (**2, 24**). A submitter originally supported the inclusion of Wai 591 within NTB's mandate, although this was subsequently found to be an error.²

Table 1: Submitters' views on the WAI claims included in Mandate Strategy

WAI #	Claim title	Claimants	Position on NTB mandate	Submitter #
<i>Claims listed in Mandate Strategy 19 July 2013</i>				
67	Oriwa 1 B3	Jean Applehof & Ors	-	
156	Oriwa Block (Whananāki)	Marie Tautari	Oppose	20
244	Te Iwi o Ngātiwai historical claims	Uru Palmer/NTB	Implicit support	Submitters supporting NTB's mandate
262	Flora & Fauna	Saana Murray, Te Witi McMath & Ors	Implicit support	
343	Otetao A Block	Wayne Peters	Support	23
504	South Whāngarei Land & Seabed	Tamihana Paki	-	
511	Matapōuri Bay council sections	Chris Koroheke & Ors	Support	26
745	Patuharakeke Hapū lands and resources	Luana Pirihi & Ors	Oppose	24
1308	Pukekauri & Takahīwai	Grant Ngāwaka Pirihi & Ors	Oppose	24
1384	Whāngaruru Lands	Elvis Reti & Ors	Oppose Support	8 25, 55, 56, 57, 63, 64, 68, 70
1392	Pukekauri 1A, 2A & 2B	Elphie Pearly Pene	-	
1512	Descendents of Wiki Pirihi & Raiha Te Kauwhata	Michael Leulua'i	-	
1528	Native Land Court: Te Kauwhata	Carmen Hetaraka	Oppose	18
1529	Native Land Court: Hetaraka & Herewini	Toru Hetaraka	Oppose	18
1530	Native Land Court: Hetaraka & Herewini	Te Rina Hetaraka	Oppose	18
1539	Native Land Court: D Kereopa & S Pirihi	Te Aroha Going	-	
1544	Ngātiwai Land Blocks	George Davies & Ors	Oppose	1, 18, 24, 33
1677	Orokawa 3B perpetual lease	Hūhana Seve	Oppose	18, 24, 33
1711	Te Whānau ā Rangiwakaahua Hapū	Kris MacDonald, James Mackie & Ors	Support	6, 26
1712	Native Land Court: Toi te Huatahi & Te Mawe	Marino Māhanga	Support	90
1717	Native Land Court: Te Whānau Whero	Alan Moore & Takapari Waata	Support	12
1719	ML Blocks: Hone & Erana Murphy	Henry Murphy	Support	5

² Submission 26 states that the submitter is a registered named claimant for Wai 591 and 1711. The submitter later filed a correction stating that his claims were in fact Wai 511 and 1711 and reaffirming his support for NTB to include these claims within its mandate (email from Chris Koroheke to Tania McPherson, NTB, 8 October 2013).

1723	Crown's Environmental Policies	John Paki	-	
1726	Paremata Mōkau A13 Block etc	Robin Paratene	-	
1786	Actions of the Crown: Reweti Whānau	Ike Reti, Gary Reti & Ors	Support	53, 54
1954	Native Land Court: Haika & Te Kauwhata	Eta Haika	Oppose	18
1955	Partitioning Land: Patu Harakeke & Ngātiwai	Juanita De Senna	-	
1960	Rangatiratanga: Tamihana & Kaupeka	Kapotai Tamihana	-	
1961	Native Land Court: Pita Tunua & Ors	David Carpenter	-	
1973	Native Land Court: Hone Pita & Marara Pita	Robert Carpenter	-	
2022	Foreshore and Seabed Motukokako Island	Edina Colston, Patuone Hoskins on behalf of the Ahuwhenua Trust and owners of Motukokako	Oppose	19, 30
2243	Little Barrier Is Acquisition Act	Tamihana Paki	tbc ³	-
<i>Claims added following request from the Crown 8 August 2013</i>				
245	Hinetapu Maihi Mahanga whanau	Hoori George Moanaroa Munro Parata	tbc ⁴	24
620	Te Waiariki/Ngāti Kororo Hapū	Colin Malcolm & Ors	Oppose	2, 17, 24
688	Nga Hapū o Whangarei	Richard John Nathan & Ors	Oppose	24
887	Himi Tataiarangi Watene Tautari Whakapapa Whanau Trust	Timi Tahana Watene & Ors	-	
1307	Ngāti Kuta Ke Te Rawhiti	Matiutaera Te Nana Clendon & Ors	Oppose	7, 11, 16, 19, 87
1411	Te Waiariki/Ngāti Kororo/Ngāti Taka	Violet Sade & Ors	Oppose	17, 24
1412	Te Waiariki/Ngāti Kororo/Ngāti Taka	Violet Sade & Ors	Oppose	17, 24
1413	Te Waiariki/Ngāti Kororo/Ngāti Taka	Violet Sade & Ors	Oppose	17, 24
1414	Te Waiariki/Ngāti Kororo/Ngāti Taka	Violet Sade & Ors	Oppose	24
1415	Te Waiariki/Ngāti Kororo/Ngāti Taka	Violet Sade & Ors	Oppose	17, 24
1416	Te Waiariki/Ngāti Kororo/Ngāti Taka	Violet Sade & Ors	Oppose	17, 24
1464	Te Kapotai and Ngāti Pare	Te Riwhi Whao Reti & Ors	Oppose	22
1513	Te Roopu Whakamana	Elizabeth Kopa & Ors	-	
1546	Te Kapotai	Edward Henry Cook	Oppose	22

Summary of submissions in support

24. The three most common reasons given by submitters who support NTB's mandate to enter into direct negotiations are that:

- NTB has done a good job keeping beneficiaries well informed of the mandating process (**4, 6, 13, 14, 27, 28, 52, 85, 86**);
- NTB has run a fair and open mandating process (**6, 13, 14, 27**); and

³ Likely support – NTB received verbal feedback at a mandate hui from this claimant who sought to include his claim within the NTB mandate (to be confirmed).

⁴ Likely support – submitter 24 originally opposed the inclusion of Wai 245 in the NTB mandate but NTB has since received a verbal indication of a change in position (to be confirmed).

- Direct negotiations are preferable to waiting another ten years for a settlement (**13, 14, 27**).

25. One supportive submitter mentions NTB's positive track record in the management of iwi resources (**6**) and another states that they have already had the opportunity to present their claim to the Waitangi Tribunal and now consider that direct negotiation is *tika and pono for Ngātiwai* (**25**).

26. As noted above, in addition to the implicit support for the NTB blanket claims Wai 244 and 262, eight of the Wai claimants support the inclusion of their claims within NTB's mandate. The eight claims are:

- Wai 343 – Otetao A Block;
- Wai 511 – Matapōuri council sections;
- Wai 1384 – Whangaruru Lands;⁵
- Wai 1711 – Te Whānau ā Rangiwhakaahua Hapū;
- Wai 1712 – Native Land Court: Toi Te Huatahi and Te Mawe;
- Wai 1717 – Native Land Court: Te Whānau Whero;
- Wai 1719 – ML Blocks: Hone & Erana Murphy; and
- Wai 1786 – Actions of the Crown: Reweti Whānau.

Summary of submissions in opposition

27. The three main substantive reasons given by submitters who oppose the mandate strategy are:

- Submitters want particular Wai claims to be heard by the Waitangi Tribunal;
- NTB does not represent the submitter; and
- The governance structure does not give sufficient weight to claimants, hapū or kaumātua.

28. Submitters raised issues related to the mandate process and the content of the mandate strategy, including:

- Insufficient time;
- Lack of engagement and consultation;
- Difficulties with registration;
- Issues with information provided by NTB; and
- Matters related to the detailed content of the mandate strategy.

29. Each of these groups of issues is described in more detail below.

Submitters who want claims to be heard by Tribunal

30. A number of submitters express a strong desire for particular Wai claims to be heard by the Waitangi Tribunal. These submitters include:

- those who identify themselves as claimants or legal representatives of claimants (**1, 2, 7, 8, 11, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 22, 30, 33**) and between them cover all 22 claims for which NTB's mandate is opposed (see Table 1); and

⁵ One registered claimant opposes the inclusion of Wai 1384.

- those who are not necessarily registered claimants but state that they have an interest in a particular claim (**3, 10, 24, 31, 34-51, 87**).

31. This group of submitters are concerned that they (or the registered claimants) will be denied an opportunity to present their grievance to the Tribunal and as a consequence, their grievances will remain unacknowledged and unaddressed. Several note that NTB does not understand their claim and is therefore in no position to pursue the claim. Typical comments and concerns include:

- *I have invested a lot of time and effort in gathering information and korero concerning my claim. I have been looking forward to airing my claim issues for a number of years. The thought of my claims not being heard and korero not being recorded is deeply upsetting for me (1);*
- *Historically, my ancestors worked so hard to have their grievances addressed... Are we now expected to forget the efforts of our tupuna ...? To deprive claimants of a right to a hearing before the Waitangi Tribunal is simply perpetuating more injustices (20);*
- *The Board has neither any knowledge nor understanding of the issues raised in the claimants' claims... It is the claimant's position that the Board is embarking to enter into negotiations simply in an attempt to fast track access to settlement money without having any concern for the issues contained in the claims they seek to settle (18);*
- *Grievances need to be heard, to be acknowledged. It is not simply about compensation. It is about honouring the past (31).*

32. Some claimants note that their hearings have already been held or are scheduled to begin shortly, allowing negotiations to then proceed with minimal delay (**8, 18, 87**). Two say they will lose funding from the Crown Forest Rental Trust (CFRT) if mandate is achieved (**18, 33**).

33. Several claimants identify that they are part of other collectives for the purposes of claims settlement:

- Te Kapotai and Ngāti Pare are part of the Ngā Hapū o Takutai Moana collective who have agreed in principle to work together for the purposes of hearings, negotiations and settlement (**22**);
- Ngāti Kuta and Patukeha are progressing their claims in tandem before the Waitangi Tribunal (**16**) and seek to include their claims in a deed of mandate for Te Takutai Moana (**19, 87**);
- Whangarei Taiwhenua claimants (**24**) and Te Waiariki, Ngāti Korora and Ngāti Taka Pari (**17**) seek to progress their claims before the Waitangi Tribunal in the Wai 1040 Te Paparahi o Te Raki inquiry; and
- Wai 2022 is not intended to relate to Ngātiwai as the shareholders in Motu Kokako Island descend from Ngāpuhi hapū (**30**).

34. Some submitters suggest alternative processes:

- an initial hearings process to ascertain the nature of the grievances followed by a negotiation is suggested by a group of submitters, many of whom express an interest in the Wai 1040 Te Paparahi o Te Raki inquiry (**34-51**); or
- a dual (parallel) process of hearings and negotiation side by side is suggested by two submitters who between them cover eight claims within the proposed scope of the NTB mandate (**18, 33**).

Ngātiwai Trust Board does not represent us

35. Several submitters state that the following hapū are not hapū of Ngātiwai:

- Te Kapotai and Ngāti Pare (22);
- Ngāti Kuta and Te Patukeha (7, 11, 16, 21, 24, 29, 87, 88, 89). Submitters from these hapū state that the Ngātiwai boundary ceases at Taupirinui Bay: *The whakawhanaungatanga to Ngātiwai is not disputed but for our hapū to be under a mandate of another hapū – that is Ngātiwai Hapū – would be demeaning...* (29)
- Te Waiariki, Ngāti Korora and Ngāti Taka Pari: *...we are distinct and separate sovereignties* (17).

36. Three submitters (87, 88, 89) focus primarily on their opposition to the proposed Tūhoronuku Deed of Mandate, and incidentally seek the removal of their hapū (Ngāti Kuta and Te Patukeha) from the NTB mandate.

37. Submitters also request that the following marae be removed from the mandate strategy:

- Te Rawhiti and Kaingaroa ki te Rawhiti (19, 87); and
- All Te Kapotai and Ngāti Pare marae, which the submission identifies as Te Turuki (Wairake) and Waihaha (22).

38. At a more general level, one submitter questions why NTB is seeking a mandate when there is a lack of agreement about who is or is not a Ngātiwai hapū (9) and one suggests the need for a NTB Whakapapa Wānanga to confirm the Ngātiwai whakapapa for settlement of historic claims (33). Another calls for a hui to clarify the marae and contemporary and historic hapū of Ngātiwai (3).

A stronger role for claimants, hapū and kaumātua

39. Several submitters associated with Ngāti Kuta and Patukeha seek a *traditional hapū driven process to reach consensus through tikanga Maori* (11, 15, 19). Others express a more general desire for a stronger hapū voice in the governance structure for direct negotiations, for example:

- *There are no teeth to hapū and hapū kaikorero in the current Ngātiwai Trust Board mandate, all power and decision making is retained within the Ngātiwai Trust Board* (33); and
- *We are a hapū and the Ngāti Wai structure is Marae based. Tribal leadership is hapū and not Marae led. This is a traditional process to reach consensus through tikanga Maori* (7).

40. Two submitters request a stronger role for kaumātua (1, 3) and one proposes a claimant voice on the claims committee (3).

Mandate process concerns

41. Several submitters comment that the timeframe for consultation on the mandate was too rushed (3, 31). One notes that not all Ngātiwai have access to the internet and that this may hinder communication (3). The consultation process in the preparation of the mandate strategy did not meet the expectations of some submitters who sought a greater level of engagement or communication prior to the consultation on the mandate strategy (2, 3, 9, 20, 50). In particular, many of the Wai claimants feel they

were not adequately consulted on the development of the mandate strategy. These submitters object to the unilateral and (in some cases) late inclusion of their claims within the scope of the strategy without their consultation or consent (**8, 17, 18, 19**). One is prepared to pursue litigation to defend their right to present their claim (**18**).

42. Some submitters express concerns about the information provided by NTB. For example:

- There is confusion about different versions of the mandate strategy (**18**);
- Board responses to claimant questions have been inadequate and in some cases misleading (**31**);
- Voters are not well informed and don't have balanced information on which to vote (**3, 31, 50**);
- Some feel that no options have been presented, so they don't have a true choice, for instance:
 - *No other options other than settlement were provided to the claimants. The only option ever provided was a direct negotiations, 'take it or leave it' approach* (**18**);
 - *The Trust Board's slide presentation to claimants clearly privileges direct negotiation over the Waitangi Tribunal process* (**31**).

43. Concerns about the voting process include:

- Problems registering on-line (**3**);
- Registered members not receiving voting papers (**50**);
- Wai claimants who do not affiliate with Ngātiwai may not be able to properly participate in mandate voting process due to lack of notification (**9**);
- Members of Ngāti Manuhiri and Ngāti Rehua should not be allowed to vote because their claims have been settled separately (**9, 50, 3**).

Issues regarding the detailed content of the mandate strategy

44. The most common complaint about the detailed content of the mandate strategy is that there is a lack of detail on the post settlement governance entity (PSGE) (**1, 8, 33, 34-51**). A couple of submitters suggest that the timeframes for direct negotiation are unrealistically short (**1, 3**). One submitter raises a number of questions about the content of the strategy, and suggests that the strategy should be consistent with tikanga Maori, provide more detail on conflict resolution, specify a proper appointment process for negotiators, and describe the details of the claim. This submitter also states that the mandate amendment and removal process is impossible to achieve (**3**).

(3) Analysis: How the mandate strategy addresses issues raised in submissions

45. This section of the report describes and evaluates how the NTB mandate strategy addresses each of the main sets of issues raised in submissions. The analysis mirrors the structure of the summary of submissions in opposition. The numbers in brackets – e.g., (p30) – refer to page numbers in the mandate strategy.

Submitters who want claims to be heard by Tribunal

46. The NTB mandate strategy acknowledges that Wai claimants “*may feel aggrieved due to the foreclosure of their options through the Waitangi Tribunal*” (p30), but makes it clear that the Crown has a strong preference to:

- negotiate with a “large natural grouping” (LNG) of tribal interests rather than with individual claimants or whānau within a tribe. The Crown has recognised Ngātiwai as a suitable LNG to enter into settlement negotiations; and
- negotiate comprehensive settlements that cover all historical Treaty claims of a LNG in comprehensive negotiations (p10).

47. The mandate strategy specifies that “*all [identified remaining Ngātiwai] Wai claims are subject to change following feedback on the mandate process*” (footnote 2, p13), indicating that NTB is open to making changes to the scope of the mandate strategy in response to feedback from Wai claimants. The mandate strategy also makes it clear that the Wai claims will be settled as part of the Ngātiwai negotiations only insofar as the claims relate to Ngātiwai; this does not preclude the settlement of aspects of the Wai claims that relate to other LNGs or iwi through other processes. In addition, a disputes procedure has been developed for situations where a claimant group has a concern about NTB representation of their interests during negotiations.

48. Specific concerns raised by Wai claimants who want their claims to be heard by the Tribunal, and the relevant NTB response in the mandate strategy, are set out in the table below.

Issues raised by submitters	NTB response in mandate strategy
Submitter has spent a lot of time researching the claim	NTB will enable and provide for a Ngātiwai claims research group to be established to advance the Ngātiwai claims under negotiation. All Ngātiwai
NTB does not understand the issues in my claim	Wai claimants will be invited to attend research meetings with other Wai claimants and the Treaty Claims Committee. The purpose of this group is to
Grievances need to be heard and acknowledged	discuss and progress claims research, the publication of research, and the presentation of claims to the Minister (p30) <i>Reviewer’s note: the publication and presentation process provides an alternative route for grievances to be heard.</i> If a claimant group has a concern regarding NTB representation of their interests during negotiations, a disputes procedure applies (p27)
Will lose funding from CFRT	<i>Reviewer’s note: additional sources of funding for Ngātiwai claims will become available if NTB receives a mandate for direct negotiations with the Crown</i>
Submitter wants claim to proceed within an alternative grouping of claimants	Ngātiwai hapū and marae are also listed in the claimant definition of other LNGs based on whakapapa and intermarriage. NTB will seek agreement to the treatment of these hapū and marae with the Crown, following discussions with the relevant groups (p11)

	<p>NTB seeks to settle all Wai claims only insofar as they relate to Ngātiwai, while other iwi may settle parts of the Wai claims that relate to them as well (p23)</p> <p>NTB's "overlapping iwi engagement strategy" will help to develop an understanding of how other iwi are progressing their Treaty settlements, and foster positive working relationships for the future (p23)</p>
Hearings scheduled to begin soon – can then proceed to negotiation	An earlier draft of the mandate strategy suggested a dual process might be possible but neither the Crown nor the Tribunal have followed through with a commitment to this process for Ngātiwai (p3)
Alternative process: dual hearings and negotiation	

“NTB does not represent us”

49. The NTB mandate strategy provides a clear “Claimant Definition”, including a list of Ngātiwai marae, present day hapū and historical hapū. Submitters seek the exclusion from the NTB mandate of:

- six of the hapū in the claimant definition – i.e., Ngāti Kuta, Patukeha, Te Kapotai, Ngāti Pare, Ngāti Korora and Ngāti Taka Pari; and
- one hapū which is not listed in the claimant definition – i.e., Te Waiariki.

50. It should also be noted that submissions were received on behalf two hapū described in the mandate strategy as “historical”, i.e., Ngāti Pare (22) and Te Whakapiko hapū o Ngāti Manaia (31).

51. Specific concerns related to the claimant definition, and the relevant NTB response in the mandate strategy, are set out in the table below.

Issues raised by submitters	NTB response in mandate strategy
Te Kapotai & Ngāti Pare are not hapū of Ngātiwai	NTB acknowledges that Ngātiwai hapū and marae are also listed in the claimant definition of other LNGs based on whakapapa and intermarriage.
Ngāti Kuta and Patukeha are not hapū of Ngātiwai	NTB will seek agreement to the treatment of these hapū and marae with the Crown, following discussions with the relevant groups (p11)
Te Waiariki, Ngāti Korora and Ngāti Taka Pari are not hapū of Ngātiwai	Te Waiariki is not listed within the NTB claimant definition (p11)
Ngātiwai boundary stops at Taupirinui Bay	<p>The mandate strategy describes the core Ngātiwai rohe as encompassing Motukokako and Cape Brett at its northernmost extent</p> <p><i>Reviewer's note: the description of the Ngātiwai rohe in the mandate strategy is consistent with the widely accepted definition in Te Kāhui Māngai directory of iwi and Maori organisations</i></p>
Remove Te Rawhiti and Kaingaroa ki te Rawhiti marae from NTB mandate	Neither of these marae is included as a “Ngātiwai marae” in the mandate strategy

Remove all Te Kapotai and Ngāti Pare marae from the mandate strategy	Neither of the marae identified in the submission is included as a “Ngātiwai marae” in the mandate strategy
Need for wananga/hui to clarify whakapapa, hapū and marae	A whakapapa wananga is proposed as part of the reporting process (p26)

A stronger role for claimants, hapū and kaumātua

52. The NTB structure provides a clear linear relationship between the beneficiaries, marae and the Trust Board. Some submitters are concerned that this structure does not provide a sufficient voice for claimants, hapū and kaumātua. In response, NTB has proposed a set of supporting structures for the negotiations that enable and provide for clear roles and opportunities for engagement by claimants, hapū and kaumātua.

53. Specific concerns related to the role of claimants, hapū and kaumātua in the negotiations, and the relevant NTB response in the mandate strategy, are set out in the table below.

Issues raised by submitters	NTB response in mandate strategy
Need a traditional hapū-driven process	NTB is providing an opportunity for hapū to participate in the supporting structures for negotiations (p28) – see below
Stronger hapū role in governance for direct negotiations	NTB will enable and provide for all Ngātiwai hapū to provide advice to NTB on their involvement in the negotiations and settlement process. The role of the hapū is to provide advice to NTB and liaise with whānau and hapū members to feed information back to all members. NTB will make tangible arrangements to accommodate participation with willing hapū (p28 & 29)
Stronger role for kaumātua	A kaumātua and kuia group will be established to advise and support NTB in direct negotiations, and to keep all kaumātua informed of developments (p29)
Claimant voice on claims committee	<p>The Treaty Claims Committee comprises the Chairman, two trustees, the CEO and the Treaty Claims Manager. Further membership may be considered as the need for additional skills or experience is identified (p17)</p> <p>NTB will enable and provide for a Ngātiwai claims research group to be established to advance the Ngātiwai claims under negotiation. All Ngātiwai Wai claimants will be invited to attend research meetings with other Wai claimants and the Treaty Claims Committee (p30).</p>

Mandate process concerns

54. The most significant concerns about the mandating process were expressed by submitters who expected a greater degree of engagement prior to the mandate voting, and by those who felt that they were not given a full range of options on which to vote.

55. In response to the first concern, NTB took a number of steps to inform and engage with members prior to the development of the mandate strategy, as detailed below and in Part (1) of this report. In relation

to the second concern, it should be noted that the voting process is specifically about NTB obtaining a mandate to negotiate directly with the Crown – and this is why no other options were included in the mandate strategy. Voters were given the opportunity to vote for either:

- NTB's mandate to bypass the hearings process and pursue direct negotiations (a YES vote); or
- the *status quo*, i.e., that all Ngātiwai claims progress through hearings followed by negotiation (a NO vote).

56. Specific concerns related to the mandating process, and the relevant NTB response in the mandate strategy, are set out in the table below.

Issues raised by submitters	NTB response in mandate strategy
Timeframe for mandating too rushed	<i>Reviewer's note: The formal mandate voting process ran initially from 17 August to 15 September, and was then extended by four weeks to 13 October to allow members more time to vote (a total time of 8 weeks)</i>
Not everyone has access to internet	Communication during the mandating process included website, posted material, newspapers, radio stations and television (p26)
Submitters wanted more engagement prior to mandate strategy	<p>NTB consultation prior to release of the mandate strategy included (p22):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • three information sharing hui in March and April 2013; • the release of a draft mandate strategy for six weeks consultation in April and May; and • meetings with Ngāti Rehua-Ngātiwai ki Aotea, Patuharakeke and representatives of Ngāti Taka, Ngāti Korora and Te Waiariki <p>As a result of this engagement, changes were made to the mandate strategy particularly in relation to processes for inclusiveness and communications during the mandating and negotiations stages (p25)</p>
Wai claimants were not informed in advance that their claims were going to be included in the mandate strategy	<i>Reviewer's note: individual Wai claimants were not informed in advance but their Wai claims were identified in the supplementary material following direction from the Crown. The supplementary material was then made available for submissions over an extended period once uploaded to the OTS website, providing the Wai claimants with an opportunity to have a say.</i>
Confusion about different versions of mandate strategy	The mandate strategy clearly states that the 19 July version supersedes previous drafts (p3)
Board responses to questions were inadequate or misleading	<p>A standardised hui presentation was used to provide consistency and transparency (p32)</p> <p><i>Reviewer's note: this submitter did not provide sufficient detail of NTB responses that the submitter considered to be inadequate or misleading to enable a fuller analysis of the concern</i></p>
Beneficiaries not well informed, don't have sufficient information to make a decision	<p>Extensive information was provided:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • at three information sharing hui held during March and April in Whangaruru, Whangarei and Auckland; • in the draft mandate strategy, the mandate strategy itself and

	<p>appendices;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • at nine mandate hui which were well advertised in advance; and • on the Ngātiwai website (p32)
Information was not balanced; no real choice or options	<p>Information on the pros and cons of direct negotiations and Waitangi Tribunal pathways was made available at the information sharing hui in March and April (Appendix T).</p> <p><i>Reviewer's note: the slides for the presentations were adapted from the CFRT Guide for Claimants Negotiating Treaty Settlements</i></p> <p>Iwi members were able to vote YES or NO regarding the proposed mandate for direct negotiations (p3)</p>
Problems registering on-line	<p>Two options for registration – on-line or fill out a registration form and post it to NTB office (p15)</p> <p>Members who choose not to register can still cast a special vote (p25)</p>
Registered members didn't receive voting papers	<p>NTB took steps to ensure that all registered members had the opportunity to update their contact details with NTB. If members did not receive voting papers they can still vote using a special voting form, including at a mandate hui (p34)</p>
Lack of notification of voting for Wai claimants who don't affiliate with Ngātiwai	<p>Claimants who are not Ngātiwai members are not eligible to vote (p33)</p>
Members of Ngāti Manuhiri and Ngāti Rehua should not be allowed to vote	<p>Although Ngāti Manuhiri and Ngāti Rehua-Ngātiwai ki Aotea already have a separate mandate to negotiate with the Crown, members of these hapū who can whakapapa into any of the other hapū in the claimant definition are able to vote through their wider whakapapa links (p11)</p>

Issues regarding detailed content of mandate strategy

57. Specific concerns related to the detailed content of the mandate strategy, and the relevant NTB response, are set out in the table below.

Issues raised by submitters	NTB response in mandate strategy
Lack of detail on PSGE	<p>The PSGE is described in general terms on page 9. Details of the PSGE will be developed together with the initialed Deed of Settlement and must be ratified by Ngātiwai before the settlement can be finalised (p9)</p> <p><i>Reviewer's note: NTB cannot advance negotiations and settlement (including a detailed proposal for a PSGE) without first obtaining the mandate to represent Ngātiwai in negotiations</i></p>
Timeframes for negotiation unrealistically short	<p>Timeframes reflect agreed milestones set with the Crown (Appendix V)</p>
Strategy should be consistent with tikanga Maori	<p>The kaumātua and kuia advisory group will provide advice, oversight, direction and guidance to NTB throughout the negotiations (p29)</p> <p><i>Reviewer's note: The role of the kaumātua and kuia advisory group with</i></p>

	<i>respect to providing advice on tikanga is implicit rather than explicit in the mandate strategy</i>
Lack of detail on conflict resolution	Disputes resolution procedure is outlined on page 26 of the mandate strategy
Not confident negotiators will have right skills etc	NTB will appoint the negotiators and monitor and review their performance. The appointment process involves development of core competencies and job description, wide advertisement and selection via an interview panel of kaumātua, hapū, NTB governance and operations (p29)
Details of claim should be provided	The mandate strategy is not intended to provide details about the claims as these matters require further research and discussion (p9)
Mandate amendment and removal process impossible to achieve	<i>Reviewer's note: It is appropriate in terms of providing certainty and stability for Ngātiwai members that there is a relatively high threshold for removal or amendment of the NTB mandate</i>

(4) Conclusions

Consistency with Crown policies

58. NTB has sought a mandate for the comprehensive settlement of all remaining Ngātiwai claims through comprehensive direct negotiations with the Crown. This approach is consistent with key Crown policies, including:

- The Crown's strong preference to negotiate with Large Natural Groupings (LNGs) of tribal interests rather than with individual claimants or whānau; and
- The Crown's strong preference to negotiate comprehensive settlements to address all historical claims of a LNG at the same time.

59. The application of these policies in the Ngātiwai rohe has been somewhat muddled by the opportunity for two Ngātiwai hapū to settle separately from Ngātiwai as part of the Tāmaki Makaurau Collective Settlement. However, this does not detract from the suitability of NTB to represent the remaining interests of Te Iwi o Ngātiwai in direct negotiations with the Crown.

60. In the northern part of the Ngātiwai rohe there are hapū and Wai claims that are shared with Ngāpuhi. The Crown's policy in these circumstances is that all claims, whether they relate in full or in part to a claimant group, need to be listed in the mandate strategy for that claimant group. NTB has fulfilled this requirement in the mandate strategy and supplementary material.

61. In cases where a hapū affiliates to two different iwi or LNGs, the Crown may accommodate hapū that appear in more than one claimant definition. If Wai claimants appear in more than one claimant definition, the Crown's policy is that claims would be settled by a Ngātiwai settlement only insofar as they relate to descent from a Ngātiwai ancestor. The NTB mandate strategy is consistent with this approach.

Fair, open and transparent process

62. NTB has run a fair, open and transparent process to achieve a mandate for direct negotiations with the Crown. Extensive efforts have been made to communicate with beneficiaries and encourage members to register and vote. The approach has been flexible (using a variety of media and opportunities to encourage engagement and participation) and appropriate to the circumstances of Ngātiwai. The formal voting process reflects New Zealand best practice.
63. Although NTB made the opportunity available for early engagement (i.e., prior to the voting period), not all members may have been aware of that opportunity or – if aware – were willing and able to participate. In particular, it appears that some of the Wai claimants were surprised to see their claims included in the mandate strategy without their prior knowledge. This concern was exacerbated by the late addition of extra claims on the direction of the Crown. Although the mandate strategy clearly states that only those aspects of the claims that relate to Ngātiwai (as determined by further research) will be settled under the NTB mandate, this message may not have got through to all of the claimants.
64. Importantly, NTB has provided formal opportunities in the supporting structures for negotiations to enable and provide for the participation of hapū, kaumātua and Wai claimants. Although these opportunities have been clearly set out in the mandate strategy, some submitters remain concerned, including those who affiliate to Ngāti Kuta, Patukeha, Te Kapotai, Ngāti Pare, Ngāti Korora and Ngāti Taka Pari.⁶
65. The treatment of the claims of these hapū who also affiliate with other iwi is clearly a complex issue and is still a “work in progress”. NTB has indicated a willingness to discuss the matter further with the relevant hapū and claimant groups and amend the list of claims in response. This is an appropriate response as these discussions, together with further research on the overlapping claims, should help clarify the final scope of the NTB mandate.

New issues raised in submissions

66. There are no completely “new” issues raised in submissions that are not already addressed – at least to some extent – in the mandate strategy. However, there are a couple of points which NTB may wish to give further consideration to when responding to submitters. Both these points derive from the concerns of some of the hapū and Wai claimants, as noted above.

Dispute resolution process

67. NTB has established a dispute resolution process for claimants who may have concerns about the way NTB is representing their interests in negotiations (see section 8.5 of the mandate strategy). The dispute resolution process includes the appointment of an independent facilitator. In light of the concerns expressed by some claimants, NTB may wish to consider the specification of a slightly more formal dispute resolution process – i.e., a staged process which includes the appointment of a mediator in the event that the dispute is unable to be resolved by the parties using an independent facilitator. Access to a more formal dispute resolution process may give Wai claimants additional confidence in proceeding with direct negotiations under the NTB mandate.

⁶ And Te Waiariki, a hapū which is not included in the NTB mandate strategy.

Reflecting tikanga Maori

68. Several submitters suggested that the strategy needs to reflect tikanga Maori. This view was expressed most strongly by those who also sought a “traditional, hapū driven” approach. It is likely that the advisory role of the kaumātua and kuia group and enabling and providing for hapū involvement in the negotiations and settlement process (as outlined in section 9.3 of the mandate strategy) will help meet the concerns of these submitters. However, NTB could also consider providing additional information to iwi members outlining how the advisory role for the kaumātua and kuia group will help ensure that the negotiations reflect tikanga Maori.

Appendix: Submission index (reviewer's version)

Notes

- The “stated affiliation” is the affiliation to Ngātiwai stated or implied in the submission. No independent analysis has been undertaken by the reviewer (NG) to verify the stated affiliations;
- The “WAI claims” listed in this table are only those Wai claims included in the proposed Ngātiwai mandate. Submitters referred also to numerous other claims which are not included in this table (but which are identified in the analysis of submissions).

No	Writer	Stated affiliation	WAI Claims	Position
1	G Davies	Registered named claimant	1544	Oppose
2	Ruiha Collier	Ngāti Kahuu o Torongare te Parawhau, Te Waiariki, Te Wharetapu o Ngāpuhi. Whangarei Regional Council Management & Planning Komiti	620	Oppose
3	Unsigned [Sarah Burkhadt]	On behalf of a group of Ngātiwai beneficiaries		Oppose
4	Merepeka Henly	Ngātiwai marae Committee Charitable Trust - Ngaiotonga marae		Support
5	Henry Murphy	Registered named claimant	1719	Support
6	Kris McDonald	Registered named claimant	1711	Support
7	Robert Willoughby	Ngāti Kuta	1307	Oppose
8	Elvis Reti	Registered named claimant	1384	Oppose
9	Winston McCarthy	Ngātiwai		Oppose
10	Teresa McCarthy	Ngātiwai, sister of a claimant		Oppose
11	Mat Clendon	Ngāti Kuta, Te Patukeha Kaumatua Ahikaaroa	1307	Oppose
12	Allan More and Takapari Waata	Te Whānau Whero	1717	Support
13	Christina Drennan and Kiri Munro	Ngātiwai		Support
14	Gordan Bayne and Catherine Munro	Ngātiwai		Support
15	Mat Clendon	Te Rawhiti 3B2 Trust Ngāti Kuta, Te Patukeha (chair), Te		Oppose

No	Writer	Stated affiliation	WAI Claims	Position
		Rawhiti marae		
16	Te Kani Williams/Robin Grey (Wackrow Williams & Davies)	Legal counsel for claimants Ngāti Kuta & Patukeha	1307	Oppose
17	Pereri Mahanga and Alana Thomas (Corban Revell)	Legal counsel for Te Waiariki, Ngāti Korora, Ngāti Taka, Ngāti Pari hapu & claimants	1411, 1412, 1413, 1414, 1415, 1416 and 620	Oppose
18	David Stone and Cameron Hockley (Te Mata-a-Maui Law)	Legal counsel for claimants	1544, 1528, 1529, 1530, 1677, and 1954	Oppose
19	Moka Puru and 3 others	Ngāti Kuta and Te Patukeha kaumātua	1307 and 2022	Oppose
20	Marie Tautari	Registered named claimant Te Whakapiko Hapu of Ngāti Manaia	156	Oppose
21	Peti Pukepuke Ahitapu	Te Patukeha Hapū of Te Rawhiti		Oppose
22	Season-Mary Downs (McCaw Lewis Lawyers)	Legal counsel for Te Kapotai and Ngāti Pare	1464 and 1546	Oppose
23	Wayne Peters	Registered named claimant	343	Support
24	Huhana Seve and 82 others	Taiwhenua Whangarei (whanau and hapu claimant cluster)	245, 688, 1411, 1412, 1413, 1414, 1415, 1416, 745, 1308, 620, 1677, 1544	Oppose
25	Merepeka Henley	Registered named claimant, Nga Hapu o Whangaruru	1384	Support
26	Chris Koroheke	Registered named claimant	1711	Support
27	Timini Reti and 21 others	Ngātiwai beneficiaries, further affiliation not stated		Support
28	Carol Whitfield	Ngāti Takapari		Support
29	Robert Clendon	Ngāti Kuta, Te Patukeha – Te Raawhiti Marae		Oppose

No	Writer	Stated affiliation	WAI Claims	Position
30	Patuone Hoskins	Motu Kokako Ahuwhenua Trust named claimant, Te Patukeha, Ngāti Tawake	2022	Oppose
31	Rowan Tautari	Te Whakapiko Hapu o Ngāti Manaia		Oppose
32	Kawiti Aorangi	Te Waiariki, Ngāti Korora & others		Oppose
33	Huhana Seve	Registered named claimant	1677, 1544	Oppose
34	Paera Rawiri	Whanau hapu claims associated with Wai 1040 Te Paparahi o Te Raki inquiry		Oppose
35	Josephine Haika	Whanau hapu claims associated with Wai 1040 Te Paparahi o Te Raki inquiry		Oppose
36	Henry Haika	Whanau hapu claims associated with Wai 1040 Te Paparahi o Te Raki inquiry		Oppose
37	Sarah-Lousie Haika	Whanau hapu claims associated with Wai 1040 Te Paparahi o Te Raki inquiry		Oppose
38	Shinnade Snowden	Whanau hapu claims associated with Wai 1040 Te Paparahi o Te Raki inquiry		Oppose
39	Henry-Leathern Haika	Whanau hapu claims associated with Wai 1040 Te Paparahi o Te Raki inquiry		Oppose
40	Te Waaka Haika	Whanau hapu claims associated with Wai 1040 Te Paparahi o Te Raki inquiry		Oppose
41	Brezae Haika	Whanau hapu claims associated with Wai 1040 Te Paparahi o Te Raki inquiry		Oppose
42	Hapeta Walters	Whanau hapu claims associated with Wai 1040 Te Paparahi o Te Raki inquiry		Oppose
43	David Shane Pussell	Whanau hapu claims associated with Wai 1040 Te Paparahi o Te Raki inquiry		Oppose
44	Lance Murphy	Whanau hapu claims associated with Wai 1040 Te Paparahi o		Oppose

No	Writer	Stated affiliation	WAI Claims	Position
		Te Raki inquiry		
45	Te Arani Mita	Whanau hapu claims associated with Wai 1040 Te Paparahi o Te Raki inquiry		Oppose
46	Adele Mita	Whanau hapu claims associated with Wai 1040 Te Paparahi o Te Raki inquiry		Oppose
47	Anthony Walters	Whanau hapu claims associated with Wai 1040 Te Paparahi o Te Raki inquiry		Oppose
48	Kuini Walters	Whanau hapu claims associated with Wai 1040 Te Paparahi o Te Raki inquiry		Oppose
49	Natasha Lee Sadler	Whanau hapu claims associated with Wai 1040 Te Paparahi o Te Raki (Ngāpuhi)		Oppose
50	Sara Burkhardt	Whanau hapu claims associated with Wai 1040 Te Paparahi o Te Raki inquiry		Oppose
51	Adelaide Nauer	Whanau hapu claims associated with Wai 1040 Te Paparahi o Te Raki inquiry		Oppose
52	Paratene Wellington	Ngāti Takapari		Support
53	Ike Trevor Reti	Registered named claimant	1786	Support
54	Gary Reti	Registered named claimant	1786	Support
55	[?, name not readable]	Nga Marae o Whangaruru	1384	Support
56	Ngahuia Wynyard	Nga Marae o Whangaruru	1384	Support
57	G Wynyard	Nga Marae o Whangaruru	1384	Support
58	Maryann Pohatu	Ngātiwai beneficiary		Support
59	Wairuku Peeke	Ngātiwai beneficiary		Support
60	Jade Strother	Ngātiwai beneficiary (reg 7509)		Support
61	Matire Josephine Doak	Ngātiwai beneficiary		Support

No	Writer	Stated affiliation	WAI Claims	Position
62	Emma Deane	Ngātiwai beneficiary (reg 5298)		Support
63	Moana Martine [Indecipherable]	Nga Marae o Whangaruru	1384	Support
64	George Okeroa Martin	Nga Marae o Whangaruru	1384	Support
65	Roi McCabe	Ngātiwai beneficiary		Support
66	Jacob Tahitahi	Ngātiwai beneficiary		Support
67	Toni-Marie Sweeney	Ngātiwai beneficiary (reg 578)		Support
68	[Indecipherable] Rapata	Nga Marae o Whangaruru	1384	Support
69	Ring Brown	Ngātiwai beneficiary		Support
70	H Edmonds	Nga Marae o Whangaruru	1384	Support
71	Te Kiri Ani Wells (Kiwikiwi)	Ngātiwai beneficiary (reg 7597)		Support
72	Cecelia Ngere	Ngātiwai beneficiary (reg 437)		Support
73	Kowhiu Kiwikipi	Ngātiwai beneficiary		Support
74	Hohepa Kiwikipi	Ngātiwai beneficiary		Support
75	Merepeka Mane Kiwikipi	Ngātiwai beneficiary		Support
76	Dawn Kiwikipi	Ngātiwai beneficiary		Support
77	Junior Stanley Martin	Ngātiwai beneficiary (reg 7569)		Support
78	Karroll Kiwikipi Ngiotonga	Ngātiwai beneficiary		Support
79	Peter Rapata Roberts	Ngātiwai beneficiary		Support
80	D Kiwikipi	Ngātiwai beneficiary		Support
81	Iwana Ripi	Ngātiwai beneficiary		Support
82	Isabel Purcell	Ngātiwai beneficiary		Support
83	Helen Pere	Ngātiwai beneficiary		Support
84	Agnes Roberts	Ngātiwai beneficiary		Support

No	Writer	Stated affiliation	WAI Claims	Position
85	Eric Wellington	Ngāti Takapari		Support
86	Paulette Wellington	Ngāti Takapari		Support
87	Shirley Hakaraia	Ngāti Kuta and Te Patukeha	1307	Oppose
88	Maude and Titchen Ririnui	Ngāti Kuta and Patukeha		Oppose
89	Sharmain Sandylee Garland	Ngāti Kuta Patukeha, Te Takutai Moana and Ngāti Rehia		Oppose
90	Marino Mahanga	Registered named claimant	1712	Support
			Submissions received	90
			Opposing	42
			Supporting	48