

CONFIRMED



MINUTES

MARINE PROTECTION FORUM MEETING

8th MEETING – 25 and 26 July 2006

Regular meeting held at the Department of Conservation Conference Room, Hokitika beginning at 1.15pm on 25 July.

Present

Bruce Hamilton (Chair), Eugenie Sage, Bruce Watson, Brad Stenhouse, Denis Shannahan, Stuart Thomson, Anne Hall, Carol Scott, Geoff Rowling, Ian McKenzie, Te Whe Weepu.

In Attendance

Murray Reedy (Manager Marine Protection Project), Nicola Pindur (Ministry of Fisheries), Don Neale (Department of Conservation), Andrea Jackson (Minute Secretary).

1.0 Apologies

Apologies received from Helen Rasmussen, while Carrol Browne is overseas. Apologies accepted.

Moved – Te Whe Weepu/Carol Scott

Carried unanimously

A Public Forum was not held in association with this meeting but the public were invited to attend and some thirteen people attended on 25 July [and one on 26 July]. An attendance register was maintained for both days. Bruce Hamilton welcomed the members of the public attending the meeting and asked them to introduce themselves. They did so and identified their interests, being a mixture of recreational fishing club members, whitebaiters and media. Chris Tonkin was attending on behalf of NZ Fish and Game. Bruce advised that members of the public could discuss issues informally during breaks and after the meeting.

Nicola Pindur advised that Scott Williamson, her manager at MinFish is seconded to another role at present and her new manager is Leigh Mitchell who was intending to attend this meeting but due to personal circumstances is now unable to, but will hopefully attend the next meeting instead.

2.0 Agenda confirmation and Declarations of Conflict of Interest

Carol Scott wished for an update on the Oceans Policy, but Nicola advised this update would need to be at the next meeting.

No conflicts of interest were declared.

CONFIRMED

3.0 Confirmation of Minutes of 27 April 2006

No changes were requested. The minutes of the meeting of 27 April 2006 were confirmed as a true and accurate record of the proceedings of the meeting.

Moved – Ian McKenzie/Dennis Shannahan

Carried unanimously

4.0 Matters Arising

No matters arose from the minutes of the meeting of 27 April 2006.

5.0 Correspondence

5.1 Bio-geographic boundaries

Murray Reedy tabled and read the letter from the Marine Conservation Unit, DoC HO in response to the Forum's letter about bio-geographic boundaries. This letter advised of the progress in train and that the Forum's valued input would be included in the information received during the consultation process. Bruce Watson noted that there would be a further consultation process.

Murray Reedy advised that the two Ministers will be also releasing the Protection Standards and Classification System out for a consultation process, and that the Forum can be involved in this process. Carol Scott expressed interest in this consultation process on behalf of fishing quota holders. She requested that MinFish make available a copy of the standards available to all Area 7 quota holders.

Eugenie Sage asked whether there was any progress on compilation of the list of interested groups and stakeholders for the Forum's process. Murray advised that the list is being compiled and will be finalised as part of the Forum's consultation work, and it will be presented as a draft list to the Forum. Bruce Watson thought it may be useful for the list to be available to the two Ministers and Eugenie thought it could also be added to the Forum website.

Eugenie Sage queried whether any thought has been given to the draft Standards being run through the Forum as a useful representative group? Nicola Pindur advised that at the next meeting, post release of the Standards, the writers of those standards would attend the meeting to present them and to receive feedback.

Bruce Hamilton thought that the Forum could request Ministers to involve the Forum more in the drafting process for the Standards. Murray Reedy was unsure what the documents will look like as they are being developed by HO officials directly for the Ministers, but possibly the Forum could ask to be a "sounding board". Murray also referred to the policy brochure wherein it seems that the Minister's intention was that much of the Standards work should be 'science-driven'. Although it was a good idea to make a request for involvement he cautioned that the development of the Standards might be too far along for involvement now. General discussion ensued and concerns were raised that the timelines for release of the Standards could extend if the Forum gets involved at this late stage.

Bruce Watson put a motion: that a letter is written to the responsible Ministers stating that the Forum would like to be used as a sounding board for the Protection Standards and Classification System, on the basis that the West Coast Forum is the longest established Forum.

CONFIRMED

*Moved – Bruce Watson/Eugenie Sage**Carried unanimously**5.2 West Coast Regional Coastal Plan submission*

Andrea reported on the progress of the Forum's submission on the Regional coastal Plan. Lillie Sadler at the Council has advised that the review is behind schedule but it should be completed by the end of September. The completed review will proceed to Council and the Council can decide if it needs to make a Plan Change now or wait for the 10-year review period or whether other actions could be taken, such as education measures. The review report would be placed on the Council website, will be made available to DOC and to others upon request. Denis Shannahan further advised that a Plan Change proposal in relation to the Taramaukau River coastal area has been requested, so Council is likely to be considering a Plan Change.

5.3 Media article/advert

Murray Reedy tabled a copy of an advertisement by the Haast interest group requesting that fishers complete a questionnaire that will be collected and come to the Forum, hopefully during the consultation stage. As well, an article appeared in the Greymouth Evening Star on 18 July raising concerns about the potential for creation of marine reserves to close out whitebaiters. In response to that article appearing Murray had rung Ray Sadler, the chair of the Whitebaiters Association to clarify matters. Murray (and Bruce Hamilton) have also had discussions with Laura Mills, the journalist concerned, to inform and update her. She had erroneously thought the Technical Report would be released at this meeting.

Murray Reedy moved on to outline the framework of the MPA policy and the Forum's role for the whitebaiters and recreational fishers present at the meeting. People might be wondering if any closure of rivers or estuaries are proposed, but the whitebait regulations remain in force and regulate the fishery by the use of gear restrictions, season and closure of some watercourses. Even if this Forum reached the conclusion that additional measures are required to protect whitebait, then these proposed measures would need to go through the review provisions of the West Coast whitebait regulation. Also the Conservation Board has a policy of consulting if any changes to the existing regulations are proposed. Similarly any marine reserve proposals must go through the marine reserve process.

A member of the public queried whether the Forum had any role in the opening of the lagoon at Blackwater Creek. Murray Reedy advised that this matter is the responsibility of the West Coast Regional Council.

In response to a query about the management of salmon and other freshwater fisheries, Murray advised that the activities of freshwater fishers are not expected to be effected and it is not the intention of the MPA policy to have any effect on this fishery. Chris Tonkin advised that the Fish and Game boundaries extend 500 metres out to sea from rivers/estuaries, in relation to "sports fish" so it would be useful for the Forum to maintain contact with Fish and Game. Geoff Rowling noted that the lack of recognition of the existing regulations for recreational fishers, so there may still may be grey areas of knowledge for the Forum process. Eugenie Sage noted the need for the Forum to be quite specific at the reporting time to ensure that any impacts on freshwater/whitebait/sports fish areas are clearly spelt out.

CONFIRMED

5.4 Te Ohu Kaimoana

Murray Reedy had received an email contact from Tania McPherson of Te Ohu Kaimoana outlining the interests of her organisation in representing the inshore fishery quotas holders, as well as the off-shore quota holders. Non-resident national fishing quota holders are represented by this organisation, and it is concerned about the potential for the property rights of its quota holders to be affected. Murray provided advice about the MPA and the Forum, and also indicated that he would ask if Tania or another contact person could attend the next Forum meeting to directly explain the agency's interests and the possible issues of concern to that organisation.

Nicola Pindur advised that Te Ohu Kaimoana represents 57 iwi and has significant orange roughy and hoki quota, and that the 12 nautical mile fishery does include some "deep sea" fishing quota areas. The Forum does not have representatives from this stakeholder group so the Forum will be avoiding any areas that are "deep sea" areas.

Eugenie Sage queried whether, if organisations representing quota holders were able to make a presentation, then what about conservation organisations doing the same? Bruce Watson responded that it may be preferable for Te Ohu Kaimoana to make a presentation during the consultation process and Bruce Hamilton agreed with that idea. This discussion prompted members of the public present to ask questions about the upcoming public consultation process and Bruce Hamilton outlined the process. He emphasised that the Forum is a long way from making decisions despite what may have appeared in the media.

5.5 Emily Arthur

Murray Reedy had received an email from Emily reconsidering her resignation from the Forum. After further thought, she now wishes to remain on the Forum, with Anne Hall filling in from time to time. General discussion followed, with the Forum in favour of Emily remaining on the Forum but not keen to support a 'regular' replacement person. Eugenie Sage reminded members that there had been agreement (at an earlier meeting) that a replacement person from the organisation represented could attend Forum meetings. The consensus was that it was valid to have a replacement person, if required, but that person becoming involved in the negotiation stages was not desirable.

5.6 NZ Coastal Policy Statement review process

Murray Reedy had been forwarded the timetable for the review of this document. During August and September comment is being sought on review issues and options paper from iwi authorities and review stakeholders. The review issues and options paper was due to be released in July [post meeting Andrea checked and was advised by DOC Head Office that the issues and options paper will be available in about a further eight weeks time, so late September].

Wrapping up the discussion on the correspondence tabled today Bruce Hamilton requested copies be made available to Forum members of the recent correspondence received (actioned before the end of the meeting).

6.0 Technical Report

6.1 Presentation by Les Malloy

Murray Reedy introduced Les Malloy, a nationally respected author of scientific books on NZ flora and fauna. Les noted that he has been visiting the West Coast and its mountains for 45

CONFIRMED

years, and that it's a great project to be involved with. Les tabled a set of samples, being the Table of Contents, the Hokitika segment plus the topographical map and four-map page for Hokitika. The layout of the Hokitika segment has been done in conjunction with the Wellington based designer he is working with on this project. Murray advised that this sample segment demonstrated the preferred writing style (jargon free and easy to read), and that the Forum may wish to consider it overnight.

Les advised that the Table of Contents works by detailing the general West Coast conditions, and then zooming into the more particular descriptive material. Murray advised that he hopes to view the classification system prior to its formal release, so that the classification work within the Technical Report is not delayed. Bruce Watson clarified that the Technical Report sub-committee asked for pictures to be added to the report as they provide a great deal of information. Les advised that the sample segment provided was a "design mock-up" rather than a final presentation version as there are no captions on photos and the photos used could change.

Carol Scott, supported by Stuart Thomson, expressed concern about the tight timeframe for completion of the Technical Report, and that there needs to be plenty of time for input by Forum members. Les advised that, due to tight timeframes, the remaining segments would be sent to the Forum in the draft format and would be edited and laid out after the review process.

A discussion about the presentation/approach/content and timeline ensued. Murray Reedy suggested that all of Part 5-segments could be available next week including photos (without captions). Bruce Watson would prefer caption were added. Andrea suggested that a photo appendix be created for each segment, with captions, and should be prepared as a separate document. This suggestion was welcomed by Don Neale as he already has work close to this output, the remaining issue is 'photo gaps', particularly underwater photos.

Eugenie Sage proposed that work needed to be done to obtain underwater photos, and there then followed a discussion on how hard it is to get photos like this Nicola Pindur advised that NABIS has pictures of all fish species but these may actually be copyrighted and not available for this publication. Geoff Rowling and Kerry Eggeling were keen that underwater habitat photos be specific to the West Coast, and not generic NZ photos. This issue was discussed and the Forum agreed with this position, with generic species photos being acceptable.

Eugenie Sage raised some issues about the maps, being: a query as to whether the colour distinction of conservation land was sufficient, and she suggested that a locator number be added to the 'index' on the topo maps, and also queried the description of the exact location of mussel and paua beds; would this identification promote over-use. Discussion on the map layout ensued, and Don Neale clarified that the depth, substrate and degree of exposure were the important environmental drivers for habitat formation, forming the context of the biological information. It was suggested that the final maps be available on the website as zipped versions plus CD copies being available.

6.2 *Review process*

The initial suggestion by Murray Reedy was that the Forum members have two weeks to respond to the chapter 5 material, with feedback coming to a review panel/sub-committee. Then the remaining parts of the report, chapters 1-4 would be circulated at the end of August.

CONFIRMED

Bruce Watson suggested that people could take away the material from the meeting (Segment 7) and have two weeks to respond, including any comments about overall presentation, which would provide a sample of the level of review work and response level.

Eugenie Sage advised that two weeks is too short to comment on all 14 segments. Murray Reedy discussed two choices the Forum could review the draft versions of the 14 segments as ready now, or wait and get the segments in a more edited and formatted version. He presumes that the Forum review panel would consist of the Technical Report sub-committee. Stuart Thomson commented that segment 7 seems to have a fair bit of information on fishing absent. Les Malloy advised he is keen to get additional information on the 14 segments so that he and Don can continue with the reviewing and editing work. The other parts of the report, parts 1-4, will be available in about four weeks.

General discussion ensued on sending the 14 segments and maps out to the Forum on the following Monday. Bruce Hamilton noted that the missing information was the key matter to address. It was agreed that at this stage the report should not be discussed further other than with Forum member due to its draft nature. Eugenie Sage reminded the Forum that it had been agreed at the last meeting that Forum members could discuss the content of the report, but not make copies available or allow others to have the draft material.

Bruce Hamilton advised that to conclude the discussion, part 5 (segments) is to be released to Forum members and Murray Reedy advised that Andrea would be the clearing-house for feedback and would send out materials (hard and digital copies). Bruce Hamilton advised that the following people have put their names forward to work on the review panel/sub-committee: Bruce Watson, Carol Scott, Eugenie Sage, and Nicola Pindur. [At the end of the meeting Denis Shannahan also put his name forward]. It was agreed that Bruce Watson would chair the sub-committee and Andrea would work with Bruce on distribution/feedback process. A total of four weeks is to be allowed for Forum feedback on all 14 segments; at which time the next parts will be distributed (parts 1-4). So dates are:

Part 5 distributed – 31 July
Feedback received – 28 August
Review meeting - 4 September

Parts 1-4 distributed – 28 August
Feedback received – 22 September
Review meeting - 29 September

Les Malloy will be able to work on the whole report and complete it as a final draft by 13 October, off to the designer, then he will be away until 3 November. There followed a general discussion on the timing of the next Forum meeting but no decision was reached. Discussion was also held on whether the final draft should be distributed to the Forum or not. Murray Reedy queried what would be added, given the preceding work by two sub-committee meetings, and whether this would mean a much longer timeframe. Geoff Rowling supported a shorter process so that the report could be released for public consultation by early November, and Eugenie Sage supported this view. Les Malloy advised that the draft report could be ready for the consultation round by 16/17 November, but only if a sub-committee review process was held and not a full Forum review as well.

CONFIRMED

Given the timing discussed above, Eugenie Sage raised the issue of the timeline, as discussed, and how it fits with the timeframe previously sent out by Murray and Nicola. Murray responded that the overall work will be pushed further out, and that he and Nicola will revise the timeline in time for tomorrow's discussion.

7.0 Science and Research

7.1 MinFish Information Standards

At the last meeting, Nicola Pindur had tabled a document explaining the Information Principles Policy that has been developed by MinFish. A shorter summary outlining some of the key parts of this policy was also provided. A brief discussion was had with the Forum about different types of information that we may receive, including scientific information, anecdotal information and opinion. This was to highlight that not all information that is received will be reliable and suitable for the Forum's consideration. General discussion followed. Nicola suggested that a framework be developed which clearly states how information will be used prior to the technical report going out so we are all clear about this.

She was queried as to what is the test for accepting anecdotal evidence, how do we determine the 'rigour' of the information presented. Eugenie Sage queried whether MinFish information standards should apply to the Forum process. Nicola responded these information principles have not been given out because the Forum must adhere to them, as the Department of Conservation also has its own information principles, but to inform the Forum as to how MinFish views information. This is important as Nicola doesn't want to see information that is not robust being used to make Forum recommendations, which may not meet Ministry and DOC guidelines later on in the process when MinFish and DOC assess and work on the implementation on possible recommendations. The Forum does need to be clear about what information received from the public can be agreed as acceptable.

Kerry Eggeling advised that he has received some 30 questionnaires back from some 300 distributed in Haast. Bruce Watson thought that the results of the Recreational fishing survey, due out in November, should be included in the Technical Report. General discussion followed about including this information as a supplementary appendix, or as a revised edition of the report following the public consultation round.

.....
The meeting closed on 5.30pm and reconvened at 8.30am on 26 April 2006.
.....

8.0 MPA Policy and Implementation Plan

8.1 Approaches on negotiated outcomes

Murray Reedy had hoped to have the Protection Standards and Classification System available to discuss with the Forum but it is currently delayed. However, the Forum will need to be able to discuss the MPA policy and then to negotiate solutions on possible MPA sites amongst themselves. With this task in mind, he had thought that the Forum members might benefit from a negotiation skills training session.

Sarah Wilson then facilitated a discussion session on various approaches to negotiating skills. Andrea advised that she would not take detailed notes, so members could have a free

CONFIRMED

discussion, but did proceed to take notes of some comments. Sarah opened by acknowledging that the Forum would be dealing with complex and sometimes difficult material, and in the future they will definitely be negotiating. She considers that it is preferable to consider the process of negotiation before they get to the actual negotiation stage when they will need to get actual agreed solutions. She also acknowledged that the Forum members are participating in a world leading conservation negotiation process.

Sarah laid out the purposes of the session as being:

- a free and frank discussion on *how* we will negotiate (not the content of negotiation)
- an opportunity to look at some models of negotiation
- to get clear about what is required of you and what you will need, especially those who represent groups, how will you get ready with your group
- how to deal with the media (added by Carol Scott)

The aim was to develop a set of negotiation principles or guidelines.

At this point a single member of the public arrived, which prompted Eugenie Sage to propose that the Forum should move "into committee", without the public present. General discussion on this matter ensued, as the meeting had been advertised as a public meeting. Murray Reedy advised that at the Conservation Board meetings, they only move "into committee" when matters of a personal or commercially sensitive nature are discussed. Sarah Wilson offered a compromise solution of having a general negotiation experience now, and then delaying a 'free and frank' discussion until after the meeting closed.

Following on from this discussion, Eugenie Sage raised the future issue of Forum negotiation sessions following the public submission rounds, and thought that the Forum would need to be able to freely discuss matters without the public present. In her experience difficult negotiation sessions don't work well in a public arena. Murray Reedy advised that, to date, the Forum has been operating with an open and transparent process and thus all the meetings have been public. In the future, some sessions may need to go 'into committee'. Given the advance advertising of meetings, the Forum will need to discuss this matter and decide in advance of a meeting being advertised. Bruce Hamilton and Anne Hall both agreed that the negotiation sessions should be 'in committee'. Murray undertook to seek legal advice about the Meeting Act and how the Forum would go about moving into the 'in-committee' process.

Kerry Eggeling raised the risk of leaked information from such 'in committee'. Sarah Wilson advised she would cover the topics of how to hold a debate and how to listen, and what does 'in confidence' mean. Eugenie Sage queried whether it's really a question of the degree of trust being generated amongst Forum members? Sarah responded by explaining that the three top questions in any new relationship between people, are the questions, 'do I trust you', 'do you trust me', and 'what's in this relationship for me'. So essentially the first building blocks of relationships are rapport building, building trust, not necessarily liking people but deciding to trust them.

Kerry Eggeling discussed how government processes have gone awry for folks on the ground that has led to a lack of trust of government processes down the track. Stuart Thomson, Kerry Eggeling (and others) raised concerns about the potential loss of property rights and financial losses to commercial fishers through 'pre-ordained' government policy. Bruce Watson advised that based on his experiences of government processes he considers it important for

CONFIRMED

the Forum to be very detailed and precise in its recommendations, so that Ministers are clear about matters at a fine level of detail, which is why he is so keen to get the level of detail right in the Technical Report. In response to a query from Sarah about which West Coast processes have been a success, Bruce thought there were plenty of successful examples, such as the management of sphagnum moss. The West Coast has the opportunity to come up with imaginative solutions. Stuart expressed concern about how to convey the negotiations conducted in confidence, to the groups they represent, how to report-back.

Sarah Wilson discussed the Fiordland marine conservation process of “gifts and gains”. Like-minded people who negotiate together and agreed to give up some things – “gifts”. Local solutions then got agreement at Government level. Feedback from Forum members that Fiordland is a special and different place, not subject to the same pressures that the West Coast faces. Sarah went on to discuss the concept of the ‘range of negotiation’, the overlapping area where agreement can be reached. Bruce Watson raised the issue that the major stumbling block is whether 10% of the West Coast coastline is the interpretation of the MPA, or less or more. A potential range of 1% to 50% will be far more difficult to negotiate.

The Forum then broke into two-person discussion groups to share negotiation experiences, and Sarah then extracted the essence of the discussions and compiled a list of what does and does not work in negotiation, as follows:

What works in negotiation

- explaining benefits or impacts
- being responsive, getting an outside perspective
- explaining roles
- understanding on all sides
- negotiation takes time
- being straight-up with people
- education/public acceptance
- credibility of enforcement
- recognising responsibilities

What does not work in negotiation

- no ability to move in negotiations
- property rights versus biodiversity
- good information does not guarantee an outcome
- conflicting expert opinions
- baggage and broken trust from the past
- enforcement/lack of public buy-in

Next discussed, were the classic phases of negotiation (not necessarily strictly sequential):

1. preparation
2. information gathering/rapport building
3. eliciting wants (statements about what is important not about issues)
4. probing into ‘wants’ (what is your intention, what is important, why is that important)
5. offering (gifts and gains, bargaining)
6. solidifying
7. communicating product

CONFIRMED

It was acknowledged that many Forum members represent groups or sectors, and discussion followed on how individual members would deal with that, especially during the negotiation stages 4-6 (as above). To that end, Forum members raised a number of issues that would assist them to negotiate outcomes.

A discussion ensued that a letter should be sent to the two Ministers requesting that the Forum wishes to report directly to them, rather than through the two agencies (DOC, MinFish). Copies would be provided to the two agencies at the same time. Advance information should be provided to Ministers before the consultation rounds.

All the members of the Forum reported on their own report-back situation, which ranged from needing national executive approval, and those with a wide grouping of stakeholders, to two people who have no particular groups to report back to.

Murray Reedy noted the potential benefit of utilising a professional facilitator to enable the chair to participate fully in the negotiation process, and he received support for this suggestion.

Te Whe Weepu advised that Te Runanga o Ngati Waewae and Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu are both interested in the MPA process as treaty partners of the Crown. Eugenie Sage raised queries about customary use information and the funding of information gathering and how this might be provided. Nicola Pindur advised that MinFish is keeping a register of marine protection areas and any proposed by the Forum will be recorded as well as any proposed by West Coast runanga.

Te Whe Weepu advised that Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu wishes to have a guiding influence on the marine environment, but the two local runanga obviously are also involved, at the local level and in more detail. Eugenie Sage raised the idea of a Cultural Impact Assessment being done and Te Whe replied that the runanga does have a suitable person available. Murray Reedy added that TRONT was planning to facilitate a customary fisheries hui in September on the West Coast. MinFish is involved and assisting with the hui.

The negotiation skills session finished with thanks to Sarah for a useful session and good techniques learned.

8.2 Forum process and timeline

Nicola Pindur presented a revised process and timeline, as the timeline emailed out some weeks ago needed to be revised. The idea of mapping all the habitats on the coastline is so that it can be used for discussion for stakeholders to work out the 'least cost' areas or other key information. Stuart Thomson advised that there is no mystery about inshore commercial fishing areas. There followed general discussion about what level of detail might be supplied by the classification system. It was agreed that Part 2 of the report would benefit from the information contained in the proposed classification system. Murray Reedy is hoping to do this by the new deadline date of 28 August. How the draft classification system is mapped as part of Part 2 of the report is not clear at present. Bruce Watson suggested that the different substrates be represented as photos in Part 2. Eugenie Sage suggested that someone skilled be used to photo research for the missing photos and she would provide the name/s of suitable people to Murray. Bruce Watson also raised the issue of how to incorporate new information becoming available, such as the Recreational Fishing Survey, new photos and new information generally.

CONFIRMED

Murray Reedy spoke to the changes in the timeline, whereby the release of the Technical Report planned for the beginning of September is now rescheduled for 17 November. Prior to the release of the report a communication process would be run to inform people and encourage submissions. Hard copies and CD's of the report would be available as well as a media supplement. A series of presentation meetings would be held over the period of a week. Copies of material would be available on the website (pdf version). It was agreed that Andrea, Nicola, Murray would work together to work out the details of the public consultation round and would send the Consultation Plan out to Forum members for feedback/approval.

There was general discussion on what the meetings would involve and it was agreed that 'workshops' were not planned at this stage. It was suggested that only one glacier town meeting would suffice, and that Bruce Bay should replace Paringa as a venue. Suggestions were raised about holding a meeting in Nelson and Motueka, and about advertising the meetings more widely, such as in the Christchurch Press. Carol Scott offered to pay for a meeting in her region. It was agreed that Nicola and Murray would finalise any meeting dates and places after the meeting. Due to the late start of the public consultation round it was recommended that the submission closing date be 31 January 2007. A submission collation exercise would follow, then a review process by the Technical Report Sub-committee. It is hoped that that process would be completed by the end of February. Murray and Nicola will revise the Forum process timeline and send out again.

9.0 Administration

9.1 Meeting dates

It was agreed that the next meeting would be a one-day meeting to discuss the Protection Standards and Classification System. No date was decided.

The final draft of the Technical Report would be available from 12 October for a 2-3 week final review period by the Forum. A meeting about the draft Technical Report would only be held if significant concerns arise.

9.2 Conservation Board Representative

The issue of Emily Arthur remaining and having a regular stand-in was discussed again. Generally the Forum members were not keen for too much changing of personnel and the use of replacement observers. Emily Arthur's presence on the Forum is valued as a representative of the younger generation and the student and tertiary sector. Bruce Hamilton is to contact Emily and to discuss her on-going involvement with her.

Bruce Hamilton closed the meeting at 2.45pm.

Confirmed
Bruce Hamilton
Chairperson

CONFIRMED

.....
Papers Tabled

1. Draft minutes of Forum meeting of 27 April at Greymouth
2. Technical Report samples (Content Pages, Segment 7 and maps)
3. Letter from DOC Head Office re bio-geographic boundaries
4. Article in Greymouth Evening Star: 18 July 2006
5. Advertisement in local paper for Haast people
6. Email correspondence about the NZCPS timeline
7. Email correspondence from Te Ohu Kaimoana
8. Email correspondence from Emily Arthur
9. Draft Forum process and timeline