

## **INTRODUCTION**

My full name is Ryan John Hepburn. I am employed by Te Rūnanga o Ngāi Tahu as a Junior Environmental Advisor. I have been in this role since January 2016.

## **SCOPE OF EVIDENCE**

This evidence is only to provide a summary of the main points from the submission made by Te Rūnanga o Ngāi Tahu and Ngā Rūnanga (collectively referred to as “Ngā Rūnanga”) and to respond to the recommendations in the *Summary of Submissions and Staff Recommendations Report* (Staff Report) on the Ngāi Tahu submission.

## **KEY ISSUES**

Ngā Rūnanga broadly supports the Pest Management Strategy but I would like, in light of the Staff Report, to make the following comments:

### **Provision for ancestral lands, waters, sites, wāhi tapu, and taonga**

The Ngā Rūnanga submission expressed concern that the Plan did not adequately provide for the relationship of Ngāi Tahu Whānui with their ‘ancestral lands, waters, sites, wāhi tapu, and taonga’, as per section 70 of the Biosecurity Act. The submission asked that this be thoroughly and explicitly addressed in the Plan.

The Staff Report recommends the Council use section 70 of the Biosecurity Act, namely through the use of a joint work programme between the Council and Te Rūnanga o Ngāi Tahu and Papatipu Rūnanga to recognise the relationship. This approach is supported.

Any joint work programme’s should, however, allow each individual Papatipu Rūnanga to be able to work with the Council to prioritise Pest Management issues within their area and implement strategies and actions on the ground to address them.

### **Funding of a Joint Work Programme**

The Ngā Rūnanga submission sought that funding be set aside in the next Long Term Plan to ensure these site led programmes can be appropriately supported. The Staff Report notes but does not recommend the Ngā Rūnanga submission point is adopted. I appreciate that there is a separate process for prioritising and allocating funds under the Long Term Plan, but I think it is important that the decisions from this process are then recognised and provided for in the Long Term Plan.

### **Timing and techniques of operation**

The Staff Report recommends amending the plan to avoid impacts on mahinga kai and other cultural values through considering timing and techniques of operation for pest management. This is supported. However, the following sentence reads as rather non-committal:

*“Staff will endeavour to notify local Rūnanga of planned control and establish discussion for alternative approaches.”*

It is important for Manawhenua who practice mahinga kai that they are made aware of any pest management activities happening in the area, particularly if harmful chemicals are being used. As such, Environment Canterbury should not 'endeavour' to notify, instead commit to notifying Rūnanga of pest management activities in the area.

**Other Matters**

With regards to the other points made in the submission of Ngā Rūnanga, I agree with the responses I received in the Staff Report.

**Thank you for providing the opportunity to speak to these points in the submission.**