



## PRE-APPLICATION CONSULTATION HUI WITH MĀORI ON TRANSGENIC RESEARCH

---

### *Summary of Key Themes for AgResearch*

---



*April 2008*

## Introduction

In 1998 the Environmental Risk Management Authority (ERMA) granted consent to AgResearch to undertake specific transgenic work with cows and sheep. That work is aimed at producing products from milk that will improve human health and nutrition. The first of those ERMA consents will expire in November 2008 and the second in 2010.

In order to continue and expand its research, AgResearch intends to apply to ERMA for consent to import and develop genetically modified animals in containment in order to produce biopharmaceuticals and other nutritional products. The applications will seek approval to:

- Undertake research and development on a wide range of species including cattle, sheep, goats, deer, zebu, buffalo, horses, chickens and rabbits, and use genetic material from a wide range of donor species including human (synthetic) proteins. The applications will not include genetic material sourced from Māori or native flora and fauna.
- Study, develop and commercialise a wide range of beneficial characteristics such as for:
  - production of medically important proteins in body fluids, such as milk;
  - resistance to diseases (fungal, bacterial and viruses);
  - altered milk, meat, wool/hair or antler composition;
  - use as models to increase understanding of human diseases.
- Undertake normal farm-scale activities so that sufficient numbers of animals can be maintained to enable pharmaceutical and nutraceutical production. These farms are likely to be located in the main dairying areas of New Zealand such as the Waikato.

AgResearch is committed to research and development for the benefit of Māori and to developing collaborative working relationships with Māori organisations and businesses. AgResearch is one partner in the relationship and has articulated its vision as:

*“Me whakahura mo te Tonuitanga, o Tangata Whenua me Te Rangahau Ahuwhenua.*

Research and development for the prosperity and empowerment of Tangata Whenua and AgResearch.”

AgResearch have noted their hope that, through engagement with Māori, AgResearch can continue to learn from Māori about their philosophies regarding “Mana Whenua, Mana Moana and Mana Tangata”. It is also hoped that Māori will learn from AgResearch about the value that science plays in maintaining “Mana Whenua, Mana Moana and Mana Tangata”.

Therefore, AgResearch has undertaken a pre-application consultation specifically with Māori, involving eleven regional consultation hui held across the country. AgResearch has also convened a National Māori Representative Group (NMRG) made up of participants from the

regional hui. This NMRG met at Ruakura to view the facility, to discuss their views, and to provide feedback to AgResearch on common themes from Māori. Having been presented with the substance of the draft application, Māori can provide their more specific feedback about transgenic issues from their own perspectives.

AgResearch provided support for the transportation, accommodation and meals for the NMRG to meet with key AgResearch staff and attend at Ruakura on 28<sup>th</sup> February 2008.

This report outlines some key themes and notable points that have arisen from the questions, comments, challenges and ideas of key tangata whenua who gave generously of their time to attend the consultation hui around the country. Our approach is to allow the words of the hui participants themselves to express important points.

Not surprisingly there was strong diversity in the views expressed by Māori, and we have tried to capture the key themes in this document. Many participants cautiously supported the concept of transgenic research largely because of the perceived medical benefits. Potential commercial opportunities also featured in the discussions, but were always tempered by social, cultural and environmental issues according to a Māori worldview which emphasises the spiritual connection of Māori with this earth. Even where there was no support, there was acknowledgement of the consultation process and appreciation shown for having gained a better understanding of the difficult issues raised as a result of consultation. Those who did not support the concept of transgenic research identified concerns such as: the impact on whakapapa; concern for potential unforeseen effects on the subject animals, on consumers, and on the environment; the potential for horizontal gene transfer; and the risk that either the transgenic animal or the genetic material itself could breach containment.

Several hui participants noted that there is a need for Māori to consider and debate the impact of transgenic research on tikanga. As Oliver Sutherland said during the Nelson hui:

*What would be interesting to me is to hear and understand how the supporters reconcile tikanga with their support. I understand that they support the opportunities for Māori but how does that stand in terms of tikanga?*

Given that, from the outset, AgResearch volunteered not to undertake research on native flora and fauna, this topic did not feature in the discussions. Some hui participants suggested that genetic material from Māori donors should be used in research to ensure that the products generated from such research are useful to Māori. However, there were many hui participants that disagreed with this view.

A number of questions were raised about the specific detail of the proposed application: what are the containment processes? How will waste from research animals be disposed of? What

is the purpose of the research, and what is actually being sought? Who are AgResearch's partners in the research and in any subsequent commercialisation? What alternatives, if any, are there to the proposed research?

There was universal support and approval for AgResearch's early engagement with Māori and its willingness to venture into the regions to discuss the application. While there was one request that hui take place on marae, generally the consultation meetings were very well received. The low attendance numbers at some hui raised few concerns given the quality of the hui participants and their contributions to the overall discussion.

Despite the positive feedback on the efforts to educate and to share information with Māori via this consultation process, there were requests for the draft application itself to be disclosed, and for greater specificity around the potential application sites and species. An independent cultural impact assessment was also sought.

AgResearch indicated in the hui that it enjoys a strong relationship with Ngāti Wairere, the local tangata whenua within whose tribal region AgResearch's primary site is located. The NMRG asked that further consultation take place before lodging the final application, including consultation on the draft application itself with iwi generally, with Ngāti Wairere, and with the NMRG. AgResearch accepted the need to acknowledge the uniqueness of iwi, hapū and whānau and to work closely with the tangata whenua of proposed containment sites, and agreed that it would consult with Ngāti Wairere on the draft applications. However, because it viewed that considerable consultation had already taken place, AgResearch declined to arrange any further hui with iwi generally or with the NMRG. Participants in the NMRG have responded by email, expressing their disappointment with the lack of consultation on the detail of the draft.

This Summary of Key Themes is not a substitute for the primary sources of information which are the minutes of each hui, including the minutes and recommendations of the NMRG hui at Ruakura on 28 February 2008. The resolutions of the NMRG hui have been incorporated into this report.

We attach copies of each of the nine consultation hui in chronological order. Draft minutes were circulated to hui participants for confirmation and have been amended according to feedback received. We also attach some email responses from members of the NMRG. This report has been peer reviewed.

## Executive Summary

- The pre-application consultation yielded a variety of responses from Māori. Some registered their strong opposition to transgenics for a variety of reasons including: the effect on the whakapapa of the research animal; potential, unforeseen effects; potential horizontal gene transfer; and the risk of containment being breached. Others recognised the potential medical benefits (including for Māori) and also potential economic benefits for New Zealand. Nevertheless, there were reservations as to whether those benefits would in fact be realised. Overall, while there was a general willingness on the part of Māori to at least consider the detail of the application, the call for caution was resounding.
- Several hui participants noted that there is a need for Māori to consider and debate the impact of transgenic research on tikanga Māori.
- A number of questions were raised about the specific details of the proposed application such as containment processes; disposal of waste; research objectives; research partners and commercial partners; and the need to identify alternatives.
- There was universal support and approval for AgResearch's early engagement with Māori and its willingness to go to each region to discuss the application. There was one request that hui take place on marae.
- There were requests for wider disclosure of the draft application and for greater specificity around the potential application sites and species. An independent cultural impact assessment was also sought.
- The National Māori Reference Group (NMRG) sought further consultation on the draft application itself with iwi generally, with Ngāti Wairere in particular, and with the NMRG. AgResearch agreed to continue consulting with Ngāti Wairere but declined to arrange further hui with iwi generally or with the NMRG. Participants in the NMRG have expressed their disappointment about this lack of commitment to further consultation on the detail of the draft and about the lack of confirmed outcomes from the consultation.
- This Summary of Key Themes is not a substitute for the primary sources of information which are the minutes of each hui, including the minutes and recommendations of the NMRG hui held at Ruakura on 28 February 2008, and the email responses from the NMRG participants.

## Contents

Introduction .....	1
Executive Summary.....	4
1. The importance of a Māori world view.....	6
1.1 Whakapapa .....	6
1.2 Diversity of views and the need for caution .....	7
2. Potential benefits.....	9
2.1 Support for potential medical benefits.....	9
2.2 Will Māori benefit? .....	9
3. Specific questions about the proposed research and perceived risks.....	12
3.1 Cultural impact assessment .....	12
3.2 Containment .....	12
3.3 Disposal of milk and waste products .....	13
3.4 Alternative methods .....	13
3.5 Horizontal gene transfer .....	14
3.6 Long-term impacts .....	15
3.7 Other questions .....	15
4. Consultation process.....	17
4.1 General approval for the process and early engagement .....	17
4.2 Further consultation sought on the application .....	18
4.3 Mana Whenua: the location of research sites and the need to engage tangata whenua ...	19
4.4 Support for ongoing engagement with Māori .....	20
5. National Māori Reference Group hui outcomes and the response from AgResearch .....	21
6. Appendices.....	23
6.1 Minutes of the Consultation Hui.....	23
6.2 Minutes of the National Māori Reference Group Hui .....	23
6.3 Email Responses.....	23

## 1. The importance of a Māori world view

### 1.1 Whakapapa

Whakapapa, the principle of genealogical descent, is central to Māori society and great efforts are made to preserve it. Whakapapa defines both the individual and kin groups to which Māori belong, and governs the relationships between them. The special relationship Māori have with their land is based on whakapapa. Every living thing has whakapapa, and a consistent theme from those participants who raised concerns about the concept of transgenics was the risk of influencing whakapapa by mixing human and animal genes. Māori challenged scientists to understand such spiritual and cultural values and questioned whether such values could be reconciled in the research being proposed:

*I just struggle with how to reconcile the science with the cultural concerns. We are being asked for feedback, our feedback is we don't want this. I don't believe that our cultural needs can be mitigated because some are so intangible. So it is frustrating to come to the meeting, to make the submissions, when ultimately we question how our concerns will be addressed or if they can be... I have heard repeatedly that whakapapa is a part of us, our environment. How do you mitigate the effect of changes to whakapapa? The connection with the environment – we want to work with it rather than change it.*

*(Jo McLean, Christchurch Hui)*

*As tangata whenua we talk about whānau, whenua, aroha, and wairua. I have a problem with science. I think it is disrespectful of us.*

*(Hori Parata, Whangarei Hui)*

*There is one thing that we Māori have that can't be taken away - that is wairua. Pākehā don't have it or understand it. You can't find it under a microscope. I feel sorry for the Pākehā they don't even know their beginning. NZ is a new country but it can't go further without the input of Māori.*

*(Emma Gibbs-Smith, Whangarei Hui)*

Some hui participants expressed a desire for more discussion between Māori about tikanga Māori and transgenics.

*What would be interesting to me is to hear and understand how the supporters reconcile tikanga with their support. I understand that they support the opportunities for Māori but how does that stand in terms of tikanga.*

*(Oliver Sutherland, Nelson Hui)*

*There are two sets of questions. Ki te tutu mai i te kau, pēhea te mimi, te tūtai inā ka taka ki roto ki a Papatūānuku - he pai, he take rānei? [If the cow is interfered with, what about the urine and faeces falling on the earth – is this acceptable, or is it a concern?] There is a real need to raise that take [issue] and wānanga [discuss] it. There is that other spiritual dimension that you shouldn't walk away from.*

*(Keir Vollerling, Whangarei Hui)*

*Te mauri o ngā āhuatanga – how do we maintain the integrity of the status quo...? To a large degree we are influenced by western research. Māori science needs to balance western science and influence it with some wairua/spirituality.*

*(Te Iwi Puihi Tipene, Whangarei Hui)*

## **1.2 Diversity of views and the need for caution**

*There is a diverse range of Māori views, just as there are amongst Pākehā. My generation is very removed from teenagers now, and we probably have different views on things.*

*(Ted Palmer, Dunedin Hui)*

The hui produced a diverse range of Māori views, but it is fair to say that the natural reaction was one of caution. The discussions in the hui exposed a general suspicion about western scientific research processes. Many participants cautiously supported the concept of transgenic research largely because of the perceived medical benefits. Commercial opportunities also featured in the discussions, but they were always tempered by social, cultural, and environmental issues according to a Māori worldview which emphasises the spiritual connection of Māori with this earth.

Participants wondered how AgResearch would evaluate the diverse views.

*Does AgResearch prioritise the views? Does it view some Māori views as more important?*

*(Glenice Paine, Nelson Hui)*

### **Accountability**

Accountability was a theme repeated in several hui.

*Our people are concerned that their information may be used against them in years to come. Scientists don't believe Te āo Māori (Māori world view).*

*(Toko Renata, Auckland Hui)*

*There is a difference between natural change and human intervention.... It is the time factor though – natural changes occur over time.... natural progression in response to the environment. It is quite different to human induced transgenics.*

*(Francia Zygadlo, Christchurch Hui)*

*There is no doubt we need science, but I also believe in accountability and restriction. I've had to use science in the RMA process to support my spiritual beliefs. We've lost a lot of intellectual property rights out of these processes. We are poor and dependent on scientifically modified produce to live on. Where is the accountability aspect in all of these proposals?*

*(Emma Gibbs-Smith, Whangarei Hui)*

*One of the issues circling around here is that of accountability. The consequences of these scientific innovations have been damaging and AgResearch and like companies should be held accountable if you get it wrong.*

*(Z Vallings, Whangarei Hui)*

Toko Renata (Hauraki Māori Trust Board) told the Auckland hui that:

*We are trying to push our younger people into science. You must have tangata whenua heading the process or Māori will switch off.*

*(Toko Renata, Auckland Hui)*

## 2. Potential benefits

### 2.1 Support for potential medical benefits

Several hui participants recognised potential medical benefits of the research.

*In terms of herceptin, I don't think you should trade off a drug for a life – if people need it, they should get it*

*(Jo McLean, Christchurch Hui)*

*There will be benefits for Māori but at the same time there are cultural issues. ... People in my family have diabetes, asthma, MS. If we can alleviate suffering we should – no race is immune from suffering.*

*(Ted Palmer, Dunedin Hui)*

*Whenever we talk about genetic modification we always have negative images of it. They do a disservice to what's happened here today. If the question was do I or my moko need this, what would I say then? That's the test of my commitment. There is the economic and social value for us as people.*

*(Wi [Charlie] Pera, Gisborne Hui)*

*Our people need to come to terms with it. A lot of our people oppose it but then some of our old people have benefitted from this.*

*(Toko Renata, Auckland Hui)*

### 2.2 Will Māori benefit?

The discussions often exposed real concerns as to whether Māori would actually benefit from the project, and who would benefit financially:

*There is a whole lot of promise but very little actual products that have actually been produced. There has been no benefit for this country. There has to be extensive monitoring of transgenic products.*

*(Malibu Hamilton, Hamilton Hui)*

*What progress has actually been made in the past nine years? It seems like a long term to research, will I even be around when these products are created?*

*(Maree Pene, Hamilton Hui)*

*Will it really benefit the wider social community or just the pharmaceutical companies? ...[I]n terms of commercialization, if this makes medicines so cheap, why would the pharmaceutical companies do it?...we are at the mercy of pharmaceuticals when they actually market the product.*

*(Jo McLean, Christchurch Hui)*

*Are there any specific benefits for Māori?... Are transgenic medicines available in NZ?*

*(Glenice Paine, Nelson Hui)*

*So who does the profit go to?*

*(Merepeka Henley, Whangarei Hui)*

*Will human testing stay in NZ? Who owns that - NZ? Is it like a service contract?... No we need access to the product. It would be unfortunate to create the product here only to not have access to it.*

*(Aroha Nikora, Rotorua Hui)*

Participants also asked about who AgResearch would partner with, and what consequences that might have for New Zealand obtaining the benefit of its intellectual property, and for Māori in terms of access to the medical products:

*Can you discuss how AgResearch would partner with pharmaceutical companies? ... So AgResearch would be partnering off-shore?*

*(Jo McLean, Christchurch Hui)*

*Should Māori genes be used in the research?*

Two hui participants suggested that Māori genes should be used in the research to ensure that it would be of direct benefit to Māori.

*So what are you saying, the genes come from North America, I think that might be alright for Pākehā. What use is that to us?*

*(Horiwa [Olivia] Bradbook, Gisborne Hui)*

*A question for us as Māori, at this point in time, is whether we need a robust debate on the issue of “no Māori genes” being used in this type of research. Would we benefit from our genes being used, especially if it leads to helping our people?*

*(Abe Witana, Whangarei Hui)*

### 3. Specific questions about the proposed research and perceived risks

Many participants cautiously supported the concept of transgenic research largely because of the perceived medical benefits. In addition to those raised in relation to a Māori world view, frequently raised concerns include those potential unforeseen effects on the subject animals, on consumers, and on the environment; the potential for horizontal gene transfer; and the risk that either the transgenic animal or the genetic material itself could breach containment. Given that, from the outset, AgResearch volunteered not to undertake research on native flora and fauna, this topic did not feature in the discussions.

#### 3.1 Cultural impact assessment

Hui participants asked for a cultural impact assessment and details of potential risks.

*I think the one thing missing is the cultural impact assessment in this application.*

*(Emma Gibbs-Smith, Whangarei Hui)*

*We haven't had any discussion of the risks of this application.*

*(Maree Pene, Hamilton Hui)*

#### 3.2 Containment

The risk of containment being breached was frequently raised in questions:

*Containment policy - what is it? If an animal is confined what are the risks with the containment?*

*(Te Iwi Puihi Tipene, Whangarei Hui)*

*The cows then that have the new genes, are they on a separate farm?*

*(Horiwa [Olivia] Bradbrook, Gisborne Hui)*

*Will you need to move animals between facilities?*

*(Julia Charity, Rotorua Hui)*

*There is still that possibility that they might get out. Have you thought of putting identity locators on the animals?*

*(Keir Vollerling, Whangarei Hui)*

### **3.3 Disposal of milk and waste products**

Other participants asked about disposal of the milk and waste products from the transgenic animal:

*So you extract the protein from the milk? Then what happens to the milk?*

*(Jo McLean, Christchurch Hui)*

*What happens to the waste that the cows excrete?*

*(Horiwa [Olivia] Bradbrook, Gisborne Hui)*

*How do you screen the genes?... what's the effect if [the milk is] spilt on land? ... How often is soil testing done? So are you saying that disposal is through an irrigator, does it reach water ways?*

*(Aroha Nikora, Rotorua Hui)*

*Is there some process in place where monitoring the whenua will happen, even if this is outside AgResearch's capability can other consultants be brought in to do that?*

*(Merepeka Henley, Whangarei Hui)*

### **3.4 Alternative methods**

Many hui participants asked about alternative methods, including illness prevention as well as methods to manufacture the proteins sought.

*Are there any other ways of getting the compounds you want?*

*(Francia Zygadlo, Christchurch Hui)*

*What other options have been looked at?*

*(Jo McLean, Christchurch Hui)*

*There are alternatives – transgenic mushroom has the potential to outperform this technology because it can be up and running in two weeks. There is a cost factor to building a facility for cows rather than mushrooms.*

*(Mick Paine, Nelson Hui)*

*I understand that it is medicinal but they can be produced in other ways. Also what about research to look at preventing illness, rather than being the ambulance at the bottom of the cliff.*

*(Jo McLean, Christchurch Hui)*

### **3.5 Horizontal gene transfer**

Questions were asked about horizontal gene transfer

*But there are reports in the States that show horizontal gene transfer has happened.*

*(Mick Paine, Nelson Hui)*

*How long will it take before it (genes) eventually does escape into the atmosphere?*

*(Horiwa [Olivia] Bradbrook, Gisborne Hui)*

*So the mutation of viruses is unknown?*

*(Te Iwi Puihi Tipene, Whangarei Hui)*

### 3.6 Long-term impacts

There was concern about unknown, long-term potential effects and consequences.

*What about long-term effects? There should be some caution - I understand that there are medicinal uses, but what are the down-stream effects?*

*(Jo McLean, Christchurch Hui)*

*I'm looking at what's happening to our rivers today, what happens in 100 yrs time? I just don't want to see us making decisions now that our future generations will have to remedy.*

*(Horiwa [Olivia] Bradbrook, Gisborne Hui)*

### 3.7 Other questions

#### *Species subject to the research*

Participants asked about the species that would be subject to the research. They sought confirmation of which species would be used, and the reasons for using that species. Some participants considered that their level of support would differ depending on what the purpose of the research would be.

*So there is no set criteria on acreage or herd size or species? ... To me it seems like there is no certainty, it has wide open connotations to those of us who oppose GM and GMOs.*

*(Malibu Hamilton, Hamilton Hui)*

*The list of species involved is very long. Are those species all going to be in the application or are they just candidates?... We don't think horses and deer are clearly medical – if it is just antler velvet for deers, that is not clearly medical. We would like to see the rationale for each of those species being on the list.*

*(Oliver Sutherland, Nelson Hui)*

*What are the risks of using cattle?*

*(Francia Zygadlo, Christchurch Hui)*

### ***Animal welfare***

The perceived risk to animal welfare was a relatively minor issue:

*Is there a higher proportion of difficult births for transgenic cows?*

*(Oliver Sutherland, Nelson Hui)*

*How long do you keep the animal for?*

*(Rutene Irwin, Gisborne Hui)*

### ***Milk processing***

Participants asked about processing of the milk:

*Is there an extraction process to get what you need?*

*(Julia Charity, Rotorua Hui)*

*Will you add things to milk as well?*

*(Francia Zygadlo, Christchurch Hui)*

### ***Research purposes***

Participants asked about the purpose of the research.

*Who determines which illnesses will be targeted in this process?*

*(Merepeka Henley, Whangarei Hui)*

## 4. Consultation process

There was universal support and approval for AgResearch's early engagement with Māori and its willingness to go to each region to discuss the application. There were requests for wider disclosure of the draft application and for greater specificity around the potential application sites and species. An independent cultural impact assessment was also sought.

### 4.1 General approval for the process and early engagement

*I thank AgResearch and ERMA for taking the application to the country. These section 67A applications should go back to everyone to be involved in. The fact that this has gone back to consult with the country pleases me.*

*(Malibu Hamilton, Hamilton Hui)*

*I do congratulate you on the consultation process. It has been very transparent. The process for me has been good.*

*(Ted Palmer, Dunedin Hui)*

*I want to say well done for engaging like this. This is one of the best processes I have seen, so well done. It has been worth doing from the point of view of those who have been involved.*

*(Oliver Sutherland, Nelson Hui)*

*The Te Rarawa policy and analysis team has just had professional development in resource development, we are appreciative of this process because it puts us on the front foot. This has helped us as an iwi to build stronger relationships with AgResearch and CRI's.*

*(Abraham Witana, Whangarei Hui)*

*AgResearch are coming with this pre-lodgment so this is a good process as we get to feedback into the application. Though Inter-iwi we haven't really shared our views.*

*(Hori Parata, National Māori Reference Group hui)*

*Thank you for explaining the information in an easy to understand way, and for engaging with us.*

*(Jo McLean, Christchurch Hui)*

There was one concern expressed regarding the venue

*This sort of environment is very Pākehā, a hui in a marae might make the people more comfortable. If you are serious about consultation with Māori, can we look at the process of consultation? It might have been more successful if it was at marae. For anyone who comes in 'cold' with no knowledge of the issues, it might be a bit much for people.*

*(Julia Charity, Rotorua Hui)*

#### **4.2 Further consultation sought on the application**

Several participants asked for further consultation on the draft application itself, and considered that it was difficult to fully respond without that information.

*I am unhappy that the draft is not available now. It is unfair to the iwi and hapu. The application itself would clarify things. You are asking Māori for their opinion but haven't provided the specific application to comment on.*

*(Malibu Hamilton, Hamilton Hui)*

*A big issue in the consultation process is lack of prior information before the application is due. We're just ordinary people we need to be in this process. I don't expect that this is the final part of the process. I believe in this process.*

*(Emma Gibbs-Smith, Whangarei Hui)*

*Why is this consultation happening now without a copy of the application being available for us to see?*

*(Z Vallings, Whangarei Hui)*

### 4.3 Mana Whenua: the location of research sites and the need to engage tangata whenua

Several hui sought greater specificity around the location of containment sites:

*What's the reason for looking for other sites?... You must know the size and location of other sites you are making application for?*

*(Keir Vollerling, Whangarei Hui)*

*Have you identified the sites?*

*(Emma Wyeth, Dunedin Hui)*

*Also, we want to know the sites, will any be within Ngāi Tahu rohe?*

*(Oliver Sutherland, Nelson Hui)*

Consultation with Māori generally on this point was sought. Participants felt strongly that the tangata whenua of each containment site would be more immediately affected and therefore should be consulted with directly. The importance of this point was reinforced in the resolutions of the NMRG hui. Tangata whenua, it was said, would be more likely to engage in the process if they knew that they would be directly affected by an application. Moreover, hui participants did not want to undermine the rights of tangata whenua to express their own view about issues impacting upon their rohe. Iwi were interested to know what tangata whenua views were, particularly those of Ngāti Wairere, the local tangata whenua of the primary research site.

*The [Ngāi Tahu] HASNO committee met yesterday and we were keen to talk to Ngāti Wairere about their experience.*

*(Emma Wyeth, Dunedin Hui)*

*Te Kotuku Whenua have been very active in Māori Network, although Hare Puke does not attend. So the view that Ngāti Wairere consistently have articulated has been that view, although Hare Puke certainly may hold that view. Ngāi Tahu seeks to support mana whenua and the view we have heard most often is that of Te Kotuku Whenua.*

*(Oliver Sutherland, Nelson Hui)*

*Supporting the mana whenua view is very important to Ngāi Tahu, and that makes it difficult for us to support the application when we don't know what the tangata whenua views are. ... [Making consultation with tangata whenua a condition of ERMA consent] would not be enough. In that case, the default position could be to oppose this application.*

*(Oliver Sutherland, Nelson Hui)*

*My concern is that where ever the site is, the tangata whenua need to have their say.*

*(Glenice Paine, Nelson Hui)*

*Because we are Māori we have vested interests through whakapapa around the motu. We demand to be kept informed of what our whanau elsewhere are doing.*

*(Emma Gibbs-Smith, Whangarei Hui)*

#### **4.4 Support for ongoing engagement with Māori**

There was clear and widespread support for ongoing engagement with Māori:

*Ongoing relationship is very important. Māori need to know what is happening – in the past Māori have not been informed of the eventual outcomes of research programmes. Not just at the start of the programme, but throughout the programme, to engage with us from time to time and how it is going. Otherwise we are being asked to sign a blank cheque and we don't know where it will end up.*

*(Ted Palmer, Dunedin Hui)*

*I think that the word 'Trust' is important to us. If you can communicate that to the organization and get them to understand that, there is a lot more depth in the relationships that you are trying to cultivate. Mahi taumaha engari mahia.*

*(Horiwa [Olivia] Bradbrook, Gisborne Hui)*

## 5. National Māori Reference Group hui outcomes and the response from AgResearch

The National Māori Reference Group (NMRG) asked for further consultation before lodgement of the final application, including direct discussion with tangata whenua of particular containment sites, with Ngāti Wairere, with iwi generally, and with the NMRG. At the National Māori Reference Group hui, several participants also asked for confirmation of the duration of the consents.

### *NMRG hui resolutions:*

- 1. Acknowledge the uniqueness of each Iwi, hapū and whānau and the need for AgResearch to work directly with tangata whenua of any proposed a containment sites*
- 2. The process of consulting with Ngāti Wairere on the draft application is unanimously supported.*
- 3. Consultation on the draft application should also take place with wider Iwi, as well prior to the application being filed. Past AgResearch reports to ERMA on the previous consent are also provided at the same time.*
- 4. That a further AgResearch National Māori Reference Group hui take place before the full application is finally filed.*
- 5. That this process takes priority over the current AgResearch timeline.*

### *Response from AgResearch*

AgResearch responded to the NMRG's resolutions by agreeing that it is important to acknowledge the uniqueness of each iwi, hapū and whānau, the need to work closely with tangata whenua of any new proposed containment sites, and to continue consulting with Ngāti Wairere on the draft application. However, because of the considerable consultation (11 regional Hui) already undertaken, no further hui would be arranged by AgResearch prior to filing the applications, including no further MRG meetings. AgResearch noted that all past reports to ERMA are already available through the AgResearch website, and also that the timeline is dictated by ERMA, not AgResearch.

Three participants in the NMRG have responded by email, expressing unhappiness with the timeframe and, because of the detail in the draft, stating that the feedback would therefore be submitted to ERMA.

*The resolution was in frustration of the lack of detail in their consultation rounds so I guess Agresearch will have to accept criticism from potentially all that attended the National Māori Reference group when their submissions go to the ERMA hearing.*

*We have the draft now which is lot more detail, and due to Agresearch maintaining that it is the timeframe of ERMA (1<sup>st</sup> April) we will not be in a*

*position to respond to them on their so called draft; instead we will submit our responses at the time of the hearing.*

*(Malibu Hamilton, e-mail response)*

One other participant outlined her expectation that specific agreements (particularly in terms of commercial opportunities for Māori) should be reached before the application is submitted to ERMA.

*...(H)ave our needs been met through the process? No. I don't think so, simply because nothing we suggest is set in concrete!!!*

*...*

*I feel that when they said that they do not require any further consultation...I feel that we still do... to make things concrete..*

*...*

*I feel that there is a need to have more communication and consultation with AgResearch as this will strengthen the relationship between Māori and the CRI in terms of economic partnership and opportunities for our future generation.*

*(Lorraine Dixon, e-mail response)*

## **6. Appendices**

**6.1 Minutes of the Consultation Hui**

**6.2 Minutes of the National Māori Reference Group Hui**

**6.3 Email Responses**