

S42A Appendix 2 - HS6 Indigenous Ecosystems - Summary Recommendation Table

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
S16.0105	Kāpiti Coast District Council			S16.0105	Kāpiti Coast District Council	General comments - overall	Oppose	<p>All provisions:</p> <p>That seek to give effect to the draft National Policy Statement for Indigenous Biodiversity:</p> <p>At the time of preparing RPS Change 1 and when making a submission on the plan change the draft NPS-IB had not been passed into law. Its final form and timing of its gazettal are not known. Council considers it is inappropriate for the regional council to attempt to implement a draft national policy statement that has no legal weight under the RMA. Such an approach prejudices submitters who have not had an opportunity to consider the final provisions of the NPS-IB and their implications. This raises issues of fair process and natural justice. Council notes draft national policy statements are not a relevant matter that can be considered by the regional council in the preparation of a proposed regional policy statement under section 61 of the RMA.</p> <p>Council requests all provisions in the plan change that have been developed to give effect to the draft NPS-IB are deleted and that a variation or plan change be prepared to give effect to the NPS-IB only after it has been gazetted.</p> <p>Alternatively, Council would be satisfied with amendments to all relevant provisions so they are only applicable to the regional council.</p>	<p>Either:</p> <p>Amend all provisions in the plan change that have been developed to give effect to the NPS-IB so they are only applicable to the regional council;</p> <p>or</p> <p>Delete all provisions in the plan change that have been developed to give effect to the draft NPS-IB.</p>	Reject
S16.0105	Kāpiti Coast District Council	FS26.082	Meridian Energy Limited	FS26.082	Meridian Energy Limited	General comments - overall	Support	<p>KCDC requests either: Amend all provisions in the plan change that have been developed to give effect to the NPS-IB so they are only applicable to the regional council; or Delete all provisions in the plan change that have been developed to give effect to the draft NPS-IB. KCDC requests all provisions in the plan change that have been developed to give effect to the draft NPS-IB are deleted and that a variation or plan change be prepared to give effect to the NPS-IB only after it has been gazetted. Alternatively, Council would be satisfied with amendments to all relevant provisions so they are only applicable to the regional council.</p> <p>The RPS must reflect and be consistent with the NPS-IB.</p>	<p>Allow as alternative relief to Meridian's requested other requested relief.</p>	Reject
S17.004	Chelsea Kershaw			S17.004	Chelsea Kershaw	General comments - indigenous ecosystems	Support	<p>The biodiversity provisions throughout the RPS are supported.</p>	<p>Retain, refine and enhance provisions.</p>	Accept

S42A Appendix 2 - HS6 Indigenous Ecosystems - Summary Recommendation Table

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
S22.004	Tegan McGowan			S22.004	Tegan McGowan	General comments - indigenous ecosystems	Support	Support the provisions supporting biodiversity.	Retain, refine and enhance provisions.	Accept
S24.004	Helen Payn			S24.004	Helen Payn	General comments - indigenous ecosystems	Support	The biodiversity provisions are supported.	Retain, refine and enhance provisions.	Accept
S28.002	Philippa Yasbek			S28.002	Philippa Yasbek	General comments - indigenous ecosystems	Support	Support indigenous biodiversity provisions.	Retain as notified.	Accept in part
S32.005	Director-General of Conservation			S32.005	Director-General of Conservation	General comments - indigenous ecosystems	Support	The proposed changes give effect to s30 and 31 of the Act, and are consistent with Te Mana o te Taiao Aotearoa New Zealand Biodiversity Strategy 2020 and the associated Implementation Plan 2022. They are also consistent with the exposure draft NPS for Indigenous Biodiversity. The references to Public Conservation Land not adequately representing all types of indigenous ecosystem, and having few options for expansion, are an accurate reflection of the situation, and provide support for the approach taken to other changes in this chapter.	Retain as notified, except where specific changes are requested below.	Accept in part
S32.005	Director-General of Conservation	FS30.283	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Ltd	FS30.283	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Ltd	General comments - indigenous ecosystems	Oppose	B+LNZ generally oppose the submission on the grounds that's B+LNZ are seeking changes of the plan change are restricted to those necessary to give effect to the National Policy Statement for Urban Development and that any other matters should be subject to proper review in the Schedule full review of the RPS in 2024 and in the scheduled reviews of the Natural Resources Plan in 2023 and 2024. This is because the changes materially impact on communities, including rural communities and B+LNZ do not consider that the necessary engagement has been undertaken to adequately inform these provisions or to meet the requirements of Part 3.2 of the NPS-FM. Furthermore, there is a risk that including matters relating to climate change and indigenous biodiversity before key national legislation is gazetted or implemented is premature and will lead to the inefficient implementation and confusion amongst those who it impacts materially.	Disallow	Reject
S35.007	Oliver Bruce			S35.007	Oliver Bruce	General comments - indigenous ecosystems	Support	Support provisions relating to indigenous biodiversity.	Retain, refine and enhance provisions.	Accept in part

S42A Appendix 2 - HS6 Indigenous Ecosystems - Summary Recommendation Table

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
S37.007	Jennifer Van Beynen			S37.007	Jennifer Van Beynen	General comments - indigenous ecosystems	Support	Support provisions relating to indigenous biodiversity.	Retain, refine and enhance submissions.	Accept
S51.008	Khoi Phan			S51.008	Khoi Phan	General comments - indigenous ecosystems	Support	Support the provisions supporting biodiversity.	Retain, refine and enhance provisions.	Accept
S53.007	Ellen Legg			S53.007	Ellen Legg	General comments - indigenous ecosystems	Support	Support the provisions supporting biodiversity.	Retain as notified.	Accept in part
S60.008	Grant Buchan			S60.008	Grant Buchan	General comments - indigenous ecosystems	Support	Support provisions supporting biodiversity.	Retain, refine and enhance provisions.	Accept
S61.008	Patrick Morgan			S61.008	Patrick Morgan	General comments - indigenous ecosystems	Support	Support provisions supporting biodiversity.	Retain, refine and enhance provisions.	Accept
S64.006	Rachel Bolstad			S64.006	Rachel Bolstad	General comments - indigenous ecosystems	Support	Support provisions relating to indigenous biodiversity.	Retain, refine and enhance provisions.	Accept
S76.008	Gene Clendon			S76.008	Gene Clendon	General comments - indigenous ecosystems	Support	Support provisions for biodiversity.	Retain, refine and enhance provisions.	Accept
S78.018	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Limited			S78.018	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Ltd	General comments - allocation of responsibilities	Not Stated / Neutral	Accepts that replacing the expression 'indigenous biological diversity' with 'indigenous biodiversity' is required to give effect to the NPS-UD but neither supports nor opposes the provisions.	Retain as notified	Accept in part
S78.018	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Limited	FS20.326	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	FS20.326	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	General comments - allocation of responsibilities	Oppose	Ātiawa oppose the entire submission by Beef + Lamb New Zealand Limited. The relief sought by Beef + Lamb is to withdraw all proposed amendments, apart from those which give effect to NPS-UD. The basis for deleting the proposed amendments (apart from NPS-UD provisions) is to delay decision-making until further national direction is gazetted or until the scheduled full review of the RPS. Ātiawa do not accept that delaying proposed RPS Change 1 is an appropriate course of action, further delays would permit further degradation of te taiao and continue to have perverse outcomes for mana whenua.	Disallow the relief sought where the submitter seeks the deletion of proposed amendments.	Reject
S80.005	Anders Crofoot			S80.005	Anders Crofoot	General comments -	Oppose	These issues would be better reviewed in their entirety in the 2024 RPS review when they could be	Delete all the proposed amendments to Chapter 3.6	Reject

S42A Appendix 2 - HS6 Indigenous Ecosystems - Summary Recommendation Table

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
						indigenous ecosystems		more properly informed by the upcoming NPS for Indigenous Biodiversity.	including text, issues, objectives and table.	
S80.005	Anders Crofoot	FS30.004	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Ltd	FS30.004	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Ltd	General comments - indigenous ecosystems	Support	B+LNZ support that regional and national policy statements and plans are created in a streamlined way that avoids duplication of review processes.	Allow	Reject
S90.008	Bronwyn Bell			S90.008	Bronwyn Bell	General comments - indigenous ecosystems	Support	Support provisions relating to indigenous biodiversity.	Retain, refine and enhance provisions.	Accept
S92.004	Ruby Miller-Kopelov			S92.004	Ruby Miller-Kopelov	General comments - indigenous ecosystems	Support	The biodiversity provisions are supported.	Retain, refine and enhance provisions.	Accept
S93.004	Isabella Cawthorn			S93.004	Isabella Cawthorn	General comments - indigenous ecosystems	Support	The biodiversity provisions are supported.	Retain, refine and enhance provisions.	Accept
S94.011	Guardians of the Bays Incorporated			S94.011	Guardians of the Bays Incorporated	General comments - indigenous ecosystems	Support	Not stated	Retain as notified	Accept in part
S98.005	Teresa Homan			S98.005	Teresa Homan	General comments - allocation of responsibilities	Support	All district plans need to identify natural taonga and heritage sights examples peat swamps, native trees, forest, birds, native fish.	Amend provisions to address the relief sought in the submission.	Accept
S99.007	Genesis Energy Limited			S99.007	Genesis Energy Limited	General comments - indigenous ecosystems	Oppose	Genesis supports the need to address the ongoing loss and degradation of indigenous biodiversity. However, Genesis is concerned about, and therefore opposed to, the approach adopted by Council in seeking to pre-emptively incorporate changes when the national policy statement is yet to be fully confirmed. Genesis considers that until the national policy statement is confirmed, it is not possible to fully assess the actual and/or potential implications of the indigenous biodiversity provisions in RPS Change 1, and whether the provisions "give effect" to the national policy direction. In reviewing the proposed provisions, Genesis is already noting inconsistencies between RPS Change 1 and the exposure draft of the dNPS-IB. For example, the proposed "10% net biodiversity gain" (for offsetting) and "10% net biodiversity benefit" (for compensation) in Policy 24 was not signalled by the exposure draft of the dNPS-IB. Whilst the changes are noted in the section 32 evaluation report to provide a	Genesis seeks that the indigenous biodiversity provisions in RPS Change1 are withdrawn in full. A separate plan change using a Schedule 1 process should be prepared at a later stage once the National Policy Statement on Indigenous Biodiversity is gazetted. Alternatively, the proposed indigenous biodiversity provisions in RPS Change 1 should be amended as appropriate to address the concerns raised in this submission.	Reject

S42A Appendix 2 - HS6 Indigenous Ecosystems - Summary Recommendation Table

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
								<p>regional interpretation, there is limited evaluation on the cost and benefits of the proposal in the New Zealand context, other than the reference that the quantum "aligns with the UK government's recent Environment Bill"1. The setting of an untested and arbitrary target therefore raises questions on its workability.</p> <p>Although Council already notes any misalignment of matters may be addressed through a separate Schedule 1 process, Genesis queries the efficiency of imposing a two-step approach on not only the Council but also all submitters. As noted in the section 32 evaluation report, the dNPS-IB is anticipated to be gazetted later in 2022 - i.e. before the RPS Change 1 process is fully complete. The close, yet misaligned, timeframes between RPS Change 1 and the gazettal of the dNPS-IB will add unnecessary complexity to the RPS Change 1 hearings with the potential to lead to appeals.</p> <p>On the above basis, Genesis opposes all provisions included in the RPS Change 1 that relate to indigenous biodiversity.</p>		
S99.007	Genesis Energy Limited	FS11.036	Fulton Hogan Limited	FS11.036	Fulton Hogan Limited	General comments - indigenous ecosystems	Support	This submission highlights the potential for inconsistency and conflict between the RPS and a future NPSIB. This is also of concern to Fulton Hogan and the submission is supported on this basis	Allow	Reject
S99.007	Genesis Energy Limited	FS26.081	Meridian Energy Limited	FS26.081	Meridian Energy Limited	General comments - indigenous ecosystems	Support	<p>Genesis (covering letter page 4) is concerned that the NPS-IB is not yet confirmed and there is misalignment with RPS Change 1 provisions. Genesis requests withdrawal of all indigenous biodiversity provisions.</p> <p>The RPS must reflect and be consistent with the NPS-IB.</p>	Allow as alternative relief to Meridian's requested other requested relief.	Reject
S106.003	Patricia (Dr) Laing			S106.003	Patricia (Dr) Laing	General comments - overall	Not Stated / Neutral	NPS-IB is at exposure draft stage now (so not gazetted) so disagrees with the statement that the direction of the NPS-IB is clear at present.	Wait to align Plan Change 1 with NPS:IB once the direction of the NPS:IB is clear.	Accept
S106.006	Patricia (Dr) Laing			S106.006	Patricia (Dr) Laing	General comments - overall	Not Stated / Neutral	The list of pests to be managed under Plan Change 1 does not include wasps that in some cases threaten the continuity of apicultural endeavours in the region.	Add wasps to the list of pests managed by the Greater Wellington Regional Council.	reject
S113.006	Wellington Water Ltd ("Wellington Water")			S113.006	Wellington Water Ltd ("Wellington Water")	General comments - indigenous ecosystems	Support in part	The provisions for indigenous biodiversity do not create appropriate planning pathways to allow for the benefits of regionally significant infrastructure. 'Protect' is a very strong term and we will struggle to achieve this in many locations. The provisions could lead to an increase in fatal flaws for our projects required to deliver Te Mana o te Wai and our	<p>Provide the most appropriate pathways for delivering RSI and its benefits by either</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Deleting this component of the RPS change • Updating the RPS change to reflect the final gazetted 	Awaiting recommendation

S42A Appendix 2 - HS6 Indigenous Ecosystems - Summary Recommendation Table

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
								services, so the provisions need to be nuanced to allow for the benefits of RSI.	version of the NPS-IB <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reflecting the provisions for specified infrastructure and associated benefits in the NPS-IB exposure draft in the RPS. 	
S113.006	Wellington Water Ltd ("Wellington Water")	FS26.012	Meridian Energy Limited	FS26.012	Meridian Energy Limited	General comments - indigenous ecosystems	Support in part	WWL requests deletion of the indigenous biodiversity component or updating of the RPS to reflect the final gazetted version of the NPS-IB or to reflect the provisions for specified infrastructure and associated benefits as per exposure draft NPS-IB. WWL also considers the word 'protect' is a very strong term and will be unachievable in many locations. Meridian agrees that the RPS provisions must reflect and be consistent with the NPS-IB. Meridian considers it is premature to advance the scope of changes GWRC proposes to the RPS indigenous biodiversity provisions in the absence of settled guidance from a gazetted National Policy Statement, particularly where the proposed RPS changes relate to terrestrial indigenous biodiversity provisions beyond the scope of a freshwater planning instrument. If GWRC's proposed RPS provisions do not give effect to the future NPS-IB, the RPS will need to be amended in any event. Until settled NPS guidance is available, Meridian prefers the amendments requested in its own submission which reflect the provisions in the proposed Natural Resources Plan (recently settled by Environment Court mediation).	Allow in part Allow to the extent that any amendments are consistent with Meridian's own requested relief.	Awaiting recommendation
S113.006	Wellington Water Ltd ("Wellington Water")	FS15.017	DairyNZ	FS15.017	DairyNZ	General comments - indigenous ecosystems	Support in part	DairyNZ agrees there are limited pathways for Regionally Significant Infrastructure. DairyNZ's position is that Council should delete provisions related to biodiversity until the National Policy Statement on Indigenous Biodiversity has been gazetted, rather than updating the RPS once the NPS is gazetted as sought by the submitter. Deletion and redrafting once the NPS has been gazetted provides for full consideration of how the NPS may be best implemented, as well as allow for consideration around important related aspects, such as the proposed definition of Regionally Significant Infrastructure.	Allow in part Deleting this component of the RPS change	Reject
S113.006	Wellington Water Ltd ("Wellington Water")	FS3.014	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	FS3.014	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	General comments - indigenous ecosystems	Support	Waka Kotahi supports this chapter being aligned with the final version of the NPS IB	Allow	Accept

S42A Appendix 2 - HS6 Indigenous Ecosystems - Summary Recommendation Table

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
S115.014	Hutt City Council			S115.014	Hutt City Council	General comments - indigenous ecosystems	Oppose	<p>While indigenous biodiversity is a key issue, we expect the government to soon gazette a National Policy Statement on Indigenous Biodiversity ("NPS-IB"). The proposed provisions may well conflict with the NPS-IB especially with regards to the process for identifying indigenous ecosystems.</p> <p>We request that all provisions relating to indigenous biodiversity be deleted and if regional direction is thought necessary after the NPS-IB is gazetted, that should occur through a variation or a separate policy statement change.</p>	Delete all new provisions and amendments to existing provisions and retain existing Operative RPS provisions.	Reject
S115.014	Hutt City Council	FS12.006	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	FS12.006	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	General comments - indigenous ecosystems	Support	<p>Noting the anticipated release of a National Policy Statement on Indigenous Biodiversity ("NPS-IB"), Kāinga Ora request that all provisions relating to indigenous biodiversity be deleted and if regional direction is thought necessary after the NPS-IB is gazetted, that should occur through a variation or a separate policy statement change.</p>	Allow	Reject
S115.014	Hutt City Council	FS26.011	Meridian Energy Limited	FS26.011	Meridian Energy Limited	General comments - indigenous ecosystems	Support in part	<p>Hutt CC notes that, while indigenous biodiversity is a key issue, the government is to soon gazette a National Policy Statement on Indigenous Biodiversity ("NPS-IB"). The proposed provisions may well conflict with the NPS-IB especially with regards to the process for identifying indigenous ecosystems. HCC requests that all provisions relating to indigenous biodiversity be deleted and if regional direction is thought necessary after the NPS-IB is gazetted, that should occur through a variation or a separate policy statement change.</p> <p>Meridian agrees in principle that the RPS must be consistent with the NPS-IB once the NPS-IB is gazetted. Meridian considers it is premature to advance the scope of changes GWRC proposes to the RPS indigenous biodiversity provisions in the absence of settled guidance from a gazetted National Policy Statement, particularly where the proposed RPS changes relate to terrestrial indigenous biodiversity provisions beyond the scope of a freshwater planning instrument. Until settled NPS guidance is available, the indigenous biodiversity provisions in the proposed Natural Resources Plan (recently settled by Environment Court mediation) represent an appropriate approach.</p>	<p>Allow in part</p> <p>Allow to the extent that any amendments are consistent with Meridian's own requested relief.</p>	Awaiting recommendation
S115.014	Hutt City Council	FS10.0010	BP Oil NZ Ltd Mobil Oil NZ Ltd and Z	FS10.0010	BP Oil NZ Ltd Mobil Oil NZ Ltd and Z	General comments -	Support	<p>Agree with concern raised that the appropriateness of the Change 1 provisions relating to indigenous biodiversity is uncertain, until such time as the NPS-IB</p>	Allow the submission and delete all new provisions and amendments to existing	Reject

S42A Appendix 2 - HS6 Indigenous Ecosystems - Summary Recommendation Table

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
			Energy Ltd (the Fuel Companies)		Energy Ltd (the Fuel Companies)	indigenous ecosystems		is gazetted, and that the existing Operative RPS provisions should be retained. Any change to provisions relating to indigenous biodiversity should be made only after gazettal of the NPS-IB.	provisions relating to indigenous biodiversity and retain existing Operative RPS provisions.	
S115.014	Hutt City Council	FS24.007	Powerco Limited	FS24.007	Powerco Limited	General comments - indigenous ecosystems	Support	Agree with concern raised that the appropriateness of the Change 1 provisions relating to indigenous biodiversity is uncertain, until such time as the NPS-IB is gazetted, and that the existing Operative RPS provisions should be retained. Any change to provisions relating to indigenous biodiversity should be made only after gazettal of the NPS-IB.	Allow the submission and delete all new provisions and amendments to existing provisions relating to indigenous biodiversity and retain existing Operative RPS provisions.	Reject
S115.014	Hutt City Council	FS15.015	DairyNZ	FS15.015	DairyNZ	General comments - indigenous ecosystems	Support	DairyNZ agrees that Council should defer provisions related to biodiversity until the National Policy Statement on Indigenous Biodiversity has been gazetted.	Allow	Reject
S126.009	Templeton Kapiti Limited (TKL)			S126.009	Templeton Kapiti Limited (TKL)	General comments - indigenous ecosystems	Support	The TKL Land could implement the Indigenous Biodiversity Amendments.	Retain as notified.	Accept in part
S127.001	Neo Leaf Global			S127.001	Neo Leaf Global	General comments - overall	Not Stated / Neutral	The NPS-IB has been subject to considerable re-editing over time and remains subject to many uncertainties. One of many concerns in the NPS-IB that has been carried through into this Proposed Change 1 relates to the concept of "buffer zones", a topic certainly not landed at this time.	Withdraw these amendments until the NPS-IB has been finalised.	Reject
S127.006	Neo Leaf Global			S127.006	Neo Leaf Global	General comments - overall	Not Stated / Neutral	The process of restoration as outlined in this definition is wide sweeping and open ended. Whose desired former state is it? The assessment of what is needed to restore a habitat etc should not come down to the subjective opinion of a council official. Balancing perspectives are needed from expert advisors including community interests.	Replace "restore" and "restoration" to "enhancement" and "improvement" throughout the document.	Reject
S127.006	Neo Leaf Global	FS10.032	BP Oil NZ Ltd Mobil Oil NZ Ltd and Z Energy Ltd (the Fuel Companies)	FS10.032	BP Oil NZ Ltd Mobil Oil NZ Ltd and Z Energy Ltd (the Fuel Companies)	General comments - overall	Support	The Fuel Companies agree there is uncertainty around what end state will be expected to be achieved where the terms 'restore' and 'restoration' are used.	Allow the submission and replace "restore" and "restoration" with "enhancement" and "improvement" throughout the document.	Reject
S127.006	Neo Leaf Global	FS24.028	Powerco Limited	FS24.028	Powerco Limited	General comments - overall	Support	Powerco agrees there is uncertainty around what end state will be expected to be achieved where the terms 'restore' and 'restoration' are used.	Allow the submission and replace "restore" and "restoration" with "enhancement" and "improvement" throughout the document.	Reject
S131.005	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai			S131.005	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai	General comments -	Support in part	In principle Ātiawa support the intent of the provisions to address the degradation of indigenous ecosystems and habitats. Ātiawa is pleased that	Ātiawa seeks further reference to mana whenua values and their relationship	Awaiting recommendation

S42A Appendix 2 - HS6 Indigenous Ecosystems - Summary Recommendation Table

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
	Charitable Trust				Charitable Trust	indigenous ecosystems		Regional Council is taking steps to better provide for mana whenua through including reference to mātauranga Māori, mahinga kai values, and generally improving provision for mana whenua involvement in resource management.	with their culture, land, water, sites, wāhi tapu and other taonga and to partner with regional and district council in the process to identify and schedule indigenous ecosystems and habitats.	
S131.005	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	FS2.47	Rangitāne o Wairarapa Inc	FS2.47	Rangitāne o Wairarapa Inc	General comments - indigenous ecosystems	Support	Rangitāne support Ātiawa in seeking inclusion of further reference to mana whenua values and their relationship with their culture, land, water, sites, wāhi tapu and other taonga and to partner with regional and district councils in the process to identify and schedule indigenous ecosystems and habitats.	Allow	
S131.005	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	FS29.209	Ngā Hapu o Otaki	FS29.209	Ngā Hapu o Otaki	General comments - indigenous ecosystems	Support	<p>Co -design under a treaty house model is about shaping plans and resource management avenues alongside manawhenua that appropriately recognise the intergenerational prosperity of the uri of Ngā Hapu o Otaki and the wider community.</p> <p>There are ongoing concerns Ngā Hapu o Otaki maintain with GWRC in regard to the policies addressing Co-governance, Co-management, Co-leadership and Co-collabroative operational processes.</p> <p>This submission goes to great length to define where and how further considerations can be made recognising the interconnected nature of matauranga maori, the inequitable impact environmental decline will have on mana whenua/tangata whenua and offers insight to the intuitive and inherent awareness manawhenua need to maintain to ensure our intergenerational survival and prosperity.</p> <p>3.4 Freshwater including Public Access – Support in Principal</p> <p>3.6 Indigenous Ecosystems – Support in Principal</p> <p>3.9 Regional Form, Design and Function – Support in Principal</p> <p>Ātiawa views regarding Freshwater, indigenous ecosystems and Regional design and function resonate with insights Ngā Hapu o Otaki maintain. Ngā Hapu o Otaki would like opportunity to speak further to such views during the hearing process. We share Ātiawas concerns for Mātauranga Māori as a foundation for equitable interchange of decision making. Their concerns regarding intensification and the further degradation of taonga across our coastline rings true to the ongoing journey we are on</p>	Not stated	Awaiting recommendation

S42A Appendix 2 - HS6 Indigenous Ecosystems - Summary Recommendation Table

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
								as manawhenua facing intense growth for the coming generation. We seek to join the conversation and endorse provisions that will see our whanaunga and other manawhenua groups recognise their environmental resilience and the cultural agility our shared whakapapa offers.		
S136.005	DairyNZ			S136.005	DairyNZ	General comments - indigenous ecosystems	Oppose	The Indigenous Ecosystems chapter should be paused to be considered in the full review of the RPS, following meaningful engagement and further understanding of the national direction from the NPS-IB which will play a crucial role in setting the direction for the Region. By delaying the introduction of the Indigenous Ecosystems chapter will remove any pre-emptive guessing as to what the finalised NPS-IB will include as well as the other national tools being introduced impacting the RPS. Believe that the Indigenous Ecosystems should be separated out to focus on Freshwater and chapter Indigenous Biodiversity separately to allow for the implementation of the NPS-IB and the NPS-FM respectively.	Delete changes and address issues through a full review of the RPS. Separate out indigenous ecosystems into separate provisions to focus on freshwater and indigenous biodiversity to align with the implementation of the NPS-IB and NPS-FM.	Reject
S136.005	DairyNZ	FS30.011	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Ltd	FS30.011	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Ltd	General comments - indigenous ecosystems	Support	B+LNZ supports the withdrawal of PC1 provisions relating to indigenous biodiversity and redrafting once the NPS-IB has been gazetted.	Allow	Reject
S136.005	DairyNZ	FS28.033	Horticulture New Zealand	FS28.033	Horticulture New Zealand	General comments - indigenous ecosystems	Support	HortNZ support separating out provisions to focus on freshwater and indigenous biodiversity to align with the implementation of the NPS-IB and NPS-FM	Allow	Accept in part
S140.017	Wellington City Council (WCC)			S140.017	Wellington City Council (WCC)	General comments - indigenous ecosystems	Support	Support as proposed.	Retain as notified.	Accept in part
S148.006	Wellington International Airport Ltd (WIAL)			S148.006	Wellington International Airport Ltd (WIAL)	General comments - indigenous ecosystems	Not Stated / Neutral	It appears that pursuant to Appendix 1A there are limits on biodiversity offsetting and compensation for certain species. The provisions of the RPS appear to then 'rule out' offsetting and compensation when even individual specimens of a species, or even part of their habitat will be lost due to a project, irrespective of whether the loss may in ecological terms be capable of being offset or compensated to produce a net gain. In the case of the Airport, and for activities such as the ongoing protection of physical assets and infrastructure, it may not always be possible to avoid impacts to habitats or certain species (e.g. giant kelp may be present in and around	The RPS needs to provide clear provisions which properly recognise the significant benefits of existing regionally significant infrastructure, and which enable its protection and adaptation. WIAL is particularly concerned that the changes to the biodiversity provisions within the RPS could unduly constrain development within the Airport environs, including	Awaiting recommendation

S42A Appendix 2 - HS6 Indigenous Ecosystems - Summary Recommendation Table

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
								the sea wall and end of the runway area where ongoing maintenance is often required to protect the road, cycleway, underground services and runway). Particularly concerned that the changes to the biodiversity provisions within the RPS could unduly constrain development within the Airport environs, including projects which may be necessary to adapt to the ongoing effects of climate change (e.g sea level rise and associated protection).	projects which may be necessary to adapt to the ongoing effects of climate change (e.g sea level rise and associated protection).	
S148.006	Wellington International Airport Ltd (WIAL)	FS8.002	Guardians of the Bays Incorporated	FS8.002	Guardians of the Bays Incorporated	General comments - indigenous ecosystems	Oppose	Guardians of the Bays considers the RPS should promote biodiversity and natural habitats that infrastructure providers such as WIAL are placed within. Biodiversity should not be feared but considered and enhanced in all projects in and around Wellington Airport.	Disallow	Awaiting recommendation
S152.009	Michelle Ducat			S152.009	Michelle Ducat	General comments - indigenous ecosystems	Support	Support provisions relating to indigenous biodiversity.	Provisions should be retained, refined and enhanced.	Accept
S162.040	Winstone Aggregates			S162.040	Winstone Aggregates	General comments - indigenous ecosystems	Oppose in part	Provisions do not allow for consideration of 'big picture' biodiversity gains - requiring that all existing values are protected can result in perverse outcomes. E.g. where a small extent of biodiversity loss is required in one location to facilitate much greater biodiversity gains.	Objective and Policy framework in this chapter be amended to allow offsetting taking into account "big picture" biodiversity gains.	Awaiting recommendation
S162.040	Winstone Aggregates	FS20.307	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	FS20.307	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	General comments - indigenous ecosystems	Oppose	Ātiawa oppose the submissions from Aggregate and Quarry Association and Winstone Aggregates to the extent that the relief sought is inconsistent with national direction, particularly the NPS-FM. Ātiawa are particularly sensitive to aggregate extraction from awa, it is mana whenua who are guaranteed tino rangatiratanga over the land, waterways and all other taonga (including aggregate) through Te Tiriti o Waitangi. Historically aggregate extraction industry has failed to uphold the articles and the principles of Te Tiriti. Additionally, aggregate extraction has adverse effects on te taiao and mana whenua values. On the matter of 'balancing' national policy statements', recent case law states that the NPS-FM 2020 and NPS-UD 2020 are to be read together and reconciled under the regional policy statement and the district plans. It goes on to say, development capacity does not outweigh (trump) Te Mana o te Wai. Te Mana o te Wai is the fundamental concept of freshwater management: any thinking to the converse would not give effect to either national	Disallow	Awaiting recommendation

S42A Appendix 2 - HS6 Indigenous Ecosystems - Summary Recommendation Table

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
								policy statement. Therefore, to reconcile national direction, it is not a balancing act, or even a compromise, the NPS-FM must be given effect to while achieving the purpose of the NPS-UD for example. This can be applied to aggregate extraction, the activity must be consistent with Te Mana o te Wai and the NPS-FM. The need for housing capacity is not license to forgo the requirements of the NPS-FM.		
S162.005	Winstone Aggregates			S162.005	Winstone Aggregates	General comments - overall	Oppose in part	The Draft NPS-IB Clause 3.11 lists the exceptions to clause 3.10(2)(a)(i) - one of those exceptions is mineral extraction - the RPS does not appear to refer to the exceptions and how effects coming within those exceptions should be managed a new objective and policy is required to do so.	Seeks that the RPS be amended to provide new objectives and policies and methods that provide for these exceptions in the Draft NPS-IB.	Accept
S162.005	Winstone Aggregates	FS20.273	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	FS20.273	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	General comments - overall	Oppose	<p>Ātiawa oppose the submissions from Aggregate and Quarry Association and Winstone Aggregates to the extent that the relief sought is inconsistent with national direction, particularly the NPS-FM. Ātiawa are particularly sensitive to aggregate extraction from awa, it is mana whenua who are guaranteed tino rangatiratanga over the land, waterways and all other taonga (including aggregate) through Te Tiriti o Waitangi. Historically aggregate extraction industry has failed to uphold the articles and the principles of Te Tiriti. Additionally, aggregate extraction has adverse effects on te taiao and mana whenua values.</p> <p>On the matter of 'balancing' national policy statements', recent case law states that the NPS-FM 2020 and NPS-UD 2020 are to be read together and reconciled under the regional policy statement and the district plans. It goes on to say, development capacity does not outweigh (trump) Te Mana o te Wai. Te Mana o te Wai is the fundamental concept of freshwater management: any thinking to the converse would not give effect to either national policy statement. Therefore, to reconcile national direction, it is not a balancing act, or even a compromise, the NPS-FM must be given effect to while achieving the purpose of the NPS-UD for example. This can be applied to aggregate extraction, the activity must be consistent with Te Mana o te Wai and the NPS-FM. The need for housing capacity is not license to forgo the requirements of the NPS-FM.</p>	Disallow	reject
S163.026	Wairarapa Federated Farmers			S163.026	Wairarapa Federated Farmers	General comments -	Oppose	Indigenous ecosystem issues and objectives would more properly be considered in the full review of the	That the proposed amendments to Chapter 3.6 be deleted	Reject

S42A Appendix 2 - HS6 Indigenous Ecosystems - Summary Recommendation Table

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
						indigenous ecosystems		RPS scheduled in 2024, informed by the upcoming NPS for Indigenous Biodiversity (NPS-IB).		
S163.026	Wairarapa Federated Farmers	FS15.016	DairyNZ	FS15.016	DairyNZ	General comments - indigenous ecosystems	Support	DairyNZ agrees that Council should defer provisions related to biodiversity until the National Policy Statement on Indigenous Biodiversity has been gazetted.	Allow	Reject
S163.026	Wairarapa Federated Farmers	FS7.070	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society (Forest & Bird)	FS7.070	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society (Forest & Bird)	General comments - indigenous ecosystems	Oppose	It is completely appropriate to include climate change, biodiversity and freshwater provisions in the plan change. This plan change creates efficiency by considering multiple policy directives from central government. The amendments sought by Federated Farmers fail to give effect to the NPSFM, the NPS for Indigenous Biodiversity, for which there is an exposure draft and the final version is due out this month, and do not achieve the purpose of the RMA or the Climate Change Response (Zero Carbon) Amendment Act 2019.	Disallow whole submission	Accept in part
S163.026	Wairarapa Federated Farmers	FS20.192	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	FS20.192	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	General comments - indigenous ecosystems	Oppose	Ātiawa oppose the entire submission by Wairarapa Federated Farmers. The relief sought by Federated Farmers is to effectively delete the entire proposed plan change (except for submission points S163.083, S163.084). The basis for deleting the proposed plan change is to delay decision-making. Ātiawa do not accept that delaying responding to national direction is an appropriate course of action, and will further compound environmental and resource management issues.	Disallow the entire submission by Wairarapa Federated Farmers.	Accept in part
S163.026	Wairarapa Federated Farmers	FS29.043	Ngā Hapu o Otaki	FS29.043	Ngā Hapu o Otaki	General comments - indigenous ecosystems	Oppose	Section 18, page 4: General Comments – OPPOSE Section 25, Page 5 Going Forward – OPPOSE It is disheartening to see that Wairarapa Federated Farmers aren't capable of recognizing the obligations GWRC must maintain with Treaty Partners. It must be understood that Manawhenua are not simply 'groups of people' but a representation of the signatories that signed the Treaty of Waitangi and the original kaitiaki and custodians of the taonga in question when considering how these plan changes are implemented. Wairarapa Federated Farmers indicate a lack of awareness to the value of manawhenua engagement. Their stated 'aspirations of delivering environmental improvements alongside a thriving bio-economy' aren't feasible without considering the intergenerational insight and technical direction that only Mātauranga Māori can offer.	Not stated	Accept in part

S42A Appendix 2 - HS6 Indigenous Ecosystems - Summary Recommendation Table

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
S163.026	Wairarapa Federated Farmers	FS30.099	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Ltd	FS30.099	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Ltd	General comments - indigenous ecosystems	Support	B+LNZ agree that the scope of RPS PC1 should be restricted to those changes necessary to give effect to the National Policy Statement for Urban Development and that any other matters should be subject to proper review in the Schedule full review of the RPS in 2024 and in the scheduled reviews of the Natural Resources Plan in 2023 and 2024. Where alternative relief is provided, B+LNZ generally support this relief.	Allow	Reject
S164.007	Megan Lane			S164.007	Megan Lane	General comments - indigenous ecosystems	Support	Support provisions relating to indigenous biodiversity.	Provisions should be retained, refined and enhanced.	Accept
S167.032	Taranaki Whānui			S167.032	Taranaki Whānui	General comments - indigenous ecosystems	Support	Taranaki Whānui want to signal their intention to be involved in partnership and decision-making regarding indigenous ecosystems.	Retain as notified.	Accept in part
S168.014	Rangitāne O Wairarapa Inc			S168.014	Rangitāne O Wairarapa Inc	General comments - indigenous ecosystems	Support in part	Rangitāne o Wairarapa support the intention of the plan change to include provisions which seek to give effect to the Exposure Draft of the National Policy Statement for Indigenous Biodiversity (NPS IB) now, rather than waiting for this policy statement to be formally gazetted.	Retain provisions that seek to give effect to the exposure draft NPSIB.	Accept
S168.014	Rangitāne O Wairarapa Inc	FS31.068	Sustainable Wairarapa Inc	FS31.068	Sustainable Wairarapa Inc	General comments - indigenous ecosystems	Support	Kia ora koutou, My name is Ian Gunn, Secretary Sustainable Wairarapa inc. contact # 021567134, address 4B McKay Street, Paraparaumu Beach 5032. Firstly we'd like to state the time frame provided to peruse over 900 pages of submissions is in our opinion an abuse of process. The benefit of further submissions is for you the council to listen and hear the views of its ratepayers. The timeframe in our case does not allow a rigorous review of the original submissions to council. On top of this we are a week before Christmas- a very busy and chaotic time for most members of the community. It is highly likely that the majority of staff will take leave over the Christmas break so analysis of any further submissions will not occur until late January 2023-so why the short period to respond. While there is due process there is also good practise your management of the further submissions fails the good practise model. As a consequence we would like you to note Sustainable Wairarapa's strong support of the original submissions lodged with council by the two Wairarapa Iwi-Ngati Kahungunu and Rangitane. Its clear that there is a poor understanding of nature based solutions this term needs further explanation.	Not stated	Accept

S42A Appendix 2 - HS6 Indigenous Ecosystems - Summary Recommendation Table

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
								Sustainable Wairarapa acknowledges that while nature based solutions offer a wide variety of options its not the only solution. We are heartened by the widespread support for the original document. Thanks for an opportunity to make a further submission. Nga mihi nui Ian Gunn		
S168.014	Rangitāne O Wairarapa Inc	FS30.468	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Ltd	FS30.468	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Ltd	General comments - indigenous ecosystems	Oppose	B+LNZ generally oppose submissions that seek further changes or support for provisions relating to climate change and agriculture before national legislation is finalised; implementing provisions of the NPSFM-2020 before the necessary engagement has been completed; and pre-empting the NPS-IB before it has been gazetted. B+LNZ are seeking changes of the plan change are restricted to those necessary to give effect to the National Policy Statement for Urban Development and that any other matters should be subject to proper review in the Schedule full review of the RPS in 2024 and in the scheduled reviews of the Natural Resources Plan in 2023 and 2024. This is because the changes materially impact on communities, including rural communities and we do not consider that the necessary engagement has been undertaken to adequately inform these provisions or to meet the requirements of Part 3.2 of the NPS-FM. Furthermore, there is a risk that including matters relating to climate change and indigenous biodiversity before key national legislation is gazetted or implemented is premature and will lead to the inefficient implementation and confusion amongst those who it impacts materially.	Disallow That these submissions be disallowed.	Reject
S168.017	Rangitāne O Wairarapa Inc			S168.017	Rangitāne O Wairarapa Inc	General comments - indigenous ecosystems	Support in part	Rangitāne o Wairarapa acknowledges the inclusion of biodiversity offsetting and environmental compensation provisions.	Seek amendments to ensure the proposed policies and definitions are consistent with best practice and give full effect to the NPS IB when it becomes operative.	Accept
S168.017	Rangitāne O Wairarapa Inc	FS31.099	Sustainable Wairarapa Inc	FS31.099	Sustainable Wairarapa Inc	General comments - indigenous ecosystems	Support	Kia ora koutou, My name is Ian Gunn, Secretary Sustainable Wairarapa inc. contact # 021567134, address 4B McKay Street, Paraparaumu Beach 5032. Firstly we'd like to state the time frame provided to peruse over 900 pages of submissions is in our opinion an abuse of process. The benefit of further submissions is for you the council to listen and hear the views of its ratepayers. The timeframe in our case does not allow a rigorous review of the original submissions to council. On top of this we are a week before Christmas- a very busy and chaotic time for	Not stated	Accept

S42A Appendix 2 - HS6 Indigenous Ecosystems - Summary Recommendation Table

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
								most members of the community. It is highly likely that the majority of staff will take leave over the Christmas break so analysis of any further submissions will not occur until late January 2023-so why the short period to respond. While there is due process there is also good practise your management of the further submissions fails the good practise model. As a consequence we would like you to note Sustainable Wairarapa's strong support of the original submissions lodged with council by the two Wairarapa Iwi-Ngati Kahungunu and Rangitane. Its clear that there is a poor understanding of nature based solutions this term needs further explanation. Sustainable Wairarapa acknowledges that while nature based solutions offer a wide variety of options its not the only solution. We are heartened by the widespread support for the original document. Thanks for an opportunity to make a further submission. Nga mihi nui lan Gun		
S168.017	Rangitāne O Wairarapa Inc	FS30.469	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Ltd	FS30.469	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Ltd	General comments - indigenous ecosystems	Oppose	B+LNZ generally oppose submissions that seek further changes or support for provisions relating to climate change and agriculture before national legislation is finalised; implementing provisions of the NPSFM-2020 before the necessary engagement has been completed; and pre-empting the NPS-IB before it has been gazetted. B+LNZ are seeking changes of the plan change are restricted to those necessary to give effect to the National Policy Statement for Urban Development and that any other matters should be subject to proper review in the Schedule full review of the RPS in 2024 and in the scheduled reviews of the Natural Resources Plan in 2023 and 2024. This is because the changes materially impact on communities, including rural communities and we do not consider that the necessary engagement has been undertaken to adequately inform these provisions or to meet the requirements of Part 3.2 of the NPS-FM. Furthermore, there is a risk that including matters relating to climate change and indigenous biodiversity before key national legislation is gazetted or implemented is premature and will lead to the inefficient implementation and confusion amongst those who it impacts materially.	DisallowThat these submissions be disallowed.	Reject
S168.067	Rangitāne O Wairarapa Inc			S168.067	Rangitāne O Wairarapa Inc	General comments - indigenous ecosystems	Support in part	The integration of the concept of Te Rito o Te Harekeke through the plan change is supported, however Rangitāne o Wairarapa would like to note that they consider the whakatauki in the Exposure	Include a policy, or method, or both, providing for the development of a regional and local expression of Te Rito	Awaiting recommendation

S42A Appendix 2 - HS6 Indigenous Ecosystems - Summary Recommendation Table

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
								Draft NPS IB is inappropriate for describing this concept in their rohe. Rangitāne o Wairarapa request that a regional and local expression of Te Rito o te Harekeke is developed and codesigned with tangata whenua, and in consultation with the wider community, to give effect to clause 3.2 of the Exposure Draft NPS IB (once gazetted).	o Te Harekeke, to be codesigned with tangata whenua and incorporated into the RPS by no later than 2024.	
S168.067	Rangitāne O Wairarapa Inc	FS31.177	Sustainable Wairarapa Inc	FS31.177	Sustainable Wairarapa Inc	General comments - indigenous ecosystems	Support	Kia ora koutou, My name is Ian Gunn, Secretary Sustainable Wairarapa inc. contact # 021567134, address 4B McKay Street, Paraparaumu Beach 5032. Firstly we'd like to state the time frame provided to peruse over 900 pages of submissions is in our opinion an abuse of process. The benefit of further submissions is for you the council to listen and hear the views of its ratepayers. The timeframe in our case does not allow a rigorous review of the original submissions to council. On top of this we are a week before Christmas- a very busy and chaotic time for most members of the community. It is highly likely that the majority of staff will take leave over the Christmas break so analysis of any further submissions will not occur until late January 2023-so why the short period to respond. While there is due process there is also good practise your management of the further submissions fails the good practise model. As a consequence we would like you to note Sustainable Wairarapa's strong support of the original submissions lodged with council by the two Wairarapa Iwi-Ngati Kahungunu and Rangitane. Its clear that there is a poor understanding of nature based solutions this term needs further explanation. Sustainable Wairarapa acknowledges that while nature based solutions offer a wide variety of options its not the only solution. We are heartened by the widespread support for the original document. Thanks for an opportunity to make a further submission. Nga mihi nui Ian Gun	Not stated	Awaiting recommendation
S168.098	Rangitāne O Wairarapa Inc			S168.098	Rangitāne O Wairarapa Inc	General comments - indigenous ecosystems	Support	Rangitāne o Wairarapa supports the amendments to Method 21.	Retain as notified.	Awaiting recommendation
S168.098	Rangitāne O Wairarapa Inc	FS31.208	Sustainable Wairarapa Inc	FS31.208	Sustainable Wairarapa Inc	General comments - indigenous ecosystems	Support	Kia ora koutou, My name is Ian Gunn, Secretary Sustainable Wairarapa inc. contact # 021567134, address 4B McKay Street, Paraparaumu Beach 5032. Firstly we'd like to state the time frame provided to peruse over 900 pages of submissions is in our opinion an abuse of process. The benefit of further	Not stated	Awaiting recommendation

S42A Appendix 2 - HS6 Indigenous Ecosystems - Summary Recommendation Table

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
								submissions is for you the council to listen and hear the views of its ratepayers. The timeframe in our case does not allow a rigorous review of the original submissions to council. On top of this we are a week before Christmas- a very busy and chaotic time for most members of the community. It is highly likely that the majority of staff will take leave over the Christmas break so analysis of any further submissions will not occur until late January 2023-so why the short period to respond. While there is due process there is also good practise your management of the further submissions fails the good practise model. As a consequence we would like you to note Sustainable Wairarapa's strong support of the original submissions lodged with council by the two Wairarapa Iwi-Ngati Kahungunu and Rangitane. Its clear that there is a poor understanding of nature based solutions this term needs further explanation. Sustainable Wairarapa acknowledges that while nature based solutions offer a wide variety of options its not the only solution. We are heartened by the widespread support for the original document. Thanks for an opportunity to make a further submission. Nga mihi nui Ian Gun		
S168.0157	Rangitāne O Wairarapa Inc			S168.0157	Rangitāne O Wairarapa Inc	General comments - definitions	Not Stated / Neutral	Not stated	That a definition is included to define what is meant by 'indigenous ecosystems' in the context of the RPS.	Accept
S168.0157	Rangitāne O Wairarapa Inc	FS31.086	Sustainable Wairarapa Inc	FS31.086	Sustainable Wairarapa Inc	General comments - indigenous ecosystems	Support	Kia ora koutou, My name is Ian Gunn, Secretary Sustainable Wairarapa inc. contact # 021567134, address 4B McKay Street, Paraparaumu Beach 5032. Firstly we'd like to state the time frame provided to peruse over 900 pages of submissions is in our opinion an abuse of process. The benefit of further submissions is for you the council to listen and hear the views of its ratepayers. The timeframe in our case does not allow a rigorous review of the original submissions to council. On top of this we are a week before Christmas- a very busy and chaotic time for most members of the community. It is highly likely that the majority of staff will take leave over the Christmas break so analysis of any further submissions will not occur until late January 2023-so why the short period to respond. While there is due process there is also good practise your management of the further submissions fails the good practise model. As a consequence we would like you to note	Not stated	Accept in part

S42A Appendix 2 - HS6 Indigenous Ecosystems - Summary Recommendation Table

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
								Sustainable Wairarapa's strong support of the original submissions lodged with council by the two Wairarapa Iwi-Ngati Kahungunu and Rangitane. Its clear that there is a poor understanding of nature based solutions this term needs further explanation. Sustainable Wairarapa acknowledges that while nature based solutions offer a wide variety of options its not the only solution. We are heartened by the widespread support for the original document. Thanks for an opportunity to make a further submission. Nga mihi nui lan Gun		
S34.0110	Te Kaunihera o Te Awa Kairangi ki Uta, Upper Hutt City Council			S34.0110	Te Kaunihera o Te Awa Kairangi ki Uta, Upper Hutt City Council	General comments - indigenous ecosystems	Oppose	Council does not support amendments to this Chapter until the NPS-IB has been gazetted. Changing this chapter at this time will result in duplication of effort and waste of ratepayer's money, and mana whenua resources, throughout the whole region.	Retain as operationally written and review once NPS-IB has been gazetted	Reject
S34.0112	Te Kaunihera o Te Awa Kairangi ki Uta, Upper Hutt City Council			S34.0112	Te Kaunihera o Te Awa Kairangi ki Uta, Upper Hutt City Council	General comments - indigenous ecosystems	Oppose	Changing Indigenous Biodiversity Provisions prior to the gazettal of the NPS-IB: It is noted that the NPS-IB is likely to include different assessment requirements which territorial authorities will have to give effect to, and that the NPS-IB implementation timeframes are eight years after commencement for general provisions and five years for significant natural areas.	Council opposes the inclusion of indigenous biodiversity provisions at this stage and submits that proposed provisions for indigenous biodiversity should be deleted in their entirety and included in a future plan change once the NPS-IB is gazetted. Should the provisions be retained, Council seeks specific relief as identified in Table 1 below.	Reject
S34.0112	Te Kaunihera o Te Awa Kairangi ki Uta, Upper Hutt City Council	FS26.083	Meridian Energy Limited	FS26.083	Meridian Energy Limited	General comments - indigenous ecosystems	Support in part	UHCC opposes the inclusion of indigenous biodiversity provisions at this stage and submits that proposed provisions for indigenous biodiversity should be deleted in their entirety and included in a future plan change once the NPS-IB is gazetted. Should the provisions be retained, Council seeks specific relief as identified in Table 1 below.	Allow in part Allow to the extent of making the amendments requested in Meridian's submission in the interim until any further changes are made, by RPS change or variation, to accommodate the future gazetted NPS-IB	Reject
S11.009	Outdoor Bliss Heather Blissett			S11.009	Outdoor Bliss Heather Blissett	Indigenous ecosystems introductory text	Support in part	Spelling mistake in introductory text	Change Rimutaka to how it is spelt: Remutaka	Accept
S100.009	Meridian Energy Limited			S100.009	Meridian Energy Limited	Indigenous ecosystems introductory text	Support in part	The RPS should refer to 'indigenous' biodiversity and 'indigenous' ecosystems. Here, and throughout proposed RPS Change #1, if changing the text in relation to wetlands, the opportunity should be taken to (more accurately) describe the issue as relating to natural wetlands.	Amend the text of the introduction as follows (or similar) and, throughout RPS Change #1 change 'native' to 'indigenous' when referring to indigenous biodiversity and	Accept in part

S42A Appendix 2 - HS6 Indigenous Ecosystems - Summary Recommendation Table

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
								It is not so much the 'conservation status' that needs to be improved, but the ecological integrity of significant remnant indigenous biodiversity. Also, the RMA requires the protection of significant areas of indigenous biodiversity from inappropriate subdivision, use and development.	ecosystems and insert 'natural' wetlands: "...Human actions that continue to impact on the remaining indigenous ecosystems include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Modification and, in some cases, destruction of ecosystems by pest plants and animals grazing animals and clearance of indigenous vegetation • Contamination of aquatic ecosystems by sediment, pollutants and nutrients • Destruction of ecosystems as a result of development • Modification of natural waterways, such as draining natural wetlands and channelling, constraining or piping of natural waterways rivers and streams • Contamination of coastal ecosystems by stormwater and sewage discharges Although New Zealand has an.... However, there is still much work to be done to protect and improve the ecological integrity conservation status of many remnant indigenous ecosystems and habitats of indigenous faunative ecosystems and species . The restoration of indigenous ecosystems on public, iwi and private land provides both public and private benefit. ... The indigenous ecosystems most reduced in extent are specifically: (a) natural wetlands... "	
S102.052	Te Tumu Paeroa Office			S102.052	Te Tumu Paeroa Office	Indigenous ecosystems	Support	Generally supports the inclusion of the 'Chapter Introductions' for 'Indigenous ecosystems'.	Retain as notified.	Accept in part

S42A Appendix 2 - HS6 Indigenous Ecosystems - Summary Recommendation Table

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
	of the Māori Trustee				of the Māori Trustee	introductory text				
S115.015	Hutt City Council			S115.015	Hutt City Council	Indigenous ecosystems introductory text	Oppose	<p>While indigenous biodiversity is a key issue, we expect the government to soon gazette a National Policy Statement on Indigenous Biodiversity ("NPS-IB"). The proposed provisions may well conflict with the NPS-IB especially with regards to the process for identifying indigenous ecosystems.</p> <p>We request that all provisions relating to indigenous biodiversity be deleted and if regional direction is thought necessary after the NPS-IB is gazetted, that should occur through a variation or a separate policy statement change.</p>	Delete all new provisions and amendments to existing provisions and retain existing Operative RPS provisions.	Reject
S115.015	Hutt City Council	FS10.011	BP Oil NZ Ltd Mobil Oil NZ Ltd and Z Energy Ltd (the Fuel Companies)	FS10.011	BP Oil NZ Ltd Mobil Oil NZ Ltd and Z Energy Ltd (the Fuel Companies)	Indigenous ecosystems introductory text	Support	Agree with concern raised that the appropriateness of the Change 1 provisions relating to indigenous biodiversity is uncertain, until such time as the NPS-IB is gazetted, and that the existing Operative RPS provisions should be retained. Any change to provisions relating to indigenous biodiversity should be made only after gazettal of the NPS-IB.	Allow the submission and delete all new provisions and amendments to existing provisions relating to indigenous biodiversity and retain existing Operative RPS provisions.	Reject
S115.015	Hutt City Council	FS24.008	Powerco Limited	FS24.008	Powerco Limited	Indigenous ecosystems introductory text	Support	Agree with concern raised that the appropriateness of the Change 1 provisions relating to indigenous biodiversity is uncertain, until such time as the NPS-IB is gazetted, and that the existing Operative RPS provisions should be retained. Any change to provisions relating to indigenous biodiversity should be made only after gazettal of the NPS-IB.	Allow the submission and delete all new provisions and amendments to existing provisions relating to indigenous biodiversity and retain existing Operative RPS provisions.	Reject
S131.030	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust			S131.030	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	Indigenous ecosystems introductory text	Support in part	<p>In principle Ātiawa supports the intent of Chapter 3.6. Ātiawa seeks reference to not only iwi, but also whānau and hapū. It is a dated approach to refer to iwi as an all encompassing group, although whānau and hapū make up an iwi, appropriate recognition must be given to whānau and hapū especially in the context of action to protect, maintain and enhance of indigenous ecosystems where whānau and hapū undertake their own efforts to restore ecosystems. Ātiawa note that some definitions are bold and italicised and others are just in italics, this approach is inconsistent and it is not clear what the rationale is for this distinction.</p> <p>Ātiawa seek that mana whenua and landowners are provided for in separate issue statements. Our values and role as mana whenua is not the same as landowners (unless it is in reference to Māori landowners) and should be recognised and provided in accordance with Te Tiriti and the RMA.</p>	Amend to: Although New Zealand has an extensive network of public conservation land (comprising over a third of the country), this does not adequately represent all types of indigenous ecosystem. With few options to expand the public conservation estate, The restoration of ecosystems relies upon the good will and actions of landowners. There are a number of individuals, whānau, hapu, iwi, and community groups and organisations throughout the region that are working to	Accept

S42A Appendix 2 - HS6 Indigenous Ecosystems - Summary Recommendation Table

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
									<p>restore indigenous ecosystems. Public supports for restoring indigenous ecosystems on public land and landowners retiring farmland has led to the regeneration of indigenous bush in rural gullies, along riparian margins, in regional parks and in urban backyards. This has led to increases in some indigenous habitats, such as in the hills around Wellington City, with sanctuaries such as Zealandia and pest control efforts increasing the number and variety of native birds and invertebrates around the city. However, there is still much work to be done to improve the conservation status of many native ecosystems and species. The restoration of indigenous ecosystems on public, whānau, hapū, iwi and private land provides both public and private benefit...</p> <p>3. Iwi Mana whenua/tangata whenua and landowner values and roles are not adequately recognised and supported. Mana whenua /tangata whenua values, including kaitiakitanga, are not adequately recognised and supported by the current approach to managing indigenous biodiversity. The conservation efforts of landowners, as stewards of their land, and local communities could be better recognised and supported.</p>	
S131.030	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	FS2.57	Rangitāne o Wairarapa Inc	FS2.57	Rangitāne o Wairarapa Inc	Indigenous ecosystems introductory text	Support	Rangitāne support Ātiawa in the proposed amendment to the text to include reference to whānau and hapū, not just iwi. Rangitāne agree it is a dated approach. Rangitāne also agree that this is	Allow	Accept

S42A Appendix 2 - HS6 Indigenous Ecosystems - Summary Recommendation Table

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
								particularly important in the context of actions to protect, maintain and enhance indigenous ecosystems, where whānau and hapū undertake their own efforts to restore ecosystems.		
S131.030	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	FS29.301	Ngā Hapu o Otaki	FS29.301	Ngā Hapu o Otaki	Indigenous ecosystems introductory text	Support	<p>Co -design under a treaty house model is about shaping plans and resource management avenues alongside manawhenua that appropriately recognise the intergenerational prosperity of the uri of Ngā Hapu o Otaki and the wider community.</p> <p>There are ongoing concerns Ngā Hapu o Otaki maintain with GWRC in regard to the policies addressing Co-governance, Co-management, Co-leadership and Co-collabroative operational processes.</p> <p>This submission goes to great length to define where and how further considerations can be made recognising the interconnected nature of matauranga maori, the inequitable impact environmental decline will have on mana whenua/tangata whenua and offers insight to the intuitive and inherent awareness manawhenua need to maintain to ensure our intergenerational survival and prosperity.</p> <p>3.4 Freshwater including Public Access – Support in Principal</p> <p>3.6 Indigenous Ecosystems – Support in Principal</p> <p>3.9 Regional Form, Design and Function – Support in Principal</p> <p>Ātiawa views regarding Freshwater, indigenous ecosystems and Regional design and function resonate with insights Ngā Hapu o Otaki maintain. Ngā Hapu o Otaki would like opportunity to speak further to such views during the hearing process. We share Ātiawas concerns for Mātauranga Māori as a foundation for equitable interchange of decision making. Their concerns regarding intensification and the further degradation of taonga across our coastline rings true to the ongoing journey we are on as manawhenua facing intense growth for the coming generation. We seek to join the conversation and endorse provisions that will see our whanaunga and other manawhenua groups recognise their environmental resilience and the cultural agility our shared whakapapa offers.</p>	Not stated	Accept
S147.018	Wellington Fish and Game Council			S147.018	Wellington Fish and Game Council	Indigenous ecosystems	Support in part	Proposed Change 1 to replace "loss of species, loss of overall diversity of species, loss of an ecosystems ability to function on an ongoing basis, and loss of	Amend the 'Ecosystem health' paragraph. Ecosystem health can be	Reject

S42A Appendix 2 - HS6 Indigenous Ecosystems - Summary Recommendation Table

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
						introductory text		complete ecosystems and types of ecosystems" with "the composition, richness and indigenous dominance of communities, functions of ecosystem processes, or the extent of the ecosystem remaining" in Chapter 3.6 Introduction is unclear and inappropriately narrow. It is also unnecessary to give effect to the NPS-FM. Restricting the Chapter 3.6 Introduction as proposed excludes the habitats of valued introduced species such as trout, salmon, and gamebirds, and; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • will introduce potential adverse environmental effects (such as trophic cascades); • adopts a values-based approach to policies and management rather than science based; and • does not give effect to Policy 10 of the NPS-FM 	measured in a number of ways, including the composition, richness and indigenous dominance of valued indigenous and introduced species communities, function of ecosystem processes -(e.g., degree to which it is connected or fragmented), or the extent of the ecosystem remaining.	
S147.018	Wellington Fish and Game Council	FS27.005	Winstone Aggregates	FS27.005	Winstone Aggregates	Indigenous ecosystems introductory text	Oppose	Winstone opposes and considers that it is inappropriate to widen the scope of Objective 16 to managing effects on other values including introduced species as this is inconsistent with the objective and policy direction in the existing RPS, which Winstone is seeking be recognised to the extent set out in Winstones submission.	Disallow	Accept
S147.018	Wellington Fish and Game Council	FS15.020	DairyNZ	FS15.020	DairyNZ	Indigenous ecosystems introductory text	Oppose	The submitters proposed amendments reduce the clarity of the text, do not appropriately reflect the importance of indigenous biodiversity as a priority, and do not reflect the importance of ecosystem processes.	Disallow	Accept
S147.018	Wellington Fish and Game Council	FS20.114	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	FS20.114	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	Indigenous ecosystems introductory text	Oppose	Ātiawa do not support the relief sought where it relates to protecting habitats of trout and salmon without any proviso. Ātiawa refer to Policy 9 and Policy 10 of the NPS-FM to support this statement, which affords indigenous freshwater species greater protection that trout and salmon. Additionally, Ātiawa do not support the protection of trout and salmon which have adverse impacts on indigenous ecosystems. Generally the management and decision making in regards to trout and salmon species has not been undertaken within a Treaty Partnership with mana whenua. To accept the relief sought by the submitter would be contrary to Te Tiriti o Waitangi and the national resource management direction.	Disallow	Accept
S147.018	Wellington Fish and Game Council	FS19.082	Wellington Water Ltd ("Wellington Water")	FS19.082	Wellington Water Ltd ("Wellington Water")	Indigenous ecosystems introductory text	Oppose	It is unnecessary and redundant to recreate NPSFM policies within the RPS. Most of the amendments sought do not in any event properly reflect the NPSFM. In particular, they do not accurately reflect the proviso to Policy 7, the requirements of clause 3.22, the limitation of Policy	Disallow	Accept

S42A Appendix 2 - HS6 Indigenous Ecosystems - Summary Recommendation Table

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
								10 to trout and salmon only, and the subservience of Policy 10 to Policy 9. Some of the amendments attempt to address matters that are already adequately covered by extant provisions or PC1 as notified. Some of the amendments undermine the more detailed content of PC1.		
S147.018	Wellington Fish and Game Council	FS30.187	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Ltd	FS30.187	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Ltd	Indigenous ecosystems introductory text	Oppose	B+LNZ generally oppose the submission on the grounds that's B+LNZ are seeking changes of the plan change are restricted to those necessary to give effect to the National Policy Statement for Urban Development and that any other matters should be subject to proper review in the Schedule full review of the RPS in 2024 and in the scheduled reviews of the Natural Resources Plan in 2023 and 2024. This is because the changes materially impact on communities, including rural communities and we do not consider that the necessary engagement has been undertaken to adequately inform these provisions or to meet the requirements of Part 3.2 of the NPS-FM. Furthermore, there is a risk that including matters relating to climate change and indigenous biodiversity before key national legislation is gazetted is premature and will lead to the inefficient implementation and confusion amongst those who it impacts materially.	Disallow That the submission be disallowed with the exception of 147.007	Accept in part
S163.028	Wairarapa Federated Farmers			S163.028	Wairarapa Federated Farmers	Indigenous ecosystems introductory text	Oppose	Defer to the full review of the RPS in 2024, at which time the introduction can be informed by careful analysis and interpretation of up-to-date regional state of the environment data. Refer to submission for more detail.	Delete the proposed amendments to the introduction.Delete the FW icon	Accept in part
S163.028	Wairarapa Federated Farmers	FS7.072	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society (Forest & Bird)	FS7.072	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society (Forest & Bird)	Indigenous ecosystems introductory text	Oppose	It is completely appropriate to include climate change, biodiversity and freshwater provisions in the plan change. This plan change creates efficiency by considering multiple policy directives from central government. The amendments sought by Federated Farmers fail to give effect to the NPSFM, the NPS for Indigenous Biodiversity, for which there is an exposure draft and the final version is due out this month, and do not achieve the purpose of the RMA or the Climate Change Response (Zero Carbon) Amendment Act 2019.	Disallow whole submission	Accept in part
S163.028	Wairarapa Federated Farmers	FS20.194	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	FS20.194	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	Indigenous ecosystems introductory text	Oppose	Ātiawa oppose the entire submission by Wairarapa Federated Farmers. The relief sought by Federated Farmers is to effectively delete the entire proposed plan change (except for submission points S163.083, S163.084). The basis for deleting the proposed plan	Disallow the entire submission by Wairarapa Federated Farmers.	Accept in part

S42A Appendix 2 - HS6 Indigenous Ecosystems - Summary Recommendation Table

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
								change is to delay decision-making. Ātiawa do not accept that delaying responding to national direction is an appropriate course of action, and will further compound environmental and resource management issues.		
S163.028	Wairarapa Federated Farmers	FS29.045	Ngā Hapu o Otaki	FS29.045	Ngā Hapu o Otaki	Indigenous ecosystems introductory text	Oppose	Section 18, page 4: General Comments – OPPOSE Section 25, Page 5 Going Forward – OPPOSE It is disheartening to see that Wairarapa Federated Farmers aren't capable of recognizing the obligations GWRC must maintain with Treaty Partners. It must be understood that Manawhenua are not simply 'groups of people' but a representation of the signatories that signed the Treaty of Waitangi and the original kaitiaki and custodians of the taonga in question when considering how these plan changes are implemented. Wairarapa Federated Farmers indicate a lack of awareness to the value of manawhenua engagement. Their stated 'aspirations of delivering environmental improvements alongside a thriving bio-economy' aren't feasible without considering the intergenerational insight and technical direction that only Mātauranga Māori can offer.	Not stated	Accept in part
S163.028	Wairarapa Federated Farmers	FS30.101	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Ltd	FS30.101	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Ltd	Indigenous ecosystems introductory text	Support	B+LNZ agree that the scope of RPS PC1 should be restricted to those changes necessary to give effect to the National Policy Statement for Urban Development and that any other matters should be subject to proper review in the Schedule full review of the RPS in 2024 and in the scheduled reviews of the Natural Resources Plan in 2023 and 2024. Where alternative relief is provided, B+LNZ generally support this relief.	Allow	Accept in part
S165.020	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society (Forest & Bird)			S165.020	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society (Forest & Bird)	Indigenous ecosystems introductory text	Support in part	Needs explanation to ensure it's clear how the plan is giving effect to the NPS-IB and therefore the RMA	The chapter introduction needs to include an explanation of Te Rito o te Harakeke to explain the link to the NPS-IB.	Accept
S165.020	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society (Forest & Bird)	FS30.319	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Ltd	FS30.319	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Ltd	Indigenous ecosystems introductory text	Oppose	B+LNZ generally oppose the submission on the grounds that's B+LNZ are seeking changes of the plan change are restricted to those necessary to give effect to the National Policy Statement for Urban Development and that any other matters should be subject to proper review in the Schedule full review of the RPS in 2024 and in the scheduled reviews of the Natural Resources Plan in 2023 and 2024. This is because the changes materially impact on communities, including rural communities and we do	Disallow	reject

S42A Appendix 2 - HS6 Indigenous Ecosystems - Summary Recommendation Table

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
								not consider that the necessary engagement has been undertaken to adequately inform these provisions or to meet the requirements of Part 3.2 of the NPS-FM. Furthermore, there is a risk that including matters relating to climate change and indigenous biodiversity before key national legislation is gazetted or implemented is premature and will lead to the inefficient implementation and confusion amongst those who it impacts materially.		
S167.033	Taranaki Whānui			S167.033	Taranaki Whānui	Indigenous ecosystems introductory text	Support in part	Taranaki Whānui supports the reference to mahinga kai.	Taranaki Whānui want to see the acknowledgement of partnership from the outset which sets a precedent for the objectives, policies, and methods of this amended chapter. Suggest adding reference to Te Rito o te Harakeke and the partnership role of mana whenua in the execution of this concept. Suggest adding text to include recognition of the intrinsic value and mauri of indigenous biodiversity as well as people's connections and relationships with it.	Accept
S168.066	Rangitāne O Wairarapa Inc			S168.066	Rangitāne O Wairarapa Inc	Indigenous ecosystems introductory text	Support	Rangitāne o Wairarapa supports the changes to recognise the separate roles of mana whenua/tangata whenua and landowners. However, Rangitāne o Wairarapa wishes to amend the wording in the introduction to more accurately acknowledge the history and issues of our region.	Amend the sentence ("The area of indigenous ecosystems has been in decline since humans first settled in our region") to highlight that the decline of indigenous biodiversity is a settler impact. The first humans of this land were tangata whenua and we are not settlers.	Accept
S168.066	Rangitāne O Wairarapa Inc	FS31.176	Sustainable Wairarapa Inc	FS31.176	Sustainable Wairarapa Inc	Indigenous ecosystems introductory text	Support	Kia ora koutou, My name is Ian Gunn, Secretary Sustainable Wairarapa inc. contact # 021567134, address 4B McKay Street, Paraparaumu Beach 5032. Firstly we'd like to state the time frame provided to peruse over 900 pages of submissions is in our opinion an abuse of process. The benefit of further submissions is for you the council to listen and hear the views of its ratepayers. The timeframe in our case does not allow a rigorous review of the original	Not stated	Accept

S42A Appendix 2 - HS6 Indigenous Ecosystems - Summary Recommendation Table

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
								submissions to council. On top of this we are a week before Christmas- a very busy and chaotic time for most members of the community. It is highly likely that the majority of staff will take leave over the Christmas break so analysis of any further submissions will not occur until late January 2023-so why the short period to respond. While there is due process there is also good practise your management of the further submissions fails the good practise model. As a consequence we would like you to note Sustainable Wairarapa's strong support of the original submissions lodged with council by the two Wairarapa Iwi-Ngati Kahungunu and Rangitane. Its clear that there is a poor understanding of nature based solutions this term needs further explanation. Sustainable Wairarapa acknowledges that while nature based solutions offer a wide variety of options its not the only solution. We are heartened by the widespread support for the original document. Thanks for an opportunity to make a further submission. Nga mihi nui lan Gun		
S170.016	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira			S170.016	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	Indigenous ecosystems introductory text	Oppose in part	Iwi and landowner values- roles are not adequately recognised and provided for. These are two different matters and need to be decoupled on page 29. It would invite confusion to bring two matters in one phrase.	Split the statement of Iwi values and landowner values into two paragraphs.	Accept
S170.016	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	FS2.92	Rangitāne o Wairarapa Inc	FS2.92	Rangitāne o Wairarapa Inc	Indigenous ecosystems introductory text	Support	Rangitāne support the proposed amendment to the introductory text for Indigenous biodiversity by Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira.	Allow	Accept
S170.016	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	FS29.130	Ngā Hapu o Otaki	FS29.130	Ngā Hapu o Otaki	Indigenous ecosystems introductory text	Support	Co -design under a treaty house model is about shaping plans and resource management avenues alongside manawhenua that appropriately recognise the intergenerational prosperity of the uri of Ngā Hapu o Otaki and the wider community. There are ongoing concerns Ngā Hapu o Otaki maintain with GWRC in regard to the policies addressing Co-governance, Co-management, Co-leadership and Co-collabroative operational processes. This submission goes to great length to define where and how further considerations can be made recognising the interconnected nature of matauranga maori, the inequitable impact environmental decline will have on mana whenua/tangata whenua and offers insight to the intuitive and inherent awareness manawhenua need to maintain to ensure our	Not stated	Accept

S42A Appendix 2 - HS6 Indigenous Ecosystems - Summary Recommendation Table

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
								intergenerational survival and prosperity. Objective 3: Lack of mana whenua / tangata whenua involvement in decision making – Support in principal FW Kaitiakitanga O1, O2, O3 – Support in principal Wai Mate O1,O2,O3 - Support in principal Climate Change and Freshwater objectives, CCFW-01, CCFW-02, CCFW-03, CCFW-04, CCFW-05, CCFW-06 This submission appropriately articulates Kaitiakitanga, FW objectives regarding Climate Change, Wai mate, Wai ora and the lack of provisions to see balanced decision making between Treaty Partners. Ngā Hapu o Otaki support Te Runanga o Toa Rangatira expression and wish to speak further to such views during the hearing process. We have serious concerns for the degradation of our taonga, in particular our wai. This combined with the projected growth the next generation will see means manawhenua resilience and agility to climate grief and environmental decline is paramount. Ngā Hapu o Otaki seek to support our whanaunga and other Manawhenua groups to build the provisions we will need to solidify our Tino Rangatiratanga and ensure our intergenerational prosperity.		
S167.034	Taranaki Whānui			S167.034	Taranaki Whānui	Issue 1: The region's indigenous ecosystems are reduced in extent	Support	Taranaki Whānui supports the inclusion of Issue 1, in particular its reference to mahinga kai.	Retain as notified.	Accept
S167.035	Taranaki Whānui			S167.035	Taranaki Whānui	Issue 2: The region's remaining ecosystems are under threat	Support in part	Taranaki Whānui support the principle of Issue 2. Remiss to not refer to damage done by agriculture.	Request that reference to the damage done to indigenous ecosystems by farming practices, in particular grazing animals/land clearance is added.	reject
S167.035	Taranaki Whānui	FS15.019	DairyNZ	FS15.019	DairyNZ	Issue 2: The region's remaining ecosystems are under threat	Oppose	DairyNZ does not support the suggested wording as the PRPS already appropriately identifies the adverse impacts of agriculture more broadly in the introductions to Chapters 3.4 and 3.6, as well as being captured through identification of human use and development. Introducing specific activities like farming on top of existing wording risks focusing on only part of the problem where the issue is much larger.	Disallow	Accept
S167.036	Taranaki Whānui			S167.036	Taranaki Whānui	Issue 3: Iwi and landowner values and	Support	Taranaki Whānui supports the inclusion of Issue 3, in particular the reference to kaitiakitanga and the 'managing' of indigenous biodiversity.	Retain as notified.	Accept

S42A Appendix 2 - HS6 Indigenous Ecosystems - Summary Recommendation Table

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
						roles are not adequately recognised and supported				
S16.057	Kāpiti Coast District Council			S16.057	Kāpiti Coast District Council	Objective 16	Support in part	Although Council supports the general intent of the objective, some elements are opposed. Council opposes the use of regulatory methods to require city and district councils to achieve restoration and enhancement of biodiversity values - it is only "maintenance" of indigenous biodiversity that is provided for under the RMA. Council also notes the use of and / or implies a choice can be made. This is an issue across RPS Change 1 where it appears GRWC is unsure whether there should be a choice or not. We request all instances of 'and / or' are reviewed and 'and' or 'or' are specifically used where appropriate.	Ensure all regulatory methods proposed to require enhancement and restoration are not the responsibility of city and district councils. All instances of 'and / or' are reviewed and 'and' or 'or' are specifically used where appropriate.	reject
S30.013	Porirua City Council			S30.013	Porirua City Council	Objective 16	Oppose	It is unclear over what timeframe this objective is to be achieved, how it is to be measured, and whether it is this gradual or absolute.	Amend the objective so that it is clear what the outcomes sought are.	reject
S30.013	Porirua City Council	FS25.046	Peka Peka Farm Limited	FS25.046	Peka Peka Farm Limited	Objective 16	Support	The submission provides a comprehensive analysis of the proposed change including in relation to matters of scope and jurisdiction. It is supported without prejudice to the specific relief sought in the primary submission or this further submission by Peka Peka Farm Ltd.	Allow	reject
S34.072	Te Kaunihera o Te Awa Kairangi ki Uta, Upper Hutt City Council			S34.072	Te Kaunihera o Te Awa Kairangi ki Uta, Upper Hutt City Council	Objective 16	Support in part	Council notes that 'protect' and 'enhance' is a change in direction that may be difficult to achieve within the context of limited resources.	If objective is retained, amend the policy to read: "Indigenous ecosystems and habitats with significant ecosystem functions and services and/or biodiversity values are protected, enhanced maintained and where possible enhanced , and restored to a healthy functioning state"	reject
S34.072	Te Kaunihera o Te Awa Kairangi ki Uta, Upper Hutt City Council	FS15.024	DairyNZ	FS15.024	DairyNZ	Objective 16	Support in part	DairyNZ agrees with the submitter's concerns. However, we consider the focus should be on significant indigenous habitats and significant habitats of indigenous fauna, as per our original submission.	Allow in part Allow Either - Focus the objective on significant indigenous habitats and significant habitats of indigenous fauna, as per our original submission Or - Adopt the submitters wording as proposed (or words to similar effect)	Accept in part

S42A Appendix 2 - HS6 Indigenous Ecosystems - Summary Recommendation Table

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
S79.009	South Wairarapa District Council			S79.009	South Wairarapa District Council	Objective 16	Support in part	Measures to protect biodiversity can be applied in the short term, or are already included in Council's regulatory documents. SWDC has protected Significant Natural Areas as part of the Combined Wairarapa District Plan for over 10 years. This is proposed to continue. However, the Objective should more appropriately reflect that it will take time to return ecosystems and habitats to a healthy functioning state. It is acknowledged that the often-promised National Policy Statement for Indigenous Biodiversity has not yet materialised. However, on the face of the provisions many of the matters within previous exposure drafts have been incorporated. The process managing the changes to the RPS needs to be alive if the proposed NPS does occur.	Amend Objective 16 as follows: Indigenous ecosystems and habitats with significant ecosystem functions and services and/or biodiversity values are protected, and over time enhanced , and restored to a healthy functioning state. Or, similar relief to the same effect; AND; Any consequential amendments to give effect to the relief sought, unless the NPS Indigenous Biodiversity gets gazetted prior to further submissions closing at which point we request that GWRC consider an appropriate process to align policy approaches.	reject
S79.009	South Wairarapa District Council	FS26.013	Meridian Energy Limited	FS26.013	Meridian Energy Limited	Objective 16	Support in part	SWDC requested amendment to: 'Indigenous ecosystems and habitats with significant ecosystem functions and services and/or biodiversity values are protected, and over time enhanced , and restored to a healthy functioning state.' Meridian agrees that the objective should acknowledge the time it will take to effect enhancement and restoration but considers the requirement for enhancement and restoration in all cases is inappropriate (consistent with its own submission on this objective). Meridian considers the text should enhancement 'or' restoration as appropriate.	Allow in part Amend the requested relief by inserting 'or' as follows: '.biodiversity values are protected, and <u>where appropriate are over time enhanced or</u> and restored <u>over time</u> to a healthy functioning state; and otherwise allow to the extent that any amendments are consistent with Meridian's own requested relief.	reject
S79.009	South Wairarapa District Council	FS14.020	Masterton District Council	FS14.020	Masterton District Council	Objective 16	Support in part	Agree with: Measures to protect biodiversity can be applied in the short term, or are already included in Council's regulatory documents. SWDC has protected Significant Natural Areas as part of the Combined Wairarapa District Plan for over 10 years. This is proposed to continue. However, the Objective should more appropriately reflect that it will take time to return ecosystems and habitats to a healthy functioning state. It is acknowledged that the often- promised National Policy Statement for Indigenous Biodiversity has not yet materialised. However, on the face of the	Not stated Agree with relief sought: Amend Objective 16 as follows: Indigenous ecosystems and habitats with significant ecosystem functions and services and/or biodiversity values are protected, and over time enhanced , and restored to a healthy functioning state. Or, similar relief to the same effect; AND; Any	reject

S42A Appendix 2 - HS6 Indigenous Ecosystems - Summary Recommendation Table

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
								provisions many of the matters within previous exposure drafts have been incorporated. The process managing the changes to the RPS needs to be alive if the proposed NPS does occur.	consequential amendments to give effect to the relief sought, unless the NPS Indigenous Biodiversity gets gazetted prior to further submissions closing at which point we request that GWRC consider an appropriate process to align policy approaches	
S79.009	South Wairarapa District Council	FS26.019	Meridian Energy Limited	FS26.019	Meridian Energy Limited	Objective 16	Oppose in part	SWDC requested the same relief as for Objective 16: Retain as notified if relief is granted as requested for Objective 16, or amend as follows: 'The region's indigenous ecosystems are maintained, enhanced, and restored over time to a healthy functioning state , improving their resilience to increasing environmental pressures, particularly climate change, and giving effect to Te Rito o te Harakeke. Or, similar relief to the same effect.' Meridian agrees the objective should acknowledge the time it will take to effect enhancement and restoration but, consistent with its own submission on Objective 16A, does not require enhancement or restoration should be required in all cases. The objective should require enhancement or restoration where appropriate.	Disallow in part Amend the requested relief to include reference to restoration 'over time' but otherwise match the relief requested in Meridian's submission (require enhancement and restoration where appropriate, not in all cases).	reject
S100.010	Meridian Energy Limited			S100.010	Meridian Energy Limited	Objective 16	Oppose in part	Enhancement and restoration will not be the only, or the appropriate, response in all situations.	Amend Objective 16 in the following (or similar) manner: "Indigenous ecosystems and habitats with significant ecosystem functions and services and/or biodiversity values are maintained protected and, where appropriate, are enhanced, and restored to a healthy functioning state."	reject
S100.010	Meridian Energy Limited	FS11.003	Fulton Hogan Limited	FS11.003	Fulton Hogan Limited	Objective 16	Support	It may not always be possible to enhance or restore existing ecosystems which may be affected by a development. Therefore, it should be clarified that enhancement and restoration of an existing ecosystem should occur where appropriate	Allow	reject
S115.016	Hutt City Council			S115.016	Hutt City Council	Objective 16	Oppose	While indigenous biodiversity is a key issue, we expect the government to soon gazette a National Policy Statement on Indigenous Biodiversity ("NPS-IB"). The proposed provisions may well conflict with	Delete all new provisions and amendments to existing provisions and retain existing Operative RPS provisions.	Reject

S42A Appendix 2 - HS6 Indigenous Ecosystems - Summary Recommendation Table

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
								the NPS-IB especially with regards to the process for identifying indigenous ecosystems. We request that all provisions relating to indigenous biodiversity be deleted and if regional direction is thought necessary after the NPS-IB is gazetted, that should occur through a variation or a separate policy statement change.		
S115.016	Hutt City Council	FS10.012	BP Oil NZ Ltd Mobil Oil NZ Ltd and Z Energy Ltd (the Fuel Companies)	FS10.012	BP Oil NZ Ltd Mobil Oil NZ Ltd and Z Energy Ltd (the Fuel Companies)	Objective 16	Support	Agree with concern raised that the appropriateness of the Change 1 provisions relating to indigenous biodiversity is uncertain, until such time as the NPS-IB is gazetted, and that the existing Operative RPS provisions should be retained. Any change to provisions relating to indigenous biodiversity should be made only after gazettal of the NPS-IB.	Allow Allow the submission and delete all new provisions and amendments to existing provisions relating to indigenous biodiversity and retain existing Operative RPS provisions.	reject
S115.016	Hutt City Council	FS24.009	Powerco Limited	FS24.009	Powerco Limited	Objective 16	Support	Agree with concern raised that the appropriateness of the Change 1 provisions relating to indigenous biodiversity is uncertain, until such time as the NPS-IB is gazetted, and that the existing Operative RPS provisions should be retained. Any change to provisions relating to indigenous biodiversity should be made only after gazettal of the NPS-IB.	Allow Allow the submission and delete all new provisions and amendments to existing provisions relating to indigenous biodiversity and retain existing Operative RPS provisions.	reject
S123.009	Peter Thompson			S123.009	Peter Thompson	Objective 16	Support	It is vital that the indigenous ecosystems and habitats of the region are maintained	Retain as notified.	Accept in part
S129.021	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency			S129.021	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	Objective 16	Support in part	Generally supports but consider that 'protected' is too strong of a directive. The policy should be amended to be in keeping with the exposure draft of the National Policy Statement for Indigenous Biodiversity.	Amend Objective 16 as follows: Indigenous ecosystems and habitats with significant ecosystem functions and services and/or biodiversity values are maintained protected , enhanced, and restored to a healthy functioning state.	Reject
S129.021	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	FS26.014	Meridian Energy Limited	FS26.014	Meridian Energy Limited	Objective 16	Oppose in part	Waka Kotahi (page 11) generally supports the objective but considers 'protected' is too strong and seeks amendment: "Indigenous ecosystems and habitats with significant ecosystem functions and services and/or biodiversity values are <u>maintained</u> , protected , enhanced, and restored to a healthy functioning state." The requested amendment retains the reference to 'enhancement' which conflicts with amendments Meridian has requested to Objective 16.	Disallow	Accept

S42A Appendix 2 - HS6 Indigenous Ecosystems - Summary Recommendation Table

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
S129.021	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	FS29.302	Ngā Hapu o Otaki	FS29.302	Ngā Hapu o Otaki	Objective 16	Support	<p>Co -design under a treaty house model is about shaping plans and resource management avenues alongside manawhenua that appropriately recognise the intergenerational prosperity of the uri of Ngā Hapu o Otaki and the wider community. There are ongoing concerns Ngā Hapu o Otaki maintain with GWRC in regard to the policies addressing Co-governance, Co-management, Co-leadership and Co-collabroative operational processes.</p> <p>This submission goes to great length to define where and how further considerations can be made recognising the interconnected nature of matauranga maori, the inequitable impact environmental decline will have on mana whenua/tangata whenua and offers insight to the intuitive and inherent awareness manawhenua need to maintain to ensure our intergenerational survival and prosperity.</p> <p>3.4 Freshwater including Public Access – Support in Principal</p> <p>3.6 Indigenous Ecosystems – Support in Principal</p> <p>3.9 Regional Form, Design and Function – Support in Principal</p> <p>Ātiawa views regarding Freshwater, indigenous ecosystems and Regional design and function resonate with insights Ngā Hapu o Otaki maintain. Ngā Hapu o Otaki would like opportunity to speak further to such views during the hearing process. We share Ātiawas concerns for Mātauranga Māori as a foundation for equitable interchange of decision making. Their concerns regarding intensification and the further degradation of taonga across our coastline rings true to the ongoing journey we are on as manawhenua facing intense growth for the coming generation. We seek to join the conversation and endorse provisions that will see our whanaunga and other manawhenua groups recognise their environmental resilience and the cultural agility our shared whakapapa offers.</p>	Not stated	Accept in part
S134.003	Powerco Limited			S134.003	Powerco Limited	Objective 16	Oppose	<p>A requirement to enhance and restore, as well as protect, significant indigenous ecosystems and habitats in all situations is onerous and does not recognise the need to provide for regionally significant infrastructure. It is more onerous than the direction set in the exposure draft of the NPS Indigenous Biodiversity around the interface between specific infrastructure and indigenous biodiversity,</p>	Amend Objective 16 to recognise that enhancement and restoration of indigenous ecosystems and habitats may not be appropriate in all circumstances. This could be achieved by making changes along the following lines:	reject

S42A Appendix 2 - HS6 Indigenous Ecosystems - Summary Recommendation Table

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
								<p>which recognises there may be situations in which there are no practicable alternatives to locating in areas of significant indigenous vegetation or significant habitats of indigenous fauna, and effects are to be managed in accordance with an effects management hierarchy. This is particularly in the context that the definition of 'restoration' sets a clear expectation that the condition of the environment should be returned to a former state.</p> <p>In the Operative RPS, Objective 16 provides for the 'maintenance' of indigenous ecosystems and habitats. The proposed shift from 'maintaining' to 'protecting' indigenous ecosystems and habitats creates the potential for the Objective to be interpreted as a proxy avoidance Objective and is opposed.</p> <p>The objective should be amended to reflect the provisions for specific infrastructure in the NPS Indigenous Biodiversity, which is currently anticipated for gazettal in December 2022. At a minimum, the objective should be amended to recognise that enhancement and restoration will not be the only, or the appropriate, response in all situations.</p>	"Indigenous ecosystems and habitats with significant ecosystem functions and services and/or biodiversity values are maintained protected and, where appropriate, enhanced, and or restored to a healthy functioning state."	
S134.003	Powerco Limited	FS26.015	Meridian Energy Limited	FS26.015	Meridian Energy Limited	Objective 16	Support	<p>Powerco requests amendment to recognise that enhancement and restoration of indigenous ecosystems and habitats may not be appropriate in all circumstances. This could be achieved by making changes along the following lines: 'Indigenous ecosystems and habitats with significant ecosystem functions and services and/or biodiversity values are <u>maintained, protected and, where appropriate,</u> enhanced, and <u>or</u> restored to a healthy functioning state.'</p> <p>The requested amendment is similar to Meridian's requested amendment to Objective16.</p>	Allow Allow to the extent that any amendments are consistent with Meridian's own requested relief	reject
S134.003	Powerco Limited	FS15.021	DairyNZ	FS15.021	DairyNZ	Objective 16	Support in part	<p>DairyNZ agrees with the submitter's concerns. However, we consider the focus should be on significant indigenous habitats and significant habitats of indigenous fauna, as per our original submission.</p>	Allow in part Allow Either - Focus the objective on significant indigenous habitats and significant habitats of indigenous fauna, as per our original submission Or - Adopt the submitters wording as proposed (or words to similar effect)	Accept in part

S42A Appendix 2 - HS6 Indigenous Ecosystems - Summary Recommendation Table

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
S136.006	DairyNZ			S136.006	DairyNZ	Objective 16	Oppose in part	In relation to indigenous vegetation and indigenous habitats, the wording as proposed goes beyond that required under S6 of the RMA which requires (emphasis ours) "The protection of areas of significant indigenous vegetation and significant habitats of indigenous fauna are of national importance". Regional Plans, District Plans and other lower level planning documents that are required to 'give effect to' the RPS are more appropriate avenues for considering where and whether to extend these protections beyond areas of significance. The NPS-FM does provide direction in relation to indigenous ecosystems than directed in the RMA. However, as with the majority of freshwater related provisions in PC1 any amendments aimed at giving effect to the NPS-FM should be considered together.	Delete Objective 16 and address the issue through a full review of the RPS OR Amend Objective 16 as follows (or words to similar effect): Significant indigenous indigenous ecosystems and habitats with significant ecosystem functions and services and/or biodiversity values are maintained protected, enhanced, and restored to a healthy functioning state.	reject
S136.006	DairyNZ	FS27.007	Winstone Aggregates	FS27.007	Winstone Aggregates	Objective 16	Support	Winstone supports the submission by Dairy NZ seeking either the deletion or amendment of Objective 16 and is concerned with the scope of Objective 16 for the reasons set out in Winstone's submission.	Allow	Reject
S136.006	DairyNZ	FS26.017	Meridian Energy Limited	FS26.017	Meridian Energy Limited	Objective 16	Support in part	Dairy NZ considers that the proposed wording goes beyond that required under S6 of the and seeks amendment as follows (or words to similar effect): Significant Indigenous ecosystems and habitats with significant ecosystem and/or biodiversity values are maintained, protected, enhanced, and restored to a healthy functioning state. Meridian agrees that the focus of the RPS should be on significant (not all) indigenous ecosystems and habitats.	Allow in part Allow to the extent that any amendments are consistent with Meridian's own requested relief.	Reject
S136.006	DairyNZ	FS30.012	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Ltd	FS30.012	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Ltd	Objective 16	Support	B+LNZ supports the withdrawal of PC1 provisions relating to indigenous biodiversity and redrafting once the NPS-IB has been gazetted.	Allow	Reject
S140.018	Wellington City Council (WCC)			S140.018	Wellington City Council (WCC)	Objective 16	Support	Support as proposed.	Retain as notified.	Accept in part
S144.014	Sustainable Wairarapa Inc			S144.014	Sustainable Wairarapa Inc	Objective 16	Support	It is vital that the indigenous ecosystems and habitats of the region are maintained as our biodiversity continues to decline. It is important that somewhere in the document, the need for controlling pest animals and plants is highlighted. Ideally funding needs to be found to restore our indigenous ecosystems - if pest species are removed from remnants, these systems can bounce back.	Retain as notified.	Accept in part

S42A Appendix 2 - HS6 Indigenous Ecosystems - Summary Recommendation Table

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
S147.019	Wellington Fish and Game Council			S147.019	Wellington Fish and Game Council	Objective 16	Support in part	<p>Supports the broadening of this objective beyond indigenous ecosystems and habitats. A focus on indigenous biodiversity, habitat, and ecosystems at the expense of other valuable habitats fails to give proper effect to the NPS-FM, and the recognition in Part 3.5(1)(a) of the NPS-FM of the interconnectedness of the whole environment. That recognition is in turn reflected in the attributes of ecosystem health in Appendix 1.A of the NPS-FM, which do not distinguish between indigenous and other valued habitats.</p> <p>As drafted, however, Proposed Change 1 does not give proper effect to Policy 10 of the NPS-FM which specifically recognises the need to protect the habitat of trout and salmon. The suggested amendment addresses this deficiency.</p> <p>While the protections of indigenous ecosystems and habitats is vital, so too is the maintaining and enhancing of the whole environment, including those habitats containing valued introduced species. An unduly narrow Indigenous - centric focus could lead to lessening or removal of protections for non-indigenous dominant systems, habitats, and species. Even ecosystems that may not be considered to be "indigenous dominant", can play a significant role in the restoration of indigenous biodiversity. They are also important for the maintenance of valued non-indigenous species, such as trout, salmon, and gamebirds. The loss of protections, enhancements, and restorations of these habitats risks adverse environmental effects and weakened climate change resilience for the region.</p>	Amend. Indigenous ecosystems, and habitats which support significant ecosystem functions, services, valued species and/ or biodiversity values, are protected, enhanced, and restored to a healthy functioning state.	reject
S147.019	Wellington Fish and Game Council	FS27.008	Winstone Aggregates	FS27.008	Winstone Aggregates	Objective 16	Oppose	Winstone opposes the submission by Wellington Fish and Game to widen the scope of Objective 16 beyond indigenous ecosystems and species as this is inconsistent with the objective and policy direction in the existing RPS, which Winstone is seeking be recognised to the extent set out in Winstone's submission	Disallow	Accept
S147.019	Wellington Fish and Game Council	FS15.022	DairyNZ	FS15.022	DairyNZ	Objective 16	Oppose	The submitters proposed amendments reduce the clarity of the objective and do not appropriately reflect the importance of indigenous biodiversity as a priority, nor the critical interaction between introduced species which predate on indigenous species.	Disallow	Accept

S42A Appendix 2 - HS6 Indigenous Ecosystems - Summary Recommendation Table

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
S147.019	Wellington Fish and Game Council	FS19.083	Wellington Water Ltd ("Wellington Water")	FS19.083	Wellington Water Ltd ("Wellington Water")	Objective 16	Oppose	It is unnecessary and redundant to recreate NPSFM policies within the RPS. Most of the amendments sought do not in any event properly reflect the NPSFM. In particular, they do not accurately reflect the proviso to Policy 7, the requirements of clause 3.22, the limitation of Policy 10 to trout and salmon only, and the subservience of Policy 10 to Policy 9. Some of the amendments attempt to address matters that are already adequately covered by extant provisions or PC1 as notified. Some of the amendments undermine the more detailed content of PC1.	Disallow	Accept
S147.019	Wellington Fish and Game Council	FS30.188	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Ltd	FS30.188	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Ltd	Objective 16	Oppose	B+LNZ generally oppose the submission on the grounds that's B+LNZ are seeking changes of the plan change are restricted to those necessary to give effect to the National Policy Statement for Urban Development and that any other matters should be subject to proper review in the Schedule full review of the RPS in 2024 and in the scheduled reviews of the Natural Resources Plan in 2023 and 2024. This is because the changes materially impact on communities, including rural communities and we do not consider that the necessary engagement has been undertaken to adequately inform these provisions or to meet the requirements of Part 3.2 of the NPS-FM. Furthermore, there is a risk that including matters relating to climate change and indigenous biodiversity before key national legislation is gazetted is premature and will lead to the inefficient implementation and confusion amongst those who it impacts materially.	Disallow That the submission be disallowed with the exception of 147.007	Accept
S148.039	Wellington International Airport Ltd (WIAL)			S148.039	Wellington International Airport Ltd (WIAL)	Objective 16	Oppose in part	WIAL acknowledges that this objective is generally consistent with section 6 requirements in the RMA relating to indigenous biodiversity outcomes. However when coupled with the ensuing policies and offsetting and compensation limitations, WIAL is concerned that this suite of provisions could significantly impact on infrastructure projects, including those which may be necessary to protect existing infrastructure assets such as maintenance of the seawall surrounding the airport. It may not always be able to enhance and restore existing ecosystems which may be affected by a development or project, however with appropriate offsetting or compensation overall ecosystem health could be improved and protected.	Amend the objective as follows: Indigenous ecosystems and habitats with significant ecosystem functions and services and/or biodiversity values are protected, enhanced, and restored where appropriate and in accordance with an effects management hierarchy in order to achieve an overall healthy functioning state.	reject

S42A Appendix 2 - HS6 Indigenous Ecosystems - Summary Recommendation Table

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
S148.039	Wellington International Airport Ltd (WIAL)	FS7.017	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society (Forest & Bird)	FS7.017	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society (Forest & Bird)	Objective 16	Oppose	Amendments sought do not give effect to s6 of the RMA.	Disallow whole submission point.	Accept in part
S148.039	Wellington International Airport Ltd (WIAL)	FS8.003	Guardians of the Bays Incorporated	FS8.003	Guardians of the Bays Incorporated	Objective 16	Oppose	Guardians of the Bays supports the proposed wording of Plan Change 1 Objective 16: Indigenous ecosystems and habitats with significant ecosystem functions and services and/or biodiversity values are maintained protected, enhanced , and restored to a healthy functioning state. The WIAL proposed wording would water down this key objective. WIAL's fear of biodiversity and the coastal environment, that Wellington Airport has been placed in, should not stop protection and enhancement of indigenous ecosystems and habitats particularly in relationship to airport seawall maintenance.	Disallow	Accept

S42A Appendix 2 - HS6 Indigenous Ecosystems - Summary Recommendation Table

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
S148.039	Wellington International Airport Ltd (WIAL)	FS8.003	Guardians of the Bays Incorporated	FS8.003	Guardians of the Bays Incorporated	Objective 16	Oppose	Guardians of the Bays supports the proposed wording of Plan Change 1 Objective 16: Indigenous ecosystems and habitats with significant ecosystem functions and services and/or biodiversity values are maintained protected, enhanced , and restored to a healthy functioning state. The WIAL proposed wording would water down this key objective. WIAL's fear of biodiversity and the coastal environment, that Wellington Airport has been placed in, should not stop protection and enhancement of indigenous ecosystems and habitats particularly in relationship to airport seawall maintenance.	Disallow	Accept
S148.039	Wellington International Airport Ltd (WIAL)	FS27.009	Winstone Aggregates	FS27.009	Winstone Aggregates	Objective 16	Support	Winstone supports the submission by WIAL raising concern that Objective 16 and the supporting suite of provisions could have on key infrastructure and significant quarrying activities in the region, for the reasons set out in Winstones submission.	Allow	reject
S148.039	Wellington International Airport Ltd (WIAL)	FS26.016	Meridian Energy Limited	FS26.016	Meridian Energy Limited	Objective 16	Not Stated / Neutral	WIAL acknowledges that this objective is generally consistent with section 6 of the RMA relating to indigenous biodiversity outcomes. However when coupled with the ensuing policies and offsetting and compensation limitations, WIAL is concerned that this suite of provisions could significantly impact on infrastructure projects, including those which may be necessary to protect existing infrastructure assets such as maintenance of the seawall surrounding the airport. It may not always be able to enhance and restore existing ecosystems which may be affected by a development or project, however with appropriate offsetting or compensation overall ecosystem health could be improved and protected. Seeks amendment as follows: 'Indigenous ecosystems and habitats with significant ecosystem functions and services and/or biodiversity values are protected, enhanced, and restored where appropriate and in accordance with an effects management hierarchy in order to achieve an overall healthy functioning state.' Meridian supports the reference to an effects management hierarchy, in addition to the amendment to protect and, where appropriate, enhance and restore (consistent with Meridian's own submission).	Allow Allow to the extent that any amendments are consistent with Meridian's own requested relief.	reject

S42A Appendix 2 - HS6 Indigenous Ecosystems - Summary Recommendation Table

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
S151.016	NZ Centre for Sustainable Cities			S151.016	NZ Centre for Sustainable Cities	Objective 16	Support in part	Objective 16 is poorly supported by related policies or methods that protect or enhance or restore those significant ecosystem functions. New urban developments around travel corridors offer an important opportunity for protection or enhancement of vital ecosystem functions that in turn provide essential services that support ecosystem and human wellbeing.	Include stronger supporting policies and/or methods to enhance or restore significant ecosystem functions.	reject
S151.016	NZ Centre for Sustainable Cities	FS8.004	Guardians of the Bays Incorporated	FS8.004	Guardians of the Bays Incorporated	Objective 16	Support	Objective 16 should be supported by related policies or methods to enhance and restore significant ecosystem functions	Allow	reject
S163.030	Wairarapa Federated Farmers			S163.030	Wairarapa Federated Farmers	Objective 16	Oppose	Defer to the full review of the RPS in 2024. The proposed amendments are "muddying" an RMA s6 matter, ie, the protection of areas of significant indigenous vegetation and significant habitats of indigenous fauna	That the amendments to Objective 16 be deleted. To the extent amendments are made, delete the FW icon	Reject
S163.030	Wairarapa Federated Farmers	FS7.074	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society (Forest & Bird)	FS7.074	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society (Forest & Bird)	Objective 16	Oppose	It is completely appropriate to include climate change, biodiversity and freshwater provisions in the plan change. This plan change creates efficiency by considering multiple policy directives from central government. The amendments sought by Federated Farmers fail to give effect to the NPSFM, the NPS for Indigenous Biodiversity, for which there is an exposure draft and the final version is due out this month, and do not achieve the purpose of the RMA or the Climate Change Response (Zero Carbon) Amendment Act 2019.	Disallow whole submission	Accept in part
S163.030	Wairarapa Federated Farmers	FS20.196	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	FS20.196	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	Objective 16	Oppose	Ātiawa oppose the entire submission by Wairarapa Federated Farmers. The relief sought by Federated Farmers is to effectively delete the entire proposed plan change (except for submission points S163.083, S163.084). The basis for deleting the proposed plan change is to delay decision-making. Ātiawa do not accept that delaying responding to national direction is an appropriate course of action, and will further compound environmental and resource management issues.	Disallow the entire submission by Wairarapa Federated Farmers.	Accept in part
S163.030	Wairarapa Federated Farmers	FS29.047	Ngā Hapu o Otaki	FS29.047	Ngā Hapu o Otaki	Objective 16	Oppose	Section 18, page 4: General Comments – OPPOSE Section 25, Page 5 Going Forward – OPPOSE It is disheartening to see that Wairarapa Federated Farmers aren't capable of recognizing the obligations GWRC must maintain with Treaty Partners. It must be understood that Manawhenua are not simply 'groups of people' but a representation of the signatories that signed the Treaty of Waitangi and the original kaitiaki	Not stated	Accept in part

S42A Appendix 2 - HS6 Indigenous Ecosystems - Summary Recommendation Table

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
								and custodians of the taonga in question when considering how these plan changes are implemented. Wairarapa Federated Farmers indicate a lack of awareness to the value of manawhenua engagement. Their stated 'aspirations of delivering environmental improvements alongside a thriving bio-economy' aren't feasible without considering the intergenerational insight and technical direction that only Mātauranga Māori can offer.		
S163.030	Wairarapa Federated Farmers	FS30.103	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Ltd	FS30.103	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Ltd	Objective 16	Support	B+LNZ agree that the scope of RPS PC1 should be restricted to those changes necessary to give effect to the National Policy Statement for Urban Development and that any other matters should be subject to proper review in the Schedule full review of the RPS in 2024 and in the scheduled reviews of the Natural Resources Plan in 2023 and 2024. Where alternative relief is provided, B+LNZ generally support this relief.	Allow	Reject
S165.021	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society (Forest & Bird)			S165.021	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society (Forest & Bird)	Objective 16	Support in part	As written this objective does not give effect to s6(c) of the RMA and needs to include protection of significant habitats of indigenous fauna which could be exotic. Policies and methods need to align to give effect to s6(c) of the RMA.	Support protection and enhancement. However, this objective needs to be broader than just indigenous ecosystems and habitats to ensure protection of significant habitats of indigenous fauna. For example, macrocarpa shelter belts can be important roosts for long-tailed bats as can exotic pine forests for Powelliphanta snails. Seek consequential changes to policies and methods to ensure significant habitats of indigenous fauna are also protected as per comment above.	Accept
S165.021	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society (Forest & Bird)	FS8.005	Guardians of the Bays Incorporated	FS8.005	Guardians of the Bays Incorporated	Objective 16	Support	Objective 16 needs to include protection of significant habitats which could be exotic for indigenous fauna e.g. in the Lyall Bay and area Tui are feed on nectar from bottle brush and banksias.	Allow	Accept

S42A Appendix 2 - HS6 Indigenous Ecosystems - Summary Recommendation Table

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
S165.021	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society (Forest & Bird)	FS17.020	Wellington International Airport Ltd (WIAL)	FS17.020	Wellington International Airport Ltd (WIAL)	Objective 16	Oppose	WIAL oppose the relief sought as it is inconsistent with WIAL's primary submission.	Disallow	Reject
S165.021	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society (Forest & Bird)	FS27.006	Winstone Aggregates	FS27.006	Winstone Aggregates	Objective 16	Oppose	Winstone opposes the widening of Policy 47 to managing effects on other values including habitats of introduced species as this is inconsistent with the objective and policy direction in the existing RPS, which Winstone is seeking be recognised to the extent set out in Winstone's submission.	Disallow	Reject
S165.021	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society (Forest & Bird)	FS20.064	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	FS20.064	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	Objective 16	Oppose	Ātiawa do not support this submission point, Ātiawa seek policy relief that prioritise the protection of indigenous ecosystems over exotic/introduced ecosystems.	Disallow	Reject
S165.021	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society (Forest & Bird)	FS26.020	Meridian Energy Limited	FS26.020	Meridian Energy Limited	Objective 16	Oppose	Forest & Bird question how non-regulatory policies, particularly Policy IE.3, and methods are going to achieve the objective and suggest additional regulatory policy is required, but have not proposed any alternative wording. Meridian opposes the request in the absence of any detailed wording suggestion.	Allow in part Allow to the extent that any amendments are consistent with Meridian's own requested relief.	Reject
S165.021	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society (Forest & Bird)	FS30.319	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Ltd	FS30.319	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Ltd	Objective 16	Oppose	B+LNZ generally oppose the submission on the grounds that's B+LNZ are seeking changes of the plan change are restricted to those necessary to give effect to the National Policy Statement for Urban Development and that any other matters should be subject to proper review in the Schedule full review of the RPS in 2024 and in the scheduled reviews of the Natural Resources Plan in 2023 and 2024. This is because the changes materially impact on communities, including rural communities and we do not consider that the necessary engagement has been undertaken to adequately inform these provisions or to meet the requirements of Part 3.2 of the NPS-FM. Furthermore, there is a risk that including matters relating to climate change and indigenous biodiversity before key national legislation is gazetted or implemented is premature and will lead to the inefficient implementation and confusion amongst those who it impacts materially.	Disallow	Reject

S42A Appendix 2 - HS6 Indigenous Ecosystems - Summary Recommendation Table

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
S166.012	Masterton District Council			S166.012	Masterton District Council	Objective 16	Support in part	Support in part (our interpretation of the Objective's intention). Oppose in part due to possible unforeseen implications for TAs roles and responsibilities which could be unaffordable for our community. What it looks like in practice could have significant consequences and costs.	Retain as notified. However: MDC requests involvement in the development of any plans or policies relating to this objective.	Accept in part
S167.037	Taranaki Whānui			S167.037	Taranaki Whānui	Objective 16	Support	Taranaki Whānui support the principle of Objective 16. In particular, we note the inclusion of Method 32 and 'partnering with mana whenua' and Method IE.2.	Retain as notified.	Accept in part
S168.068	Rangitāne O Wairarapa Inc			S168.068	Rangitāne O Wairarapa Inc	Objective 16	Support	Rangitāne o Wairarapa support this policy and the proposed changes with respect to protection and enhancement of indigenous biodiversity.	Retain as notified	Accept in part
S168.068	Rangitāne O Wairarapa Inc	FS31.178	Sustainable Wairarapa Inc	FS31.178	Sustainable Wairarapa Inc	Objective 16	Support	Kia ora koutou, My name is Ian Gunn, Secretary Sustainable Wairarapa inc. contact # 021567134, address 4B McKay Street, Paraparaumu Beach 5032. Firstly we'd like to state the time frame provided to peruse over 900 pages of submissions is in our opinion an abuse of process. The benefit of further submissions is for you the council to listen and hear the views of its ratepayers. The timeframe in our case does not allow a rigorous review of the original submissions to council. On top of this we are a week before Christmas- a very busy and chaotic time for most members of the community. It is highly likely that the majority of staff will take leave over the Christmas break so analysis of any further submissions will not occur until late January 2023-so why the short period to respond. While there is due process there is also good practise your management of the further submissions fails the good practise model. As a consequence we would like you to note Sustainable Wairarapa's strong support of the original submissions lodged with council by the two Wairarapa Iwi-Ngati Kahungunu and Rangitane. Its clear that there is a poor understanding of nature based solutions this term needs further explanation. Sustainable Wairarapa acknowledges that while nature based solutions offer a wide variety of options its not the only solution. We are heartened by the widespread support for the original document. Thanks for an opportunity to make a further submission. Nga mihi nui Ian Gun	Not stated	Accept in part

S42A Appendix 2 - HS6 Indigenous Ecosystems - Summary Recommendation Table

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
S16.059	Kāpiti Coast District Council			S16.059	Kāpiti Coast District Council	Objective 16A	Support	The intent of the objective is supported.	Retain	Accept
S30.014	Porirua City Council			S30.014	Porirua City Council	Objective 16A	Oppose	It is unclear over what timeframe is this objective to be achieved, how it is to be measured, and whether it is this gradual or absolute. This objective is similar to Objective 16 but frames outcomes sought differently, it could be deleted if objective 16 was amended.	<i>[Note: Reasoning references Objective 16, Chapter 3.6 Indigenous ecosystems]</i> Either delete objective, or amend the objective so that it is clear what the outcomes sought are.	reject
S30.014	Porirua City Council	FS25.047	Peka Peka Farm Limited	FS25.047	Peka Peka Farm Limited	Objective 16A	Support	The submission provides a comprehensive analysis of the proposed change including in relation to matters of scope and jurisdiction. It is supported without prejudice to the specific relief sought in the primary submission or this further submission by Peka Peka Farm Ltd.	Allow	reject
S34.079	Te Kaunihera o Te Awa Kairangi ki Uta, Upper Hutt City Council			S34.079	Te Kaunihera o Te Awa Kairangi ki Uta, Upper Hutt City Council	Objective 16A	Oppose	Intent of objective is supported but is inappropriate until the NPS-IB is gazetted.	Delete in its entirety and review once the NPS-IB has been gazetted.	reject
S100.011	Meridian Energy Limited			S100.011	Meridian Energy Limited	Objective 16A	Oppose in part	Objective 16 seeks to protect (and, where appropriate enhance and restore) significant indigenous ecosystems and habitats. Objective 16A seeks to maintain other (non-significant) indigenous ecosystems. As with Objective 16, enhancement and restoration will not be the only or appropriate response in all situations and the wording should reflect this. Also, the last part of the objective is not necessary because a 'healthy functioning state' will have resilience against the pressures described. Improving resilience and giving effect to Te Rito o te Harakeke should be addressed by proposed policies that set out how the 'maintain' and 'enhance' outcome is to be achieved (and, in large measure the policies already do this). It seems incongruent that improving resilience should be a desired outcome for non-significant indigenous ecosystems and habitats, but is not a desired outcome for significant indigenous ecosystems and habitats.	Amend Objective 16A as follows (or in a similar manner to achieve the same effect): "The region's indigenous ecosystems are maintained and, where appropriate, enhanced, and restored to a healthy functioning state., improving their resilience to increasing environmental pressures, particularly climate change, and giving effect to Te Rito o te Harakeke."	reject
S100.011	Meridian Energy Limited	FS11.004	Fulton Hogan Limited	FS11.004	Fulton Hogan Limited	Objective 16A	Support	Similar to Objective 16, enhancement and restoration of an existing ecosystem will not be the most appropriate response in all situations and the wording should reflect this.	Allow	reject

S42A Appendix 2 - HS6 Indigenous Ecosystems - Summary Recommendation Table

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
								Agree with the submitter that improving resilience and 'giving effect to Te Rito o te Harakeke' should be addressed through policy direction rather than being included within an objective. The policy should provide the direction as to how the 'maintain' and 'enhance' elements of the objective are to be achieved.		
S102.053	Te Tumu Paeroa Office of the Māori Trustee			S102.053	Te Tumu Paeroa Office of the Māori Trustee	Objective 16A	Support	Generally supports the objectives in the 'Indigenous ecosystems' chapter.	Retain as notified.	Accept
S115.019	Hutt City Council			S115.019	Hutt City Council	Objective 16A	Oppose	While indigenous biodiversity is a key issue, we expect the government to soon gazette a National Policy Statement on Indigenous Biodiversity ("NPS-IB"). The proposed provisions may well conflict with the NPS-IB especially with regards to the process for identifying indigenous ecosystems. We request that all provisions relating to indigenous biodiversity be deleted and if regional direction is thought necessary after the NPS-IB is gazetted, that should occur through a variation or a separate policy statement change.	Delete all new provisions and amendments to existing provisions and retain existing Operative RPS provisions.	Reject
S115.019	Hutt City Council	FS27.0010	Winstone Aggregates	FS27.0010	Winstone Aggregates	Objective 16A	Support	Winstone supports the submission by HCC seeking new or amended provisions in Objective 16A in a manner consistent with the NPS-IB when gazetted or similar for the reasons set out Winstones submission.	Allow	reject
S115.019	Hutt City Council	FS10.015	BP Oil NZ Ltd Mobil Oil NZ Ltd and Z Energy Ltd (the Fuel Companies)	FS10.015	BP Oil NZ Ltd Mobil Oil NZ Ltd and Z Energy Ltd (the Fuel Companies)	Objective 16A	Support	Agree with concern raised that the appropriateness of the Change 1 provisions relating to indigenous biodiversity is uncertain, until such time as the NPS-IB is gazetted, and that the existing Operative RPS provisions should be retained. Any change to provisions relating to indigenous biodiversity should be made only after gazettal of the NPS-IB.	Allow Allow the submission and delete all new provisions and amendments to existing provisions relating to indigenous biodiversity and retain existing Operative RPS provisions.	reject
S115.019	Hutt City Council	FS24.012	Powerco Limited	FS24.012	Powerco Limited	Objective 16A	Support	Agree with concern raised that the appropriateness of the Change 1 provisions relating to indigenous biodiversity is uncertain, until such time as the NPS-IB is gazetted, and that the existing Operative RPS provisions should be retained. Any change to provisions relating to indigenous biodiversity should be made only after gazettal of the NPS-IB.	Allow Allow the submission and delete all new provisions and amendments to existing provisions relating to indigenous biodiversity and retain existing Operative RPS provisions.	reject

S42A Appendix 2 - HS6 Indigenous Ecosystems - Summary Recommendation Table

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
S123.010	Peter Thompson			S123.010	Peter Thompson	Objective 16A	Support	It is vital that the indigenous ecosystems and habitats of the region are maintained	Retain as notified.	Accept
S131.032	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust			S131.032	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	Objective 16A	Support in part	Ātiawa seeks that pre-notification drafting of Objective 16A be reinstated and current RPS Change 1 Objective 16A is deleted. There is no direct reference to ecosystem health, ecological integrity, and ecological connectivity of indigenous ecosystems in the current wording of Objective 16A. This appears to be an oversight as these factors are outlined as key issue and should be addressed as an objective.	Amend: Objective 16A The ecosystem health, ecological integrity and ecological connectivity of the region's indigenous ecosystems, and the ecological processes that supports them, are enhanced, maintained and restored, so that indigenous biodiversity and mahinga kai is thriving and is resilient to environmental pressures particularly climate change, and giving effect to Te Rito o te Harakeke.	reject
S131.032	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	FS29.303	Ngā Hapu o Otaki	FS29.303	Ngā Hapu o Otaki	Objective 16A	Support	Co -design under a treaty house model is about shaping plans and resource management avenues alongside manawhenua that appropriately recognise the intergenerational prosperity of the uri of Ngā Hapu o Otaki and the wider community. There are ongoing concerns Ngā Hapu o Otaki maintain with GWRC in regard to the policies addressing Co-governance, Co-management, Co-leadership and Co-collabroative operational processes. This submission goes to great length to define where and how further considerations can be made recognising the interconnected nature of matauranga maori, the inequitable impact environmental decline will have on mana whenua/tangata whenua and offers insight to the intuitive and inherent awareness manawhenua need to maintain to ensure our intergenerational survival and prosperity. 3.4 Freshwater including Public Access – Support in Principal 3.6 Indigenous Ecosystems – Support in Principal 3.9 Regional Form, Design and Function – Support in Principal Ātiawa views regarding Freshwater, indigenous ecosystems and Regional design and function resonate with insights Ngā Hapu o Otaki maintain. Ngā Hapu o Otaki would like opportunity to speak further to such views during the hearing process. We share Ātiawas concerns for Mātauranga Māori as a	Not stated	reject

S42A Appendix 2 - HS6 Indigenous Ecosystems - Summary Recommendation Table

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
								foundation for equitable interchange of decision making. Their concerns regarding intensification and the further degradation of taonga across our coastline rings true to the ongoing journey we are on as manawhenua facing intense growth for the coming generation. We seek to join the conversation and endorse provisions that will see our whanaunga and other manawhenua groups recognise their environmental resilience and the cultural agility our shared whakapapa offers.		
S133.017	Muaūpoko Tribal Authority			S133.017	Muaūpoko Tribal Authority	Objective 16A	Support in part	Supports the maintenance, enhancement and restoration of indigenous ecosystems and the acknowledgement of the roles of tangata whenua, including Muaūpoko and landowners.	Include specific reference to Muaūpoko's relationship with indigenous ecosystems. OR Alternative relief that may be necessary or appropriate to ensure Muaūpoko's connection to Te-Whanganui-a-Tara is recognised.	reject
S133.017	Muaūpoko Tribal Authority	FS6.048	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira on behalf of Ngāti Toa Rangatira	FS6.048	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira on behalf of Ngāti Toa Rangatira	Objective 16A	Oppose	We oppose this submission because as Muaūpoko claims are inappropriate. This not only causes confusion around which iwi are Tangata Whenua in Te Whanganui a Tara rohe and which iwi to engage with, but also portrays a false perception of who the mana whenua are, which is also inappropriate.	Disallow We seek that this part of the submission is disallowed.	Accept
S133.017	Muaūpoko Tribal Authority	FS20.364	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	FS20.364	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	Objective 16A	Oppose	Ātiawa vehemently oppose the submission and claims made by Muaūpoko Tribal Authority. The assertions made by Muaūpoko Tribal Authority are categorically incorrect and highly offensive to Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai. While Muaūpoko may have historical associations with Te Whanganui-a-Tara and Kāpiti. These associations are recognised as historical only. Ātiawa refer to the evidence provided by Ngārongo Iwikatea Nicholson in support of Ngāti Toarangatira's claims which were upheld and settled by the Crown. Pages 26-34 sets out the extinguishment of Muaūpoko rights in our rohe. From both a tikanga Māori perspective and a Crown law perspective, Muaūpoko do not hold mana whenua (including for the purposes of the Resource Management Act). There is therefore no basis for Muaūpoko Tribal Authority to be recognised as being kaitiaki in the rohe; to do so would be incomprehensible and irreconcilable to Ātiawa, and more generally an affront to tikanga Māori. Muaūpoko Tribal Authority have cited Te Kāhui	Disallow the whole submission	Accept in part

S42A Appendix 2 - HS6 Indigenous Ecosystems - Summary Recommendation Table

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
								<p>Māngai mapping as evidence of the spatial extent that they exercise kaitiakitanga. This in itself evidences the lack of basis to their claims, in that Te Kāhui Māngai map simply reflects claims made by Māori groups, and from our previous inquiry to Te Puni Kōkiri who are responsible for this map, we learned that Muaūpoko Tribal Authority included that spatial extent in their Agreement in Principle. Agreements in Principle provide claimants the opportunity to set out everything that a claimant wants from the Crown. They have no legal effect and are therefore not legally recognised. We strongly advise the Council to remain conscious that it is not appropriate for regional planning processes to be exploited in the manner suggested by the Muaūpoko Tribal Authority, that dealing with the false claims of groups like these must be left to the Crown, and that settlements must not pre-empted. Whilst Muaūpoko Tribal Authority may wish to seek out new territories through online maps, this is not of course how mana whenua is gained or held. We remain as ahi kā and mana whenua on the land, as we have undisturbed for over 198 years.</p>		
S134.004	Powerco Limited			S134.004	Powerco Limited	Objective 16A	Oppose	<p>As per Objective 16, a requirement to enhance and restore, as well as maintain, indigenous ecosystems and habitats in all situations is onerous and does not recognise the need to provide for regionally significant infrastructure. It is more onerous than the direction set in the exposure draft of the NPS Indigenous Biodiversity around the interface between specific infrastructure and indigenous biodiversity. Further, it is unclear why specific reference is made in Objective 16A to improved resilience to environmental pressures and Te Rito o te Harakeke in relation to indigenous ecosystems and not in relation to significant indigenous ecosystems, which are addressed in Objective 16. Nor is it clear that improved resilience to environmental pressures will be able to be achieved in relation to all development proposals affecting indigenous ecosystems, for example where maintenance or minor upgrade of existing regionally significant infrastructure is required.</p> <p>The objective should be amended to reflect the provisions for specific infrastructure in the NPS Indigenous Biodiversity, which is currently</p>	<p>Amend Objective 16A to recognise that enhancement and restoration of indigenous ecosystems and habitats may not be appropriate in all circumstances. This could be achieved by making changes along the following lines: "The region's indigenous ecosystems are maintained and, where appropriate, enhanced, and or restored to a healthy functioning state., improving their resilience to increasing environmental pressures, particularly climate change, and giving effect to Te Rito o te Harakeke."</p>	Reject

S42A Appendix 2 - HS6 Indigenous Ecosystems - Summary Recommendation Table

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
								anticipated for gazettal in December 2022. At a minimum, the objective should be amended to recognise that enhancement and restoration will not be the only, or the appropriate, response in all situations.		
S134.004	Powerco Limited	FS26.018	Meridian Energy Limited	FS26.018	Meridian Energy Limited	Objective 16A	Support	Powerco seeks amendment of Objective 16A to recognise that enhancement and restoration of indigenous ecosystems and habitats may not be appropriate in all circumstances. This could be achieved by making changes along the following lines: 'The region's indigenous ecosystems are maintained and, where appropriate , enhanced, and or restored to a healthy functioning state, improving their resilience to increasing environmental pressures, particularly climate change, and giving effect to Te Rito o te Harakeke. Meridian agrees that enhancement or restoration should be required where appropriate (for example, where values are degraded) and not in all situations.	Allow Allow to the extent that any amendments are consistent with Meridian's own requested relief.	reject
S136.007	DairyNZ			S136.007	DairyNZ	Objective 16A	Oppose in part	Supports an objective to improve the current state of the regions ecosystem however concerned with the objective's wording and the use of "restoring to a healthy functioning state" which has not been defined and will depend on the outcome of the freshwater plan change process. Support consideration of a focus on significant indigenous biodiversity and habitats as required at s6 of the RMA through amendments to Objective 16 (as above) with a broader focus on s7 matters through an appropriate rewording of this Objective.	Delete Objective 16A and address the issue through a full review of the RPS OR Amend Objective 16A (or words to similar effect): The region's indigenous ecosystems are maintained, enhanced, and restored to a healthy functioning state, improving resilience to increasing environmental pressures, and giving effect to Te Rito o te Harakeke.	Reject
S136.007	DairyNZ	FS30.013	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Ltd	FS30.013	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Ltd	Objective 16A	Support	B+LNZ supports the withdrawal of PC1 provisions relating to indigenous biodiversity and redrafting once the NPS-IB has been gazetted.	Allow	reject
S136.007	DairyNZ	FS26.021	Meridian Energy Limited	FS26.021	Meridian Energy Limited	Objective 16A	Support in part	Dairy NZ requests that Objective 16A is deleted with the issue addressed through a full review of the RPS. Alternatively, amend Objective 16A as follows (or words to similar effect): 'The region's indigenous ecosystems are maintained, enhanced, and restored to a healthy functioning state, improving their resilience to increasing	Allow in part Allow to the extent that any amendments are consistent with Meridian's own requested relief.	reject

S42A Appendix 2 - HS6 Indigenous Ecosystems - Summary Recommendation Table

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
								environmental pressures, particularly climate change, and giving effect to Te Rito o te Harakeke.' Meridian opposes the requirement for enhancement and restoration in all situations (consistent with its own submission points on Objective 16A).		
S139.004	Ian Gunn			S139.004	Ian Gunn	Objective 16A	Support	Nature-based solutions offer a wide variety of benefits compared to hard infrastructure.	Retain as notified.	Accept
S140.019	Wellington City Council (WCC)			S140.019	Wellington City Council (WCC)	Objective 16A	Support in part	Wording should be consistent with the Exposure Draft for the proposed National Policy Statement for Indigenous Biodiversity (NPS-IB).	The region's indigenous ecosystems biodiversity are is maintained, enhanced, and restored to a healthy functioning state, improving their resilience to increasing environmental pressures, particularly climate change, and giving effect to Te Rito o te Harakeke.	Accept
S140.019	Wellington City Council (WCC)	FS15.018	DairyNZ	FS15.018	DairyNZ	Objective 16A	Oppose in part	DairyNZ agrees that the provisions related to biodiversity should be consistent with the National Policy Statement on Indigenous Biodiversity. However, given the potential for changes to the exposure draft of the NPS Biodiversity we consider it more prudent to delete the relevant provisions and revisit once the NPS is gazetted.	Allow in part Deleting this component of the RPS change, Reviewing the RPS once the NPS-IB has been gazetted	reject
S140.019	Wellington City Council (WCC)	FS15.023	DairyNZ	FS15.023	DairyNZ	Objective 16A	Oppose in part	While DairyNZ agrees with the submitter's concerns in respect of potential inconsistencies between this Objective and the NPS-IB, we consider the relief sought in our original submission (deletion of the Objective until a full review of the RPS is undertaken) or amendments to wording as sought in our original submission.	Disallow	reject
S144.015	Sustainable Wairarapa Inc			S144.015	Sustainable Wairarapa Inc	Objective 16A	Support	It is vital that the indigenous ecosystems and habitats of the region are maintained as our biodiversity continues to decline. It is important that somewhere in the document, the need for controlling pest animals and plants is highlighted. Ideally funding needs to be found to restore our indigenous ecosystems - if pest species are removed from remnants, these systems can bounce back.	Retain as notified.	Accept
S144.015	Sustainable Wairarapa Inc	FS14.029	Masterton District Council	FS14.029	Masterton District Council	Objective 16A	Support	Agree with: It is vital that the indigenous ecosystems and habitats of the region are maintained as our biodiversity continues to decline. It is important that somewhere in the document, the need for controlling pest	Not stated Agree with relief sought: Retain as notified	Accept

S42A Appendix 2 - HS6 Indigenous Ecosystems - Summary Recommendation Table

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
								animals and plants is highlighted. Ideally funding needs to be found to restore our indigenous ecosystems - if pest species are removed from remnants, these systems can bounce back.		
S147.029	Wellington Fish and Game Council			S147.029	Wellington Fish and Game Council	Objective 16A	Support in part	The suggested amendment follows from the suggested amendment to Objective 16, above, and is intended to give better effect to the NPS-FM (including Policy 10). While the protections of indigenous ecosystems and habitats is vital, so too is the maintaining and enhancing of the whole environment, including those containing valued introduced species. An unduly narrow indigenous - centric focus could lead to lessening or removal of protections for non-indigenous dominant systems, habitats, and species. The loss of protections, enhancements, and restorations risks adverse environmental effects and weakened climate change resilience for the region.	Amend. The region's indigenous ecosystems, and habitats with significant biodiversity or other values , are maintained, enhanced and restored to a healthy functioning state, improving their resilience to increasing environmental pressures, particularly climate change, and giving effect to Te Rito o te Harakeke.	reject
S147.029	Wellington Fish and Game Council	FS20.131	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	FS20.131	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	Objective 16A	Oppose	Ātiawa do not support the rationale set out by Fish and Game, - indigenous ecosystems must be afforded the greatest protection above the protection of introduced ecosystems which already dominate te taiao, to the detriment of indigenous ecosystems. The relief sought by the submitter would like result in a status-quo outcome for indigenous ecosystems, Ātiawa are opposed to this outcome.	Disallow	Accept
S147.029	Wellington Fish and Game Council	FS19.093	Wellington Water Ltd ("Wellington Water")	FS19.093	Wellington Water Ltd ("Wellington Water")	Objective 16A	Oppose	It is unnecessary and redundant to recreate NPSFM policies within the RPS. Most of the amendments sought do not in any event properly reflect the NPSFM. In particular, they do not accurately reflect the proviso to Policy 7, the requirements of clause 3.22, the limitation of Policy 10 to trout and salmon only, and the subservience of Policy 10 to Policy 9. Some of the amendments attempt to address matters that are already adequately covered by extant provisions or PC1 as notified. Some of the amendments undermine the more detailed content of PC1.	Disallow	Accept
S147.029	Wellington Fish and Game Council	FS30.198	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Ltd	FS30.198	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Ltd	Objective 16A	Oppose	B+LNZ generally oppose the submission on the grounds that's B+LNZ are seeking changes of the plan change are restricted to those necessary to give effect to the National Policy Statement for Urban Development and that any other matters should be subject to proper review in the Schedule full review	Disallow That the submission be disallowed with the exception of 147.007	Accept in part

S42A Appendix 2 - HS6 Indigenous Ecosystems - Summary Recommendation Table

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
								of the RPS in 2024 and in the scheduled reviews of the Natural Resources Plan in 2023 and 2024. This is because the changes materially impact on communities, including rural communities and we do not consider that the necessary engagement has been undertaken to adequately inform these provisions or to meet the requirements of Part 3.2 of the NPS-FM. Furthermore, there is a risk that including matters relating to climate change and indigenous biodiversity before key national legislation is gazetted is premature and will lead to the inefficient implementation and confusion amongst those who it impacts materially.		
S163.031	Wairarapa Federated Farmers			S163.031	Wairarapa Federated Farmers	Objective 16A	Oppose	Defer to the full review of the RPS in 2024.	That Objective 16A be deleted. Delete the FW icon	Accept in part
S163.031	Wairarapa Federated Farmers	FS7.075	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society (Forest & Bird)	FS7.075	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society (Forest & Bird)	Objective 16A	Oppose	It is completely appropriate to include climate change, biodiversity and freshwater provisions in the plan change. This plan change creates efficiency by considering multiple policy directives from central government. The amendments sought by Federated Farmers fail to give effect to the NPSFM, the NPS for Indigenous Biodiversity, for which there is an exposure draft and the final version is due out this month, and do not achieve the purpose of the RMA or the Climate Change Response (Zero Carbon) Amendment Act 2019.	Disallow whole submission	Accept in part
S163.031	Wairarapa Federated Farmers	FS20.197	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	FS20.197	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	Objective 16A	Oppose	Ātiawa oppose the entire submission by Wairarapa Federated Farmers. The relief sought by Federated Farmers is to effectively delete the entire proposed plan change (except for submission points S163.083, S163.084). The basis for deleting the proposed plan change is to delay decision-making. Ātiawa do not accept that delaying responding to national direction is an appropriate course of action, and will further compound environmental and resource management issues.	Disallow the entire submission by Wairarapa Federated Farmers.	Accept in part
S163.031	Wairarapa Federated Farmers	FS29.048	Ngā Hapu o Otaki	FS29.048	Ngā Hapu o Otaki	Objective 16A	Oppose	Section 18, page 4: General Comments – OPPOSE Section 25, Page 5 Going Forward – OPPOSE It is disheartening to see that Wairarapa Federated Farmers aren't capable of recognizing the obligations GWRC must maintain with Treaty Partners. It must be understood that Manawhenua are not simply 'groups of people' but a representation of the signatories that signed the Treaty of Waitangi and the original kaitiaki	Not stated	Accept in part

S42A Appendix 2 - HS6 Indigenous Ecosystems - Summary Recommendation Table

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
								and custodians of the taonga in question when considering how these plan changes are implemented. Wairarapa Federated Farmers indicate a lack of awareness to the value of manawhenua engagement. Their stated 'aspirations of delivering environmental improvements alongside a thriving bio-economy' aren't feasible without considering the intergenerational insight and technical direction that only Mātauranga Māori can offer.		
S163.031	Wairarapa Federated Farmers	FS30.104	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Ltd	FS30.104	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Ltd	Objective 16A	Support	B+LNZ agree that the scope of RPS PC1 should be restricted to those changes necessary to give effect to the National Policy Statement for Urban Development and that any other matters should be subject to proper review in the Schedule full review of the RPS in 2024 and in the scheduled reviews of the Natural Resources Plan in 2023 and 2024. Where alternative relief is provided, B+LNZ generally support this relief.	Allow	reject
S165.022	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society (Forest & Bird)			S165.022	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society (Forest & Bird)	Objective 16A	Support	This is consistent with the RMA.	Retain	Accept
S165.022	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society (Forest & Bird)	FS30.319	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Ltd	FS30.319	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Ltd	Objective 16C	Oppose	B+LNZ generally oppose the submission on the grounds that's B+LNZ are seeking changes of the plan change are restricted to those necessary to give effect to the National Policy Statement for Urban Development and that any other matters should be subject to proper review in the Schedule full review of the RPS in 2024 and in the scheduled reviews of the Natural Resources Plan in 2023 and 2024. This is because the changes materially impact on communities, including rural communities and we do not consider that the necessary engagement has been undertaken to adequately inform these provisions or to meet the requirements of Part 3.2 of the NPS-FM. Furthermore, there is a risk that including matters relating to climate change and indigenous biodiversity before key national legislation is gazetted or implemented is premature and will lead to the inefficient implementation and confusion amongst those who it impacts materially.	Disallow	Awaiting recommendation

S42A Appendix 2 - HS6 Indigenous Ecosystems - Summary Recommendation Table

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
S165.023	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society (Forest & Bird)			S165.023	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society (Forest & Bird)	Objective 16A	Oppose in part	The policies and methods need to give better effect to the RMA. Question how non-regulatory policies, particularly Policy IE.3, and methods are going to achieve the objective. Question how non-regulatory policies, particularly Policy IE.3, and methods are going to achieve the objective. [Note: submission refers to 'Policies and Methods to Achieve Objective 16A']	Suggest additional regulatory policy required to ensure maintenance of biodiversity as per council functions under s31 of the RMA.	Accept in part
S165.023	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society (Forest & Bird)	FS30.319	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Ltd	FS30.319	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Ltd	Objective 16A	Oppose	B+LNZ generally oppose the submission on the grounds that's B+LNZ are seeking changes of the plan change are restricted to those necessary to give effect to the National Policy Statement for Urban Development and that any other matters should be subject to proper review in the Schedule full review of the RPS in 2024 and in the scheduled reviews of the Natural Resources Plan in 2023 and 2024. This is because the changes materially impact on communities, including rural communities and we do not consider that the necessary engagement has been undertaken to adequately inform these provisions or to meet the requirements of Part 3.2 of the NPS-FM. Furthermore, there is a risk that including matters relating to climate change and indigenous biodiversity before key national legislation is gazetted or implemented is premature and will lead to the inefficient implementation and confusion amongst those who it impacts materially.	Disallow	reject
S166.013	Masterton District Council			S166.013	Masterton District Council	Objective 16A	Support	Support this objective	Retain as notified. However: further work is required to understand the cost implications and what affordability impacts this may have on our communities.	Accept
S167.038	Taranaki Whānui			S167.038	Taranaki Whānui	Objective 16A	Support in part	Taranaki Whānui support the principle of Objective 16A. We note the inclusion of Method 32 and 'partnering with mana whenua' and Method IE.3	Include Method IE.1 under Objective16A.	Accept
S168.070	Rangitāne O Wairarapa Inc			S168.070	Rangitāne O Wairarapa Inc	Objective 16A	Support	Rangitāne o Wairarapa support giving effect to Te Rito o te Harekeke, noting the above comments which seek the incorporation of a local expression of this concept.	Retain as notified	Accept
S168.070	Rangitāne O Wairarapa Inc	FS31.180	Sustainable Wairarapa Inc	FS31.180	Sustainable Wairarapa Inc	Objective 16A	Support	Kia ora koutou, My name is Ian Gunn, Secretary Sustainable Wairarapa inc. contact # 021567134, address 4B McKay Street, Paraparaumu Beach 5032.	Not stated	Accept

S42A Appendix 2 - HS6 Indigenous Ecosystems - Summary Recommendation Table

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
								<p>Firstly we'd like to state the time frame provided to peruse over 900 pages of submissions is in our opinion an abuse of process. The benefit of further submissions is for you the council to listen and hear the views of its ratepayers. The timeframe in our case does not allow a rigorous review of the original submissions to council. On top of this we are a week before Christmas- a very busy and chaotic time for most members of the community. It is highly likely that the majority of staff will take leave over the Christmas break so analysis of any further submissions will not occur until late January 2023-so why the short period to respond. While there is due process there is also good practise your management of the further submissions fails the good practise model. As a consequence we would like you to note Sustainable Wairarapa's strong support of the original submissions lodged with council by the two Wairarapa Iwi-Ngati Kahungunu and Rangitane. Its clear that there is a poor understanding of nature based solutions this term needs further explanation. Sustainable Wairarapa acknowledges that while nature based solutions offer a wide variety of options its not the only solution. We are heartened by the widespread support for the original document. Thanks for an opportunity to make a further submission. Nga mihi nui Ian Gun</p>		
S30.015	Porirua City Council			S30.015	Porirua City Council	Objective 16B	Oppose	It is unclear what "decision making" refers to. This needs to be better articulated so that it is plan users are able to determine if it is being achieved or not. As worded, it reads more as a policy than an objective. It needs to be reframed so it is clear what the outcome sought to be achieved is.	Amend the objective so that it is clear what the outcomes sought are.	reject
S30.015	Porirua City Council	FS25.048	Peka Peka Farm Limited	FS25.048	Peka Peka Farm Limited	Objective 16B	Support	The submission provides a comprehensive analysis of the proposed change including in relation to matters of scope and jurisdiction. It is supported without prejudice to the specific relief sought in the primary submission or this further submission by Peka Peka Farm Ltd.	Allow	reject
S34.082	Te Kaunihera o Te Awa Kairangi ki Uta, Upper Hutt City Council			S34.082	Te Kaunihera o Te Awa Kairangi ki Uta, Upper Hutt City Council	Objective 16B	Support	Notwithstanding the general comments on waiting for the NPS- IB, we support the need to recognise mana whenua values	Retain provision as notified.	Accept

S42A Appendix 2 - HS6 Indigenous Ecosystems - Summary Recommendation Table

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
S79.010	South Wairarapa District Council			S79.010	South Wairarapa District Council	Objective 16B	Support in part	It is acknowledged that the often- promised National Policy Statement for Indigenous Biodiversity has not yet materialised. However, on the face of the provisions many of the matters within previous exposure drafts have been incorporated. The process managing the changes to the RPS needs to be alive if the proposed NPS does occur.	If the NPS Indigenous Biodiversity gets gazetted prior to further submissions closing at which point we request that GWRC consider an appropriate process to align policy approaches.	Accept
S79.010	South Wairarapa District Council	FS26.022	Meridian Energy Limited	FS26.022	Meridian Energy Limited	Objective 16B	Support in part	SWDC requests that, if the NPS Indigenous Biodiversity gets gazetted prior to further submissions closing, GWRC consider an appropriate process to align policy approaches. Meridian considers it is premature to advance the scope of changes GWRC proposes to the RPS indigenous biodiversity provisions in the absence of settled guidance from a gazetted National Policy Statement, particularly where the proposed RPS changes relate to terrestrial indigenous biodiversity provisions beyond the scope of a freshwater planning instrument. If GWRC's proposed RPS provisions do not give effect to the future NPS-IB, the RPS will need to be amended in any event. Until settled NPS guidance is available, Meridian prefers the amendments requested in its own submission which reflect the provisions in the proposed Natural Resources Plan (recently settled by Environment Court mediation).	Allow in part Allow to the extent of making the amendments requested in Meridian's submission in the interim until any further changes are made, by RPS change or variation, to accommodate the future gazetted NPS-IB.	Accept
S102.054	Te Tumu Paeroa Office of the Māori Trustee			S102.054	Te Tumu Paeroa Office of the Māori Trustee	Objective 16B	Support	Generally supports the objectives in the 'Indigenous ecosystems' chapter.	Retain as notified.	Accept
S115.017	Hutt City Council			S115.017	Hutt City Council	Objective 16B	Oppose	While indigenous biodiversity is a key issue, we expect the government to soon gazette a National Policy Statement on Indigenous Biodiversity ("NPS-IB"). The proposed provisions may well conflict with the NPS-IB especially with regards to the process for identifying indigenous ecosystems. We request that all provisions relating to indigenous biodiversity be deleted and if regional direction is thought necessary after the NPS-IB is gazetted, that should occur through a variation or a separate policy statement change.	Delete all new provisions and amendments to existing provisions and retain existing Operative RPS provisions.	reject
S115.017	Hutt City Council	FS27.011	Winstone Aggregates	FS27.011	Winstone Aggregates	Objective 16B	Support	Winstone supports the submission by HCC seeking new or amended provisions in Objective 16A in a	Allow	reject

S42A Appendix 2 - HS6 Indigenous Ecosystems - Summary Recommendation Table

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
								manner consistent with the NPS-IB when gazetted or similar for the reasons set out Winstones submission.		
S115.017	Hutt City Council	FS10.013	BP Oil NZ Ltd Mobil Oil NZ Ltd and Z Energy Ltd (the Fuel Companies)	FS10.013	BP Oil NZ Ltd Mobil Oil NZ Ltd and Z Energy Ltd (the Fuel Companies)	Objective 16B	Support	Agree with concern raised that the appropriateness of the Change 1 provisions relating to indigenous biodiversity is uncertain, until such time as the NPS-IB is gazetted, and that the existing Operative RPS provisions should be retained. Any change to provisions relating to indigenous biodiversity should be made only after gazettal of the NPS-IB.	Allow the submission and delete all new provisions and amendments to existing provisions relating to indigenous biodiversity and retain existing Operative RPS provisions.	reject
S115.017	Hutt City Council	FS24.0010	Powerco Limited	FS24.0010	Powerco Limited	Objective 16B	Support	Agree with concern raised that the appropriateness of the Change 1 provisions relating to indigenous biodiversity is uncertain, until such time as the NPS-IB is gazetted, and that the existing Operative RPS provisions should be retained. Any change to provisions relating to indigenous biodiversity should be made only after gazettal of the NPS-IB.	Allow the submission and delete all new provisions and amendments to existing provisions relating to indigenous biodiversity and retain existing Operative RPS provisions.	reject
S131.033	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust			S131.033	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	Objective 16B	Support in part	Ātiawa seeks that consistent reference to ecosystems rather than biodiversity is applied to Objective 16B. Ātiawa seeks that reference to support and resourcing is included, it is a significant part of the relationship between local government and mana whenua under Te Tiriti to provide equitable outcomes for mana whenua/tangata whenua. Without adequate support and resourcing mana whenua/tangata whenua are limited in their ability to participate in decision-making, which includes exercising kaitiakitanga.	Placeholder Objective 16B Mana Whenua/tangata whenua values relating to indigenous biodiversity ecosystems, particularly taonga species and the important relationship between indigenous ecosystem health and well-being, are given effect to in decision-making and mana whenua/tangata whenua are enabled to exercise their kaitiakitanga through adequate support and resourcing are supported to exercise their kaitiakitanga for indigenous biodiversity.	reject
S131.033	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	FS29.304	Ngā Hapu o Otaki	FS29.304	Ngā Hapu o Otaki	Objective 16B	Support	Co -design under a treaty house model is about shaping plans and resource management avenues alongside manawhenua that appropriately recognise the intergenerational prosperity of the uri of Ngā Hapu o Otaki and the wider community. There are ongoing concerns Ngā Hapu o Otaki maintain with GWRC in regard to the policies addressing Co-governance, Co-management, Co-leadership and Co-collabroative operational processes. This submission goes to great length to define where	Not stated	reject

S42A Appendix 2 - HS6 Indigenous Ecosystems - Summary Recommendation Table

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
								and how further considerations can be made recognising the interconnected nature of matauranga maori, the inequitable impact environmental decline will have on mana whenua/tangata whenua and offers insight to the intuitive and inherent awareness manawhenua need to maintain to ensure our intergenerational survival and prosperity. 3.4 Freshwater including Public Access – Support in Principal 3.6 Indigenous Ecosystems – Support in Principal 3.9 Regional Form, Design and Function – Support in Principal Ātiawa views regarding Freshwater, indigenous ecosystems and Regional design and function resonate with insights Ngā Hapu o Otaki maintain. Ngā Hapu o Otaki would like opportunity to speak further to such views during the hearing process. We share Ātiawas concerns for Mātauranga Māori as a foundation for equitable interchange of decision making. Their concerns regarding intensification and the further degradation of taonga across our coastline rings true to the ongoing journey we are on as manawhenua facing intense growth for the coming generation. We seek to join the conversation and endorse provisions that will see our whanaunga and other manawhenua groups recognise their environmental resilience and the cultural agility our shared whakapapa offers.		
S133.018	Muaūpoko Tribal Authority			S133.018	Muaūpoko Tribal Authority	Objective 16B	Support in part	Supports the maintenance, enhancement and restoration of indigenous ecosystems and the acknowledgement of the roles of tangata whenua, including Muaūpoko and landowners.	Include specific referenceto Muaūpoko's relationship with indigenous ecosystems. OR Alternative relief that maybe necessary or appropriate to ensure Muaūpoko's connection to Te-Whanganui-a-Tarais recognised.	reject
S133.018	Muaūpoko Tribal Authority	FS6.049	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira on behalf of Ngāti Toa Rangatira	FS6.049	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira on behalf of Ngāti Toa Rangatira	Objective 16B	Oppose	We oppose this submission because as Muaūpoko claims are inappropriate. This not only causes confusion around which iwi are Tangata Whenua in Te Whanganui a Tara rohe and which iwi to engage with, but also portrays a false perception of who the mana whenua are, which is also inappropriate.	Disallow We seek that this part of the submission is disallowed.	Accept
S133.018	Muaūpoko Tribal Authority	FS20.365	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	FS20.365	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	Objective 16B	Oppose	Ātiawa vehemently oppose the submission and claims made by Muaūpoko Tribal Authority. The assertions made by Muāupoko Tribal Authority are categorically incorrect and highly offensive to Ātiawa	Disallow the whole submission	Accept in part

S42A Appendix 2 - HS6 Indigenous Ecosystems - Summary Recommendation Table

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
								<p>ki Whakarongotai. While Muaūpoko may have historical associations with Te Whanganui-a-Tara and Kāpiti. These associations are recognised as historical only. Ātiawa refer to the evidence provided by Ngārongo Iwikatea Nicholson in support of Ngāti Toarangatira's claims which were upheld and settled by the Crown. Pages 26-34 sets out the extinguishment of Muaūpoko rights in our rohe. From both a tikanga Māori perspective and a Crown law perspective, Muaūpoko do not hold mana whenua (including for the purposes of the Resource Management Act). There is therefore no basis for Muaūpoko Tribal Authority to be recognised as being kaitiaki in the rohe; to do so would be incomprehensible and irreconcilable to Ātiawa, and more generally an affront to tikanga Māori. Muaūpoko Tribal Authority have cited Te Kāhui Māngai mapping as evidence of the spatial extent that they exercise kaitiakitanga. This in itself evidences the lack of basis to their claims, in that Te Kāhui Māngai map simply reflects claims made by Māori groups, and from our previous inquiry to Te Puni Kōkiri who are responsible for this map, we learned that Muaūpoko Tribal Authority included that spatial extent in their Agreement in Principle. Agreements in Principle provide claimants the opportunity to set out everything that a claimant wants from the Crown. They have no legal effect and are therefore not legally recognised. We strongly advise the Council to remain conscious that it is not appropriate for regional planning processes to be exploited in the manner suggested by the Muaūpoko Tribal Authority, that dealing with the false claims of groups like these must be left to the Crown, and that settlements must not pre-empted. Whilst Muaūpoko Tribal Authority may wish to seek out new territories through online maps, this is not of course how mana whenua is gained or held. We remain as ahi kā and mana whenua on the land, as we have undisturbed for over 198 years.</p>		
S140.020	Wellington City Council (WCC)			S140.020	Wellington City Council (WCC)	Objective 16B	Support	Support as proposed.	Retain as notified	Accept
S147.030	Wellington Fish and Game Council			S147.030	Wellington Fish and Game Council	Objective 16B	Support in part	Support the intention of this objective to ensure that mana whenua/tangata whenua values are properly recognised and provided for in decision-making and	Amend. Mana whenua/tangata whenua values relating to	reject

S42A Appendix 2 - HS6 Indigenous Ecosystems - Summary Recommendation Table

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
								their role as kaitiaki is supported. At the same time, to give full effect to the NPS-FM, those values must be considered alongside other recognised values and achieved in partnership with statutory managers of freshwater species and their habitats.	indigenous biodiversity, particularly taonga species, and the important relationship between indigenous ecosystem health and well-being, are recognised and provided for in decision making. Mana whenua/tangata whenua are supported to exercise their kaitiakitanga for indigenous biodiversity within a wider framework of equal weighting given to community values around indigenous and valued introduced biodiversity.	
S147.030	Wellington Fish and Game Council	FS20.146	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	FS20.146	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	Objective 16B	Oppose in part	As Treaty Partners, Ātiawa do not support the submission point which seeks to provide community values, and introduced biodiversity equal weighting to indigenous biodiversity. It is evident that indigenous ecosystems must be provided with the greatest protection. To accept the relief sought by the submitter would be contrary to Te Tiriti o Waitangi and national resource management direction.	Disallow in part Disallow the relief sought that references: "within a wider framework of equal weighting given to community values around indigenous and valued biodiversity".	Accept
S147.030	Wellington Fish and Game Council	FS19.094	Wellington Water Ltd ("Wellington Water")	FS19.094	Wellington Water Ltd ("Wellington Water")	Objective 16B	Oppose	It is unnecessary and redundant to recreate NPSFM policies within the RPS. Most of the amendments sought do not in any event properly reflect the NPSFM. In particular, they do not accurately reflect the proviso to Policy 7, the requirements of clause 3.22, the limitation of Policy 10 to trout and salmon only, and the subservience of Policy 10 to Policy 9. Some of the amendments attempt to address matters that are already adequately covered by extant provisions or PC1 as notified. Some of the amendments undermine the more detailed content of PC1.	Disallow	Accept
S147.030	Wellington Fish and Game Council	FS30.199	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Ltd	FS30.199	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Ltd	Objective 16B	Oppose	B+LNZ generally oppose the submission on the grounds that's B+LNZ are seeking changes of the plan change are restricted to those necessary to give effect to the National Policy Statement for Urban Development and that any other matters should be subject to proper review in the Schedule full review of the RPS in 2024 and in the scheduled reviews of	Disallow That the submission be disallowed with the exception of 147.007	Accept in part

S42A Appendix 2 - HS6 Indigenous Ecosystems - Summary Recommendation Table

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
								the Natural Resources Plan in 2023 and 2024. This is because the changes materially impact on communities, including rural communities and we do not consider that the necessary engagement has been undertaken to adequately inform these provisions or to meet the requirements of Part 3.2 of the NPS-FM. Furthermore, there is a risk that including matters relating to climate change and indigenous biodiversity before key national legislation is gazetted is premature and will lead to the inefficient implementation and confusion amongst those who it impacts materially.		
S163.032	Wairarapa Federated Farmers			S163.032	Wairarapa Federated Farmers	Objective 16B	Oppose	Defer to the full review of the RPS in 2024.	That Objective 16B be deleted. Delete the FW icon	Accept in part
S163.032	Wairarapa Federated Farmers	FS7.076	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society (Forest & Bird)	FS7.076	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society (Forest & Bird)	Objective 16B	Oppose	It is completely appropriate to include climate change, biodiversity and freshwater provisions in the plan change. This plan change creates efficiency by considering multiple policy directives from central government. The amendments sought by Federated Farmers fail to give effect to the NPSFM, the NPS for Indigenous Biodiversity, for which there is an exposure draft and the final version is due out this month, and do not achieve the purpose of the RMA or the Climate Change Response (Zero Carbon) Amendment Act 2019.	Disallow whole submission	Accept in part
S163.032	Wairarapa Federated Farmers	FS20.198	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	FS20.198	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	Objective 16B	Oppose	Ātiawa oppose the entire submission by Wairarapa Federated Farmers. The relief sought by Federated Farmers is to effectively delete the entire proposed plan change (except for submission points S163.083, S163.084). The basis for deleting the proposed plan change is to delay decision-making. Ātiawa do not accept that delaying responding to national direction is an appropriate course of action, and will further compound environmental and resource management issues.	Disallow the entire submission by Wairarapa Federated Farmers.	Accept in part
S163.032	Wairarapa Federated Farmers	FS29.049	Ngā Hapu o Otaki	FS29.049	Ngā Hapu o Otaki	Objective 16B	Oppose	Section 18, page 4: General Comments – OPPOSE Section 25, Page 5 Going Forward – OPPOSE It is disheartening to see that Wairarapa Federated Farmers aren't capable of recognizing the obligations GWRC must maintain with Treaty Partners. It must be understood that Manawhenua are not simply 'groups of people' but a representation of the signatories that signed the Treaty of Waitangi and the original kaitiaki and custodians of the taonga in question when	Not stated	Accept in part

S42A Appendix 2 - HS6 Indigenous Ecosystems - Summary Recommendation Table

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
								considering how these plan changes are implemented. Wairarapa Federated Farmers indicate a lack of awareness to the value of manawhenua engagement. Their stated 'aspirations of delivering environmental improvements alongside a thriving bio-economy' aren't feasible without considering the intergenerational insight and technical direction that only Mātauranga Māori can offer.		
S163.032	Wairarapa Federated Farmers	FS30.105	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Ltd	FS30.105	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Ltd	Objective 16B	Support	B+LNZ agree that the scope of RPS PC1 should be restricted to those changes necessary to give effect to the National Policy Statement for Urban Development and that any other matters should be subject to proper review in the Schedule full review of the RPS in 2024 and in the scheduled reviews of the Natural Resources Plan in 2023 and 2024. Where alternative relief is provided, B+LNZ generally support this relief.	Allow	reject
S165.024	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society (Forest & Bird)			S165.024	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society (Forest & Bird)	Objective 16B	Support	This objective is appropriate.	Retain	Accept
S165.024	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society (Forest & Bird)	FS30.319	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Ltd	FS30.319	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Ltd	Objective 16B	Oppose	B+LNZ generally oppose the submission on the grounds that's B+LNZ are seeking changes of the plan change are restricted to those necessary to give effect to the National Policy Statement for Urban Development and that any other matters should be subject to proper review in the Schedule full review of the RPS in 2024 and in the scheduled reviews of the Natural Resources Plan in 2023 and 2024. This is because the changes materially impact on communities, including rural communities and we do not consider that the necessary engagement has been undertaken to adequately inform these provisions or to meet the requirements of Part 3.2 of the NPS-FM. Furthermore, there is a risk that including matters relating to climate change and indigenous biodiversity before key national legislation is gazetted or implemented is premature and will lead to the inefficient implementation and confusion amongst those who it impacts materially.	Disallow	reject

S42A Appendix 2 - HS6 Indigenous Ecosystems - Summary Recommendation Table

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
S166.014	Masterton District Council			S166.014	Masterton District Council	Objective 16B	Support	Agree that mana whenua / tangata whenua values are given effect to in decision making and they are supported to exercise their kaitiakitanga for indigenous biodiversity.	Retain as notified.	Accept
S167.039	Taranaki Whānui			S167.039	Taranaki Whānui	Objective 16B	Support in part	Taranaki Whānui support the principle of Objective 16B. It is important to note that the implementation of this objective will require adequate resourcing.	Amend the provision to read: ..., and mana whenua / tangata whenua are supported and resourced to exercise their kaitiakitanga for indigenous biodiversity.	reject
S167.039	Taranaki Whānui	FS6.025	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira on behalf of Ngāti Toa Rangatira	FS6.025	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira on behalf of Ngāti Toa Rangatira	Objective 16B	Support	We support this submission as the suggested amendments support resourcing mana whenua/ tangata whenua which will be very valuable for exercising kaitiakitanga and building the capacity to protect indigenous biodiversity.	Allow	reject
S168.069	Rangitāne O Wairarapa Inc			S168.069	Rangitāne O Wairarapa Inc	Objective 16B	Support	Rangitāne o Wairarapa support the acknowledgment of the special relationship of mana whenua/tangata whenua with indigenous ecosystem health and wellbeing in this policy	Retain as notified	Accept
FS31.179	Sustainable Wairarapa Inc	FS31.179	Sustainable Wairarapa Inc	FS31.179	Sustainable Wairarapa Inc	Objective 16B	Support	Kia ora koutou, My name is Ian Gunn, Secretary Sustainable Wairarapa inc. contact # 021567134, address 4B McKay Street, Paraparaumu Beach 5032. Firstly we'd like to state the time frame provided to peruse over 900 pages of submissions is in our opinion an abuse of process. The benefit of further submissions is for you the council to listen and hear the views of its ratepayers. The timeframe in our case does not allow a rigorous review of the original submissions to council. On top of this we are a week before Christmas- a very busy and chaotic time for most members of the community. It is highly likely that the majority of staff will take leave over the Christmas break so analysis of any further submissions will not occur until late January 2023-so why the short period to respond. While there is due process there is also good practise your management of the further submissions fails the good practise model. As a consequence we would like you to note Sustainable Wairarapa's strong support of the original submissions lodged with council by the two Wairarapa Iwi-Ngati Kahungunu and Rangitane. Its clear that there is a poor understanding of nature based solutions this term needs further explanation. Sustainable Wairarapa acknowledges that while nature based solutions offer a wide variety of options	Not stated	Accept

S42A Appendix 2 - HS6 Indigenous Ecosystems - Summary Recommendation Table

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
								its not the only solution. We are heartened by the widespread support for the original document. Thanks for an opportunity to make a further submission. Nga mihi nui Ian Gun		
S170.017	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	S170.017	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira on behalf of Ngāti Toa Rangatira	S170.017	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	Objective 16B	Support	Objective 16B is supported specifically recognising Mana Whenua values relating to indigenous biodiversity and these values are given effect to in decision-making and the roles of mana whenua as kaitiaki are supported and resourced. The use of Policy IE.2 and Policy IE.3 is also fundamental to achieve this objective.	Retain as notified.	Accept
S170.017	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	FS29.131	Ngā Hapu o Otaki	FS29.131	Ngā Hapu o Otaki	Objective 16B	Support	Co -design under a treaty house model is about shaping plans and resource management avenues alongside manawhenua that appropriately recognise the intergenerational prosperity of the uri of Ngā Hapu o Otaki and the wider community. There are ongoing concerns Ngā Hapu o Otaki maintain with GWRC in regard to the policies addressing Co-governance, Co-management, Co-leadership and Co-collabroative operational processes. This submission goes to great length to define where and how further considerations can be made recognising the interconnected nature of matauranga maori, the inequitable impact environmental decline will have on mana whenua/tangata whenua and offers insight to the intuitive and inherent awareness manawhenua need to maintain to ensure our intergenerational survival and prosperity. Objective 3: Lack of mana whenua / tangata whenua involvement in decision making – Support in principal FW Kaitiakitanga O1, O2, O3 – Support in principal Wai Mate O1,O2,O3 - Support in principal Climate Change and Freshwater objectives, CCFW-01, CCFW-02, CCFW-03, CCFW-04, CCFW-05, CCFW-06 This submission appropriately articulates Kaitiakitanga, FW objectives regarding Climate Change, Wai mate, Wai ora and the lack of provisions to see balanced decision making between Treaty Partners. Ngā Hapu o Otaki support Te Runanga o Toa Rangatira expression and wish to speak further to such views during the hearing process. We have serious concerns for the degradation of our taonga, in particular our wai. This combined with the projected growth the next generation will see means manawhenua resilience and agility to climate grief	Not stated	Accept

S42A Appendix 2 - HS6 Indigenous Ecosystems - Summary Recommendation Table

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
								and environmental decline is paramount. Ngā Hapu o Otaki seek to support our whanaunga and other Manawhenua groups to build the provisions we will need to solidify our Tino Rangatiratanga and ensure our intergenerational prosperity.		
S16.061	Kāpiti Coast District Council			S16.061	Kāpiti Coast District Council	Objective 16C	Support	Council supports the recognition of the steward role that landowners and communities play in maintaining, enhancing and restoring indigenous biodiversity.	Retain	Awaiting recommendation
S30.016	Porirua City Council			S30.016	Porirua City Council	Objective 16C	Oppose	It is unclear how or where these values are to be "recognised and provided for". This needs to be better articulated so that it is plan users are able to determine if it is being achieved or not.	Amend the objective so that it is clear what the outcomes sought are.	reject
S30.016	Porirua City Council	FS25.049	Peka Peka Farm Limited	FS25.049	Peka Peka Farm Limited	Objective 16C	Support	The submission provides a comprehensive analysis of the proposed change including in relation to matters of scope and jurisdiction. It is supported without prejudice to the specific relief sought in the primary submission or this further submission by Peka Peka Farm Ltd.	Allow	reject
S34.085	Te Kaunihera o Te Awa Kairangi ki Uta, Upper Hutt City Council			S34.085	Te Kaunihera o Te Awa Kairangi ki Uta, Upper Hutt City Council	Objective 16C	Oppose in part	Council supports and recognises the role of landowners and the community; however, it is unclear how conflicting values and requirements will work in practice to balance and management expectation. Council considers this is inappropriate at this time	Delete indigenous biodiversity provisions until the NPS-IB is gazetted.	reject
S79.011	South Wairarapa District Council			S79.011	South Wairarapa District Council	Objective 16C	Support in part	Where additional materials intended to be used for regulatory and non- regulatory processes are developed is appropriate and necessary that all stakeholders are included.	Retain as notified If the NPS Indigenous Biodiversity gets gazetted prior to further submissions closing at which point we request that GWRC consider an appropriate process to align policy approaches.	Accept
S79.011	South Wairarapa District Council	FS26.023	Meridian Energy Limited	FS26.023	Meridian Energy Limited	Objective 16C	Support in part	SWDC requests that, if the NPS Indigenous Biodiversity gets gazetted prior to further submissions closing, GWRC consider an appropriate process to align policy approaches. Meridian considers it is premature to advance the scope of changes GWRC proposes to the RPS indigenous biodiversity provisions in the absence of settled guidance from a gazetted National Policy Statement, particularly where the proposed RPS changes relate to terrestrial indigenous biodiversity provisions beyond the scope of a freshwater planning	Allow to the extent of making the amendments requested in Meridian's submission in the interim until any further changes are made, by RPS change or variation, to accommodate the future gazetted NPS-IB.	Accept

S42A Appendix 2 - HS6 Indigenous Ecosystems - Summary Recommendation Table

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
								instrument. If GWRC's proposed RPS provisions do not give effect to the future NPS-IB, the RPS will need to be amended in any event. Until settled NPS guidance is available, Meridian prefers the amendments requested in its own submission which reflect the provisions in the proposed Natural Resources Plan (recently settled by Environment Court mediation).		
S102.055	Te Tumu Paeroa Office of the Māori Trustee			S102.055	Te Tumu Paeroa Office of the Māori Trustee	Objective 16C	Support	Generally supports the objectives in the 'Indigenous ecosystems' chapter.	Retain as notified.	Accept
S115.018	Hutt City Council			S115.018	Hutt City Council	Objective 16C	Oppose	While indigenous biodiversity is a key issue, we expect the government to soon gazette a National Policy Statement on Indigenous Biodiversity ("NPS-IB"). The proposed provisions may well conflict with the NPS-IB especially with regards to the process for identifying indigenous ecosystems. We request that all provisions relating to indigenous biodiversity be deleted and if regional direction is thought necessary after the NPS-IB is gazetted, that should occur through a variation or a separate policy statement change.	Delete all new provisions and amendments to existing provisions and retain existing Operative RPS provisions.	reject
S115.018	Hutt City Council	FS10.014	BP Oil NZ Ltd Mobil Oil NZ Ltd and Z Energy Ltd (the Fuel Companies)	FS10.014	BP Oil NZ Ltd Mobil Oil NZ Ltd and Z Energy Ltd (the Fuel Companies)	Objective 16C	Support	Agree with concern raised that the appropriateness of the Change 1 provisions relating to indigenous biodiversity is uncertain, until such time as the NPS-IB is gazetted, and that the existing Operative RPS provisions should be retained. Any change to provisions relating to indigenous biodiversity should be made only after gazettal of the NPS-IB.	Allow the submission and delete all new provisions and amendments to existing provisions relating to indigenous biodiversity and retain existing Operative RPS provisions.	reject
S115.018	Hutt City Council	FS24.011	Powerco Limited	FS24.011	Powerco Limited	Objective 16C	Support	Agree with concern raised that the appropriateness of the Change 1 provisions relating to indigenous biodiversity is uncertain, until such time as the NPS-IB is gazetted, and that the existing Operative RPS provisions should be retained. Any change to provisions relating to indigenous biodiversity should be made only after gazettal of the NPS-IB.	Allow the submission and delete all new provisions and amendments to existing provisions relating to indigenous biodiversity and retain existing Operative RPS provisions.	reject
S133.019	Muaūpoko Tribal Authority			S133.019	Muaūpoko Tribal Authority	Objective 16C	Support in part	Supports the maintenance, enhancement and restoration of indigenous ecosystems and the acknowledgement of the roles of tangata whenua, including Muaūpoko and landowners.	Include specific referenceto Muaūpoko's relationship with indigenous ecosystems. OR Alternative relief that maybe necessary or appropriate to ensure Muaūpoko's	reject

S42A Appendix 2 - HS6 Indigenous Ecosystems - Summary Recommendation Table

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
									connection to Te-Whanganui-a-Tarais recognised.	
S133.019	Muaūpoko Tribal Authority	FS6.050	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira on behalf of Ngāti Toa Rangatira	FS6.050	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira on behalf of Ngāti Toa Rangatira	Objective 16C	Oppose	We oppose this submission because as Muaūpoko claims are inappropriate. This not only causes confusion around which iwi are Tangata Whenua in Te Whanganui a Tara rohe and which iwi to engage with, but also portrays a false perception of who the mana whenua are, which is also inappropriate.	Disallow We seek that this part of the submission is disallowed.	Accept
S133.019	Muaūpoko Tribal Authority	FS20.366	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	FS20.366	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	Objective 16C	Oppose	Ātiawa vehemently oppose the submission and claims made by Muaūpoko Tribal Authority. The assertions made by Muāupoko Tribal Authority are categorically incorrect and highly offensive to Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai. While Muaūpoko may have historical associations with Te Whanganui-a-Tara and Kāpiti. These associations are recognised as historical only. Ātiawa refer to the evidence provided by Ngārongo Iwikatea Nicholson in support of Ngāti Toarangatira's claims which were upheld and settled by the Crown. Pages 26-34 sets out the extinguishment of Muaūpoko rights in our rohe. From both a tikanga Māori perspective and a Crown law perspective, Muaūpoko do not hold mana whenua (including for the purposes of the Resource Management Act). There is therefore no basis for Muaūpoko Tribal Authority to be recognised as being kaitiaki in the rohe; to do so would be incomprehensible and irreconcilable to Ātiawa, and more generally an affront to tikanga Māori. Muaūpoko Tribal Authority have cited Te Kāhui Māngai mapping as evidence of the spatial extent that they exercise kaitiakitanga. This in itself evidences the lack of basis to their claims, in that Te Kāhui Māngai map simply reflects claims made by Māori groups, and from our previous inquiry to Te Puni Kōkiri who are responsible for this map, we learned that Muaūpoko Tribal Authority included that spatial extent in their Agreement in Principle. Agreements in Principle provide claimants the opportunity to set out everything that a claimant wants from the Crown. They have no legal effect and are therefore not legally recognised. We strongly advise the Council to remain conscious that it is not appropriate for regional planning processes to be exploited in the manner suggested by the Muaūpoko Tribal Authority, that dealing with the false claims of groups like these must be left to the Crown, and that	Disallow Disallow the whole submission	Accept in part

S42A Appendix 2 - HS6 Indigenous Ecosystems - Summary Recommendation Table

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
								settlements must not pre-empted. Whilst Muaūpoko Tribal Authority may wish to seek out new territories through online maps, this is not of course how mana whenua is gained or held. We remain as ahi kā and mana whenua on the land, as we have undisturbed for over 198 years.		
S136.008	DairyNZ			S136.008	DairyNZ	Objective 16C	Oppose in part	Support the intention to recognise and support landowners, as with the other objectives relating to biodiversity we believe an objective of this nature should be considered through a full review of the RPS. Also concerned at the use of the word 'steward'. This infers a responsibility of landowners to deliver 'community values' with no clarity around what this may mean in a practical sense. Dairy farmers hold a significant amount of land and therefore indigenous ecosystems. Needs to ensure that the RPS provides opportunity for farming to continue as a viable operation while working with farmers. The wording of this objective should reflect this intent, without unduly inferring a responsibility on farmers as solely responsible for delivering on community values.	Delete Objective and address the issue through a full review of the RPS OR Amended objective 16C as follows (or words to similar effect): Landowner and community values in relation to indigenous biodiversity are recognised and provided for. Landowners are engaged with, recognised and their roles as stewards are supported.	reject
S136.008	DairyNZ	FS30.014	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Ltd	FS30.014	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Ltd	Objective 16C	Support	B+LNZ supports the withdrawal of PC1 provisions relating to indigenous biodiversity and redrafting once the NPS-IB has been gazetted.	Allow	Awaiting recommendation
S140.021	Wellington City Council (WCC)			S140.021	Wellington City Council (WCC)	Objective 16C	Support	Support as proposed.	Retain as notified.	Accept
S165.025	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society (Forest & Bird)			S165.025	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society (Forest & Bird)	Objective 16C	Support	This objective is appropriate.	Retain.	Accept
S165.025	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society (Forest & Bird)	FS20.065	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	FS20.065	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	Objective 16C	Support in part	Ātiawa support Objective 16C and the intention to recognise and provide landowner and community values, provided that the Council's relationship with mana whenua is upheld and supported in regards to Te Tiriti o Waitangi.	Allow	Accept

S42A Appendix 2 - HS6 Indigenous Ecosystems - Summary Recommendation Table

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
S165.025	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society (Forest & Bird)	FS30.319	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Ltd	FS30.319	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Ltd	Objective 16C	Oppose	B+LNZ generally oppose the submission on the grounds that's B+LNZ are seeking changes of the plan change are restricted to those necessary to give effect to the National Policy Statement for Urban Development and that any other matters should be subject to proper review in the Schedule full review of the RPS in 2024 and in the scheduled reviews of the Natural Resources Plan in 2023 and 2024. This is because the changes materially impact on communities, including rural communities and we do not consider that the necessary engagement has been undertaken to adequately inform these provisions or to meet the requirements of Part 3.2 of the NPS-FM. Furthermore, there is a risk that including matters relating to climate change and indigenous biodiversity before key national legislation is gazetted or implemented is premature and will lead to the inefficient implementation and confusion amongst those who it impacts materially.	Disallow	reject
S166.015	Masterton District Council			S166.015	Masterton District Council	Objective 16C	Support in part	Agree with proposed content, but on the proviso that this objective is not to the detriment of mana whenua/tangata whenua values as per Objective 16B.	Retain as notified. However: Further clarity required to ascertain whether this objective has any impacts on Objective 16B.	Accept in part
S167.040	Taranaki Whānui			S167.040	Taranaki Whānui	Objective 16C	Support	Taranaki Whānui support Objective 16.	Retain as notified.	Accept
S168.071	Rangitāne O Wairarapa Inc			S168.071	Rangitāne O Wairarapa Inc	Objective 16C	Support	Rangitāne o Wairarapa support the acknowledgment of the role of landowners, as well as the separation of Objectives 16B and 16C, to ensure that the special relationship that mana whenua/tangata whenua have with indigenous ecosystem health is recognised.	Retain as notified	Accept
S168.071	Sustainable Wairarapa Inc	FS31.181	Sustainable Wairarapa Inc	FS31.181	Sustainable Wairarapa Inc	Objective 16C	Support	Kia ora koutou, My name is Ian Gunn, Secretary Sustainable Wairarapa inc. contact # 021567134, address 4B McKay Street, Paraparaumu Beach 5032. Firstly we'd like to state the time frame provided to peruse over 900 pages of submissions is in our opinion an abuse of process. The benefit of further submissions is for you the council to listen and hear the views of its ratepayers. The timeframe in our case does not allow a rigorous review of the original submissions to council. On top of this we are a week before Christmas- a very busy and chaotic time for most members of the community. It is highly likely that the majority of staff will take leave over the	Not stated	Accept

S42A Appendix 2 - HS6 Indigenous Ecosystems - Summary Recommendation Table

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
								Christmas break so analysis of any further submissions will not occur until late January 2023-so why the short period to respond. While there is due process there is also good practise your management of the further submissions fails the good practise model. As a consequence we would like you to note Sustainable Wairarapa's strong support of the original submissions lodged with council by the two Wairarapa Iwi-Ngati Kahungunu and Rangitane. Its clear that there is a poor understanding of nature based solutions this term needs further explanation. Sustainable Wairarapa acknowledges that while nature based solutions offer a wide variety of options its not the only solution. We are heartened by the widespread support for the original document. Thanks for an opportunity to make a further submission. Nga mihi nui lan Gun		
S129.022	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency			S129.022	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	Table 6(a)	Support	Generally supports the intent of Policy 24 but seeks that the wording is consistent with the exposure draft of the National Policy Statement for Indigenous Biodiversity.	Amend Policy 24 as follows: Protecting , Managing indigenous ecosystems and habitats with significant indigenous biodiversity values - district and regional plans	reject
S129.022	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	FS20.102	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	FS20.102	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	Table 6(a)	Oppose	Ātiawa oppose these submission point, the rationale is incorrect - the draft NPS-IB sets out that (in many clauses) that indigenous biodiversity must be protected. Given the extent of the loss of indigenous biodiversity it would be inappropriate to only manage the remnants, there must be conscious action (including strong policy direction) to protect, restore and enhance indigenous biodiversity.	Disallow	Accept
S163.029	Wairarapa Federated Farmers			S163.029	Wairarapa Federated Farmers	Table 6(a)	Oppose	Defer to the full review of the RPS in 2024.	Delete Table 6A OR Amend objectives and policies in Table 6A as per details in submission and make consequential amendments to related methods. Delete FW icons	Accept in part
S163.029	Wairarapa Federated Farmers	FS7.073	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society (Forest & Bird)	FS7.073	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society (Forest & Bird)	Table 6(a)	Oppose	It is completely appropriate to include climate change, biodiversity and freshwater provisions in the plan change. This plan change creates efficiency by considering multiple policy directives from central government. The amendments sought by Federated Farmers fail to give effect to the NPSFM, the NPS for	Disallow whole submission	Accept in part

S42A Appendix 2 - HS6 Indigenous Ecosystems - Summary Recommendation Table

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
								Indigenous Biodiversity, for which there is an exposure draft and the final version is due out this month, and do not achieve the purpose of the RMA or the Climate Change Response (Zero Carbon) Amendment Act 2019.		
S163.029	Wairarapa Federated Farmers	FS20.195	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	FS20.195	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	Table 6(a)	Oppose	Ātiawa oppose the entire submission by Wairarapa Federated Farmers. The relief sought by Federated Farmers is to effectively delete the entire proposed plan change (except for submission points S163.083, S163.084). The basis for deleting the proposed plan change is to delay decision-making. Ātiawa do not accept that delaying responding to national direction is an appropriate course of action, and will further compound environmental and resource management issues.	Disallow the entire submission by Wairarapa Federated Farmers.	Accept in part
S163.029	Wairarapa Federated Farmers	FS29.046	Ngā Hapu o Otaki	FS29.046	Ngā Hapu o Otaki	Table 6(a)	Oppose	Section 18, page 4: General Comments – OPPOSE Section 25, Page 5 Going Forward – OPPOSE It is disheartening to see that Wairarapa Federated Farmers aren't capable of recognizing the obligations GWRC must maintain with Treaty Partners. It must be understood that Manawhenua are not simply 'groups of people' but a representation of the signatories that signed the Treaty of Waitangi and the original kaitiaki and custodians of the taonga in question when considering how these plan changes are implemented. Wairarapa Federated Farmers indicate a lack of awareness to the value of manawhenua engagement. Their stated 'aspirations of delivering environmental improvements alongside a thriving bio-economy' aren't feasible without considering the intergenerational insight and technical direction that only Mātauranga Māori can offer.	Not stated	Accept in part
S163.029	Wairarapa Federated Farmers	FS30.102	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Ltd	FS30.102	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Ltd	Table 6(a)	Support	B+LNZ agree that the scope of RPS PC1 should be restricted to those changes necessary to give effect to the National Policy Statement for Urban Development and that any other matters should be subject to proper review in the Schedule full review of the RPS in 2024 and in the scheduled reviews of the Natural Resources Plan in 2023 and 2024. Where alternative relief is provided, B+LNZ generally support this relief.	Allow	reject
S167.041	Taranaki Whānui			S167.041	Taranaki Whānui	Table 6(a)	Support in part	Updated the table to include the amendments suggested by Taranaki Whānui	Updated the table to include the amendments requested to Objective 16A and 16B.	Accept

S42A Appendix 2 - HS6 Indigenous Ecosystems - Summary Recommendation Table

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
S11.016	Outdoor Bliss Heather Blissett			S11.016	Outdoor Bliss Heather Blissett	Policy 23: Identifying indigenous ecosystems and habitats with significant indigenous biodiversity values - district and regional plans	Oppose in part	Policy if they still exhibit the ecosystem functions which are considered significant by mana whenua/tangata whenua. 30 June 2025 is plenty of time for current landowners to destroy evidence that their land exhibits the ecosystem functions. Eg. Mangaroa Wetlands. What about resistance from landowners which currently exist.	Consider timeframe to implement policy and associated risks.	Accept in part
S16.066	Kāpiti Coast District Council			S16.066	Kāpiti Coast District Council	Policy 23: Identifying indigenous ecosystems and habitats with significant indigenous biodiversity values - district and regional plans	Support in part	Council opposes the suggested introduction of a date by which city and district councils are to identify and evaluate indigenous ecosystems and habitats with significant indigenous biodiversity values. With the anticipated gazettal of the NPS-IB it is inappropriate for the RPS to include arbitrary dates that may conflict with the requirements of the future NPS-IB. The RPS and district plans will need to be amended in accordance with the requirements of the NPS- IB once it comes into law in its final form. Councils supports the introduction of mana whenua into the policy as this provides clarify for city and district councils on who is to be involved in plan changes, however we oppose the retention of tangata whenua as the literal translation of this term means people of the land. We consider this does not provide councils with any direction on who should be involved in giving effect to the policy (and all other objectives and policies in RPS Change 1 where this term is used).	Delete proposed insertion of the deadline for giving effect to the policy. Retain references to mana whenua. Delete references to tangata whenua.	reject
S25.027	Carterton District Council			S25.027	Carterton District Council	Policy 23: Identifying indigenous ecosystems and habitats with significant indigenous biodiversity values - district and regional plans	Oppose	CDC opposes the amendment to this policy requiring that indigenous ecosystems and habitats are identified by June 2025. This policy appears to be pre-empting the forthcoming National Policy Statement for Indigenous Biodiversity (NPS-IB). CDC considers that any amendments giving effect to the NPS-IB should be addressed in a separate plan variation process.	Delete 'By 30 June 2025' from this policy.	Accept in part
S30.047	Porirua City Council			S30.047	Porirua City Council	Policy 23: Identifying indigenous ecosystems	Oppose	Council supports this policy being timebound in principle. It has already been given effect to through our Proposed District Plan (PDP). However, Policy EI.1 requires a first principles approach to SNA	Amend policy to either: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • remove 2025 time frame; or • align with NPS-IB timeframes once gazetted; or 	Accept

S42A Appendix 2 - HS6 Indigenous Ecosystems - Summary Recommendation Table

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
						and habitats with significant indigenous biodiversity values - district and regional plans		identification and protection which would make it challenging for any council to meet this. The government has released an exposure draft of the NPS-IB which sets out additional requirements and a longer implementation timeframe. The RPS should align with these if/when the NPS-IB is gazetted.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> provide for councils that have mapped and protected all SNA in their plan to give effect to this policy through their next full district plan review. 	
S30.047	Porirua City Council	FS25.080	Peka Peka Farm Limited	FS25.080	Peka Peka Farm Limited	Policy 23: Identifying indigenous ecosystems and habitats with significant indigenous biodiversity values - district and regional plans	Support	The submission provides a comprehensive analysis of the proposed change including in relation to matters of scope and jurisdiction. It is supported without prejudice to the specific relief sought in the primary submission or this further submission by Peka Peka Farm Ltd.	Allow	Accept
S31.019	Robert Anker			S31.019	Robert Anker	Policy 23: Identifying indigenous ecosystems and habitats with significant indigenous biodiversity values - district and regional plans	Oppose in part	The exposure draft indicates that SNA area plans will need to be notified within 5 years from the commencement date which date has not yet occurred. By introducing a date of June 2025 GWRC is attempting to pressure already overloaded local authorities to produce SNA maps without adequate time for community consultation.	Amend the policy to read: By 30 June 2025 Within 5 years from the commencement date of NPS-IB , District and regional plans shall identify and evaluate indigenous ecosystems and habitats with significant indigenous biodiversity values; these ecosystems and habitats will be considered significant if they meet one or more of the following criteria:	Accept
S31.020	Robert Anker			S31.020	Robert Anker	Policy 23: Identifying indigenous ecosystems and habitats with significant indigenous biodiversity values - district and regional plans	Oppose in part	It is recognised that there are values and standards that are of significance to the Maori community and as long as those values and standards remain within that community then there is no conflict. However, once you attempt to introduce those standards into the wider community then you need to need to establish who, what, why and where.	Refine the RPS to address these factors and meet their obligation to the community	reject
S32.018	Director-General of Conservation			S32.018	Director-General of Conservation	Policy 23: Identifying indigenous	Support	The inclusion of a deadline to identify and evaluate indigenous ecosystems and habitats with significant indigenous biodiversity values is an appropriate	Retain as notified	Accept in part

S42A Appendix 2 - HS6 Indigenous Ecosystems - Summary Recommendation Table

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
						ecosystems and habitats with significant indigenous biodiversity values - district and regional plans		measure to ensure that S6(c) of the RMA is given effect to. Although this is a shorter timeframe than is currently indicated in the exposure draft of the NPS for Indigenous Biodiversity, it is not unreasonable given that the RPS has required this work to be undertaken since 2013.		
S32.018	Director-General of Conservation	FS27.014	Winstone Aggregates	FS27.014	Winstone Aggregates	Policy 23: Identifying indigenous ecosystems and habitats with significant indigenous biodiversity values - district and regional plans	Oppose	Winstone opposes the inclusion of the deadline to identify and evaluate indigenous ecosystems and habitats with significant indigenous biodiversity values that is a shorter timeframe than is currently indicated in the exposure draft of the NPS for Indigenous Biodiversity, for the reasons set out in Winstones submission	Disallow	reject
S32.018	Director-General of Conservation	FS30.296	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Ltd	FS30.296	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Ltd	Policy 23: Identifying indigenous ecosystems and habitats with significant indigenous biodiversity values - district and regional plans	Oppose	B+LNZ generally oppose the submission on the grounds that's B+LNZ are seeking changes of the plan change are restricted to those necessary to give effect to the National Policy Statement for Urban Development and that any other matters should be subject to proper review in the Schedule full review of the RPS in 2024 and in the scheduled reviews of the Natural Resources Plan in 2023 and 2024. This is because the changes materially impact on communities, including rural communities and B+LNZ do not consider that the necessary engagement has been undertaken to adequately inform these provisions or to meet the requirements of Part 3.2 of the NPS-FM. Furthermore, there is a risk that including matters relating to climate change and indigenous biodiversity before key national legislation is gazetted or implemented is premature and will lead to the inefficient implementation and confusion amongst those who it impacts materially.	Disallow	reject
S34.073	Te Kaunihera o Te Awa Kairangi ki Uta, Upper Hutt City Council			S34.073	Te Kaunihera o Te Awa Kairangi ki Uta, Upper Hutt City Council	Policy 23: Identifying indigenous ecosystems and habitats with significant indigenous biodiversity	Oppose	Councils opposes the arbitrary timeframe imposed on territorial authorities, particularly in advance of the NPS- IB. It is impractical to require territorial authorities to implement this policy by 2025, particularly given timeframes within the NPS-IB indicate a timeframe of 5 years from implementation. Council notes implementation of this policy ahead of the NPS-IB would duplicate a resource heavy and	Retain as operationally written and review once NPS-IB has been gazetted but include wording changes referring to mana whenua.	Accept

S42A Appendix 2 - HS6 Indigenous Ecosystems - Summary Recommendation Table

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
						values - district and regional plans		expensive process unnecessarily. Council supports the amendments to refer to the correct wording of mana whenua.		
S34.073	Te Kaunihera o Te Awa Kairangi ki Uta, Upper Hutt City Council	FS27.015	Winstone Aggregates	FS27.015	Winstone Aggregates	Policy 23: Identifying indigenous ecosystems and habitats with significant indigenous biodiversity values - district and regional plans	Support	Winstone supports the submission by Hutt City Council regarding bringing the timings forward for implementation to 25 June 2025 (including areas of significant biodiversity) to the extent that it is consistent with Winstone's submission on Policy 23. Winstone supports the amendments to refer to the correct wording of mana whenua.	Allow	Accept
S62.019	Philip Clegg			S62.019	Philip Clegg	Policy 23: Identifying indigenous ecosystems and habitats with significant indigenous biodiversity values - district and regional plans	Oppose in part	The NPS-IB hasn't yet been released following consultation on the exposure draft. The exposure draft indicated that SNA area plans would need to be notified within 5 years from the commencement date (which we won't know until the NPS-IB is promulgated). The June 2025 date will put unnecessary pressure on already overloaded local authorities to produce SNA maps that are based on criteria not yet released in the NPS-IB. That will likely impact on time for community consultation, and result in further erosion of public support for SNAs.	Withdraw policy until the NPS-IB has been released, and when the policy is ready to be notified, delete " 30 June 2025 " and replace with " within 5 years from the commencement date of NPS-IB ".	Accept in part
S79.034	South Wairarapa District Council			S79.034	South Wairarapa District Council	Policy 23: Identifying indigenous ecosystems and habitats with significant indigenous biodiversity values - district and regional plans	Oppose in part	While the Wairarapa Combined District Plan has contained SNA's for at least 12 years, further assessment and ground truthing is estimated for the South Wairarapa District to cost a minimum of \$600,000. This equates to an approximately 3% increase in rates. The last two rating years has seen a 28% increase in rate, largely to provide for improved infrastructure. The work is not funded as part of the LTP and would have to go out for consultation in the 23/24 year and be completed in one financial year. This is unlikely achievable given that funds would need to be provided, field work undertaken, then plan changes complete in a 12 month period. Other substantial capital costs related to infrastructure are anticipated in that period as well. The requirement is unaffordable to the ratepayers of South Wairarapa in its current form.	Require the Greater Wellington Regional Council to fund and undertake the necessary work required to comply with the policy.	reject
S96.015	Sarah (Dr) Kerkin			S96.015	Sarah (Dr) Kerkin	Policy 23: Identifying	Oppose in part	The NPS-IB hasn't yet been released following consultation on the exposure draft. The exposure	Withdraw policy until the NPS-IB has been released, and	Accept in part

S42A Appendix 2 - HS6 Indigenous Ecosystems - Summary Recommendation Table

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
						indigenous ecosystems and habitats with significant indigenous biodiversity values - district and regional plans		draft indicated that SNA area plans would need to be notified within 5 years from the commencement date (which we won't know until the NPS-IB is promulgated). The June 2025 date will put unnecessary pressure on already overloaded local authorities to produce SNA maps that are based on criteria not yet released in the NPS-IB. That will likely impact on time for community consultation, and result in further erosion of public support for SNAs.	when the policy is ready to be notified, delete " 30 June 2025 " and replace with " within 5 years from the commencement date of NPS-IB ".	
S115.047	Hutt City Council			S115.047	Hutt City Council	Policy 23: Identifying indigenous ecosystems and habitats with significant indigenous biodiversity values - district and regional plans	Oppose	We seek the deletion of all the proposed provisions relating to indigenous biodiversity until the upcoming National Policy Statement on Indigenous Biodiversity is gazetted.	Delete amendments to Policy 23 and retain the Operative RPS Policy 23. Failing that, amend the deadline from 30 June 2025 to 5 years after RPS Change 1 becomes operative.	Accept in part
S115.047	Hutt City Council	FS27.016	Winstone Aggregates	FS27.016	Winstone Aggregates	Policy 23: Identifying indigenous ecosystems and habitats with significant indigenous biodiversity values - district and regional plans	Support	Winstone supports the submission by Hutt City Council regarding bringing the timings forward for implementation to 25 June 2025 (including areas of significant biodiversity) to the extent that it is consistent with Winstones submission on Policy 23.	Allow	Accept in part
S115.047	Hutt City Council	FS10.019	BP Oil NZ Ltd Mobil Oil NZ Ltd and Z Energy Ltd (the Fuel Companies)	FS10.019	BP Oil NZ Ltd Mobil Oil NZ Ltd and Z Energy Ltd (the Fuel Companies)	Policy 23: Identifying indigenous ecosystems and habitats with significant indigenous biodiversity values - district and regional plans	Support	Agree that provisions relating to indigenous biodiversity should only be reviewed once the NPS-IB is gazetted, or as a minimum, the timeframes should be amended to align with those set out in the most recent draft of the NPS-IB.	Allow the submission and delete all new provisions and amendments to existing provisions relating to indigenous biodiversity and retain existing Operative RPS provisions.	reject
S115.047	Hutt City Council	FS24.015	Powerco Limited	FS24.015	Powerco Limited	Policy 23: Identifying	Support	Agree that provisions relating to indigenous biodiversity should only be reviewed once the NPS-IB	Allow the submission and delete all new provisions and	reject

S42A Appendix 2 - HS6 Indigenous Ecosystems - Summary Recommendation Table

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
						indigenous ecosystems and habitats with significant indigenous biodiversity values - district and regional plans		is gazetted, or as a minimum, the timeframes should be amended to align with those set out in the most recent draft of the NPS-IB.	amendments to existing provisions relating to indigenous biodiversity and retain existing Operative RPS provisions.	
S123.014	Peter Thompson			S123.014	Peter Thompson	Policy 23: Identifying indigenous ecosystems and habitats with significant indigenous biodiversity values - district and regional plans	Support	This should have been completed years ago - the timeline of 2025 is useful	Retain as notified.	Accept in part
S131.071	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust			S131.071	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	Policy 23: Identifying indigenous ecosystems and habitats with significant indigenous biodiversity values - district and regional plans	Support in part	<p>Ātiawa supports identifying and protecting indigenous ecosystems and habitats. Indigenous ecosystems and habitats not only play a vital role in ensuring the health, well-being and balance of te taiao, but also provide for mana whenua values such as mauri, wairua, whakapapa and mana. When our indigenous ecosystems are flourishing and abundant it enables Ātiawa to interact with te taiao to undertake activities which enhance our relationship with te taiao, thereby strengthening our identity. Ātiawa supports subclause (e) which enables mana whenua to identify indigenous ecosystems and habitats that are significant to mana whenua. Therefore mana whenua seek to work in partnership with local authorities to identify and evaluate indigenous ecosystems and habitats with significant indigenous biodiversity values.</p> <p>Ātiawa seek clarity on why the timeframe (30 June 2025) has been extended by one year compared to the pre-notified version date of 30 June 2024. Ātiawa are concerned that indigenous ecosystems and habitats that don't meet criteria to be considered 'significant' will then perceived as okay to modify and destroy. We do not support this and seek that the Regional Council avoid this from occurring.</p>	Amend to: By 30 June 2025, district and regional plans, in partnership with mana whenua shall identify and evaluate indigenous ecosystems and habitats with significant indigenous biodiversity values; these ecosystems and habitats will be considered significant if they meet one or more of the following criteria:	Accept in part

S42A Appendix 2 - HS6 Indigenous Ecosystems - Summary Recommendation Table

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
S131.071	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust			S131.071	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	Policy 23: Identifying indigenous ecosystems and habitats with significant indigenous biodiversity values - district and regional plans	Support in part	<p>Ātiawa supports identifying and protecting indigenous ecosystems and habitats. Indigenous ecosystems and habitats not only play a vital role in ensuring the health, well-being and balance of te taiao, but also provide for mana whenua values such as mauri, wairua, whakapapa and mana. When our indigenous ecosystems are flourishing and abundant it enables Ātiawa to interact with te taiao to undertake activities which enhance our relationship with te taiao, thereby strengthening our identity. Ātiawa supports subclause (e) which enables mana whenua to identify indigenous ecosystems and habitats that are significant to mana whenua. Therefore mana whenua seek to work in partnership with local authorities to identify and evaluate indigenous ecosystems and habitats with significant indigenous biodiversity values.</p> <p>Ātiawa seek clarity on why the timeframe (30 June 2025) has been extended by one year compared to the pre-notified version date of 30 June 2024. Ātiawa are concerned that indigenous ecosystems and habitats that don't meet criteria to be considered 'significant' will then perceived as okay to modify and destroy. We do not support this and seek that the Regional Council avoid this from occurring.</p>	Amend to: By 30 June 2025, district and regional plans, in partnership with mana whenua shall identify and evaluate indigenous ecosystems and habitats with significant indigenous biodiversity values; these ecosystems and habitats will be considered significant if they meet one or more of the following criteria:	Accept in part
S131.071	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	FS29.341	Ngā Hapu o Otaki	FS29.341	Ngā Hapu o Otaki	Policy 23: Identifying indigenous ecosystems and habitats with significant indigenous biodiversity values - district and regional plans	Support	<p>Co-design under a treaty house model is about shaping plans and resource management avenues alongside manawhenua that appropriately recognise the intergenerational prosperity of the uri of Ngā Hapu o Otaki and the wider community. There are ongoing concerns Ngā Hapu o Otaki maintain with GWRC in regard to the policies addressing Co-governance, Co-management, Co-leadership and Co-collabroative operational processes.</p> <p>This submission goes to great length to define where and how further considerations can be made recognising the interconnected nature of matauranga maori, the inequitable impact environmental decline will have on mana whenua/tangata whenua and offers insight to the intuitive and inherent awareness manawhenua need to maintain to ensure our intergenerational survival and prosperity.</p> <p>3.4 Freshwater including Public Access – Support in Principal 3.6 Indigenous Ecosystems – Support in Principal 3.9 Regional Form, Design and Function – Support in</p>	Not stated	Accept in part

S42A Appendix 2 - HS6 Indigenous Ecosystems - Summary Recommendation Table

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
								Principal Ātiawa views regarding Freshwater, indigenous ecosystems and Regional design and function resonate with insights Ngā Hapu o Otaki maintain. Ngā Hapu o Otaki would like opportunity to speak further to such views during the hearing process. We share Ātiawas concerns for Mātauranga Māori as a foundation for equitable interchange of decision making. Their concerns regarding intensification and the further degradation of taonga across our coastline rings true to the ongoing journey we are on as manawhenua facing intense growth for the coming generation. We seek to join the conversation and endorse provisions that will see our whanaunga and other manawhenua groups recognise their environmental resilience and the cultural agility our shared whakapapa offers.		
S140.048	Wellington City Council (WCC)			S140.048	Wellington City Council (WCC)	Policy 23: Identifying indigenous ecosystems and habitats with significant indigenous biodiversity values - district and regional plans	Oppose	Reason set out in 'general' section above.	Remove deadline.	reject
S144.019	Sustainable Wairarapa Inc			S144.019	Sustainable Wairarapa Inc	Policy 23: Identifying indigenous ecosystems and habitats with significant indigenous biodiversity values - district and regional plans	Support	This should have been completed years ago - the timeline of 2025 is useful	Retain as notified.	Accept in part
S147.020	Wellington Fish and Game Council			S147.020	Wellington Fish and Game Council	Policy 23: Identifying indigenous ecosystems and habitats with significant indigenous	Support in part	The suggested amendments follows from the suggested amendment to Objective 16, and are intended to give better effect to the NPS-FM (including Policy 10). It is important to identify which habitats have strong indigenous biodiversity values. It is equally important	Amend title: Identifying indigenous ecosystems, and habitats with significant indigenous biodiversity or other values, in district and regional plans	reject

S42A Appendix 2 - HS6 Indigenous Ecosystems - Summary Recommendation Table

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
						biodiversity values - district and regional plans		to recognise that other habitats, while not indigenous dominant, are valuable and require identification and also protection.		
S147.020	Wellington Fish and Game Council	FS20.124	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	FS20.124	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	Policy 23: Identifying indigenous ecosystems and habitats with significant indigenous biodiversity values - district and regional plans	Oppose	Ātiawa do not support the rationale set out by Fish and Game, - indigenous ecosystems must be afforded the greatest protection above the protection of introduced ecosystems which already dominate te taiao, to the detriment of indigenous ecosystems. The relief sought by the submitter would like result in a status-quo outcome for indigenous ecosystems, Ātiawa are opposed to this outcome.	Disallow	Accept
S147.020	Wellington Fish and Game Council	FS19.084	Wellington Water Ltd ("Wellington Water")	FS19.084	Wellington Water Ltd ("Wellington Water")	Policy 23: Identifying indigenous ecosystems and habitats with significant indigenous biodiversity values - district and regional plans	Oppose	It is unnecessary and redundant to recreate NPSFM policies within the RPS. Most of the amendments sought do not in any event properly reflect the NPSFM. In particular, they do not accurately reflect the proviso to Policy 7, the requirements of clause 3.2, the limitation of Policy 10 to trout and salmon only, and the subservience of Policy 10 to Policy 9. Some of the amendments attempt to address matters that are already adequately covered by extant provisions or PC1 as notified. Some of the amendments undermine the more detailed content of PC1.	Disallow	Accept
S147.020	Wellington Fish and Game Council	FS30.189	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Ltd	FS30.189	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Ltd	Policy 23: Identifying indigenous ecosystems and habitats with significant indigenous biodiversity values - district and regional plans	Oppose	B+LNZ generally oppose the submission on the grounds that's B+LNZ are seeking changes of the plan change are restricted to those necessary to give effect to the National Policy Statement for Urban Development and that any other matters should be subject to proper review in the Schedule full review of the RPS in 2024 and in the scheduled reviews of the Natural Resources Plan in 2023 and 2024. This is because the changes materially impact on communities, including rural communities and we do not consider that the necessary engagement has been undertaken to adequately inform these provisions or to meet the requirements of Part 3.2 of the NPS-FM. Furthermore, there is a risk that including matters relating to climate change and indigenous biodiversity before key national legislation is gazetted is premature and will lead to	Disallow That the submission be disallowed with the exception of 147.007	Accept

S42A Appendix 2 - HS6 Indigenous Ecosystems - Summary Recommendation Table

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
								the inefficient implementation and confusion amongst those who it impacts materially.		
S147.021	Wellington Fish and Game Council			S147.021	Wellington Fish and Game Council	Policy 23: Identifying indigenous ecosystems and habitats with significant indigenous biodiversity values - district and regional plans	Support in part	The suggested amendments follows from the suggested amendment to Objective 16, and are intended to give better effect to the NPS-FM (including Policy 10). It is important to identify which habitats have strong indigenous biodiversity values. It is equally important to recognise that other habitats, while not indigenous dominant, are valuable and require identification and also protection.	Amend text: By 30 June 2025, district and regional plans shall identify and evaluate indigenous ecosystems and habitats with significant indigenous biodiversity and other values; these ecosystems and habitats will be considered significant if they meet one or more of the following criteria:	reject
S147.021	Wellington Fish and Game Council	FS20.125	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	FS20.125	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	Policy 23: Identifying indigenous ecosystems and habitats with significant indigenous biodiversity values - district and regional plans	Oppose	Ātiawa do not support the rationale set out by Fish and Game, - indigenous ecosystems must be afforded the greatest protection above the protection of introduced ecosystems which already dominate te taiao, to the detriment of indigenous ecosystems. The relief sought by the submitter would like result in a status-quo outcome for indigenous ecosystems, Ātiawa are opposed to this outcome.	Disallow	Accept
S147.021	Wellington Fish and Game Council	FS19.085	Wellington Water Ltd ("Wellington Water")	FS19.085	Wellington Water Ltd ("Wellington Water")	Policy 23: Identifying indigenous ecosystems and habitats with significant indigenous biodiversity values - district and regional plans	Oppose	It is unnecessary and redundant to recreate NPSFM policies within the RPS. Most of the amendments sought do not in any event properly reflect the proviso to Policy 7, the requirements of clause 3.22, the limitation of Policy 10 to trout and salmon only, and the subservience of Policy 10 to Policy 9. Some of the amendments attempt to address matters that are already adequately covered by extant provisions or PC1 as notified. Some of the amendments undermine the more detailed content of PC1.	Disallow	Accept
S147.021	Wellington Fish and Game Council	FS30.190	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Ltd	FS30.190	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Ltd	Policy 23: Identifying indigenous ecosystems and habitats with significant indigenous biodiversity values - district	Oppose	B+LNZ generally oppose the submission on the grounds that's B+LNZ are seeking changes of the plan change are restricted to those necessary to give effect to the National Policy Statement for Urban Development and that any other matters should be subject to proper review in the Schedule full review of the RPS in 2024 and in the scheduled reviews of the Natural Resources Plan in 2023 and 2024. This is because the changes materially impact on	Disallow That the submission be disallowed with the exception of 147.007	Accept in part

S42A Appendix 2 - HS6 Indigenous Ecosystems - Summary Recommendation Table

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
						and regional plans		communities, including rural communities and we do not consider that the necessary engagement has been undertaken to adequately inform these provisions or to meet the requirements of Part 3.2 of the NPS-FM. Furthermore, there is a risk that including matters relating to climate change and indigenous biodiversity before key national legislation is gazetted is premature and will lead to the inefficient implementation and confusion amongst those who it impacts materially.		
S147.022	Wellington Fish and Game Council			S147.022	Wellington Fish and Game Council	Policy 23: Identifying indigenous ecosystems and habitats with significant indigenous biodiversity values - district and regional plans	Support in part	The suggested amendments follows from the suggested amendment to Objective 16, and are intended to give better effect to the NPS-FM (including Policy 10). It is important to identify which habitats have strong indigenous biodiversity values. It is equally important to recognise that other habitats, while not indigenous dominant, are valuable and require identification and also protection.	New subclause: (f) The habitat supports significant populations of trout, salmon or other valued introduced species together with indigenous species.	reject
S147.022	Wellington Fish and Game Council	FS20.115	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	FS20.115	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	Policy 23: Identifying indigenous ecosystems and habitats with significant indigenous biodiversity values - district and regional plans	Oppose	Ātiawa do not support the relief sought where it relates to protecting habitats of trout and salmon without any proviso. Ātiawa refer to Policy 9 and Policy 10 of the NPS-FM to support this statement, which affords indigenous freshwater species greater protection than trout and salmon. Additionally, Ātiawa do not support the protection of trout and salmon which have adverse impacts on indigenous ecosystems. Generally the management and decision making in regards to trout and salmon species has not been undertaken within a Treaty Partnership with mana whenua. To accept the relief sought by the submitter would be contrary to Te Tiriti o Waitangi and the national resource management direction.	Disallow	Accept
S147.022	Wellington Fish and Game Council	FS20.126	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	FS20.126	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	Policy 23: Identifying indigenous ecosystems and habitats with significant indigenous biodiversity values - district	Oppose	Ātiawa do not support the rationale set out by Fish and Game, - indigenous ecosystems must be afforded the greatest protection above the protection of introduced ecosystems which already dominate te taiao, to the detriment of indigenous ecosystems. The relief sought by the submitter would like result in a status-quo outcome for indigenous ecosystems, Ātiawa are opposed to this outcome.	Disallow	Accept

S42A Appendix 2 - HS6 Indigenous Ecosystems - Summary Recommendation Table

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
						and regional plans				
S147.022	Wellington Fish and Game Council	FS26.070	Meridian Energy Limited	FS26.070	Meridian Energy Limited	Policy 23: Identifying indigenous ecosystems and habitats with significant indigenous biodiversity values - district and regional plans	Support in part	<p>GWRC requests amendment of the definition as follows: Biodiversity compensation: A measurable positive environmental outcome resulting from actions that are designed to compensate for residual adverse biodiversity effects that cannot be otherwise managed after avoidance minimisation, remediation, and biodiversity offset measures have been applied.</p> <p>The wording reflects the definition in the settled proposed Natural Resources Plan. The PNRP definition also refers to a set of principles in Schedule G3. The principles provide helpful guidance. The proposed RPS definition would equally benefit from the addition of an appropriately worded set of principles. In this respect, proposed Appendix 1A and the proposed amendments to RPS Policy 24 are not helpful or complete in providing meaningful guidance for plans.</p>	Allow in part	Accept
S147.022	Wellington Fish and Game Council	FS19.086	Wellington Water Ltd ("Wellington Water")	FS19.086	Wellington Water Ltd ("Wellington Water")	Policy 23: Identifying indigenous ecosystems and habitats with significant indigenous biodiversity values - district and regional plans	Oppose	<p>It is unnecessary and redundant to recreate NPSFM policies within the RPS. Most of the amendments sought do not in any event properly reflect the NPSFM. In particular, they do not accurately reflect the proviso to Policy 7, the requirements of clause 3.22, the limitation of Policy 10 to trout and salmon only, and the subservience of Policy 10 to Policy 9. Some of the amendments attempt to address matters that are already adequately covered by extant provisions or PC1 as notified. Some of the amendments undermine the more detailed content of PC1.</p>	Disallow	reject
S147.022	Wellington Fish and Game Council	FS30.191	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Ltd	FS30.191	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Ltd	Policy 23: Identifying indigenous ecosystems and habitats with significant indigenous biodiversity values - district and regional plans	Oppose	<p>B+LNZ generally oppose the submission on the grounds that's B+LNZ are seeking changes of the plan change are restricted to those necessary to give effect to the National Policy Statement for Urban Development and that any other matters should be subject to proper review in the Schedule full review of the RPS in 2024 and in the scheduled reviews of the Natural Resources Plan in 2023 and 2024. This is because the changes materially impact on communities, including rural communities and we do not consider that the necessary engagement has been undertaken to adequately inform these</p>	<p>Disallow</p> <p>That the submission be disallowed with the exception of 147.007</p>	Accept in part

S42A Appendix 2 - HS6 Indigenous Ecosystems - Summary Recommendation Table

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
								provisions or to meet the requirements of Part 3.2 of the NPS-FM. Furthermore, there is a risk that including matters relating to climate change and indigenous biodiversity before key national legislation is gazetted is premature and will lead to the inefficient implementation and confusion amongst those who it impacts materially.		
S148.040	Wellington International Airport Ltd (WIAL)			S148.040	Wellington International Airport Ltd (WIAL)	Policy 23: Identifying indigenous ecosystems and habitats with significant indigenous biodiversity values - district and regional plans	Oppose in part	WIAL is concerned that the broad framing of this significance criteria will likely mean significant areas of the region are identified as being a significant natural area. This criteria could potentially capture highly modified areas which cannot sensibly be identified as significant natural areas. WIAL also notes that the National Policy Statement for Indigenous Biodiversity is pending. It is likely that this will contain criteria that will be different to the RPS. It may therefore be appropriate to await the outcome of this policy document to ensure consistency.	Ensure this provision is consistent with national guidance, or alternatively ensure the criteria is appropriately targeted so that it does not inadvertently capture areas which do not sensibly comprise significant natural areas or delete the policy	Accept
S148.040	Wellington International Airport Ltd (WIAL)	FS7.018	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society (Forest & Bird)	FS7.018	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society (Forest & Bird)	Policy 23: Identifying indigenous ecosystems and habitats with significant indigenous biodiversity values - district and regional plans	Oppose	Policy 23 is an existing policy and there is no evidence that it has been used in the way expressed by WIAL. This policy needs to be retained to give effect to s6 of the RMA.	Disallow whole submission point.	reject
S148.040	Wellington International Airport Ltd (WIAL)	FS8.0010	Guardians of the Bays Incorporated	FS8.0010	Guardians of the Bays Incorporated	Policy 23: Identifying indigenous ecosystems and habitats with significant indigenous biodiversity values - district and regional plans	Oppose	There shouldn't be limitations on a broad framework of significant areas in the region due to the aviation industry. A RPS on biodiversity can be incorporated in the future into Policy 23 Identifying indigenous ecosystems and habitats with significant indigenous biodiversity values.	Disallow	reject
S148.040	Wellington International Airport Ltd (WIAL)	FS27.017	Winstone Aggregates	FS27.017	Winstone Aggregates	Policy 23: Identifying indigenous ecosystems	Support	Winstone supports the submission by WIAL and agrees Policy 23 should be consistent with national guidance (i.e. NPS-IB when gazetted) or alternatively ensure the criteria is appropriately targeted so that it	Allow	Accept

S42A Appendix 2 - HS6 Indigenous Ecosystems - Summary Recommendation Table

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
						and habitats with significant indigenous biodiversity values - district and regional plans		does not inadvertently capture areas which do not sensibly comprise significant natural areas or delete the policy		
S158.023	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities			S158.023	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	Policy 23: Identifying indigenous ecosystems and habitats with significant indigenous biodiversity values - district and regional plans	Support in part	Seeks that this policy is aligned within the NPS-IB once gazetted.	Amend the policy to align with the NPS-IB once gazetted.	Accept
S162.008	Winstone Aggregates			S162.008	Winstone Aggregates	Policy 23: Identifying indigenous ecosystems and habitats with significant indigenous biodiversity values - district and regional plans	Oppose	<p>This policy requires identifications of ecosystems and habitats with significant indigenous biodiversity values by 2025. However, there is no policy that requires plans to manage effects on these areas in any way. Policy 24 relates to the ecosystems in Appendix 1A, rather than linking with Policy 23. The RPS seeks to implement the Exposure Draft of the NPS-IB. Concerned about the extent that the RPS seeks to implement a draft version of the NPS-IB that will inevitably change before coming into force and questions the timing of these amendments. There is no requirement to give effect to a draft NPS-IB. Policy package 2 identified in the s32 Report would have been more appropriate, which maintained status quo until the NPS-IB content has been confirmed (s32 page 132), particularly given the high cost and complexity of assessment and impact on property owners and short timeframe that the RPS introduces (June 2025 which is 2.5 years less than the proposed NPS-IB) for Councils to map and identify these areas. Meeting "objectives" earlier is not a benefit when those objectives at a National level remain uncertain. It is unclear if Policy 23 gives effect to the Draft NPS-IB.</p> <p>There is often direct conflict between areas of land that contain regionally significant mineral deposits and land that contains significant indigenous biodiversity values due to this land being set aside for</p>	Reject the proposed changes to this policy. Undertake mineral mapping at the same time as the SNA mapping and ensure that a viable pathway being provided for quarrying and clean filling activities within those identified areas.	reject

S42A Appendix 2 - HS6 Indigenous Ecosystems - Summary Recommendation Table

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
								<p>future aggregate extraction. The s32 evaluation fails to consider the costs of this.</p> <p>The s32 report (p191) states that the direction to local authorities to identify significant biodiversity values has been in the RPS since 1995, but this has not occurred. It also fails to mention that the RPS Method 52 currently provides for GWRC mapping of regionally significant minerals deposits, which also has not yet taken place. Seek that this work be completed by GWRC and a better framework developed to recognise the importance of access to aggregate and role in growth.</p> <p>Policy 23 does not currently contain defined terms and no amendments are proposed to the wording of most of the policy. However it deals with concepts that are likely to be impacted by proposed new definitions in Appendix 3 terms for example Policy 23(d)(i) deals with ecological assessment of an area, including the extent the ecosystem 'enhances connectivity.' It is unclear how this relates to the new definition of ecological connectivity, same can be said for the proposed new definitions of ecological integrity, ecological health, naturally uncommon ecosystems it is unclear how these interact or impact on how policy 23 will be interpreted.</p>		
S162.008	Winstone Aggregates	FS7.022	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society (Forest & Bird)	FS7.022	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society (Forest & Bird)	Policy 23: Identifying indigenous ecosystems and habitats with significant indigenous biodiversity values - district and regional plans	Oppose	<p>Policy 23 is an existing policy.</p> <p>It is not clear how mineral mapping is relevant to the interpretation of this policy.</p> <p>It is not clear how the submitter proposes the policy should be amended to update the defined terms mentioned.</p>	Disallow whole submission point.	Accept
S162.008	Winstone Aggregates	FS11.0010	Fulton Hogan Limited	FS11.0010	Fulton Hogan Limited	Policy 23: Identifying indigenous ecosystems and habitats with significant indigenous biodiversity values - district	Support	<p>The proposed 2025 date to map Significant Natural Areas (SNA) is 2.5 years shorter than the 5-year period contained within the exposure draft of the NPS-IB. This is a very short time to accurately map SNA.</p> <p>Agree that there is often conflict between areas of land that contain regionally significant mineral deposits and land that contains significant indigenous biodiversity values due to this land being set aside for future aggregate extraction. Further detailed analysis</p>	Allow	reject

S42A Appendix 2 - HS6 Indigenous Ecosystems - Summary Recommendation Table

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
						and regional plans		of the costs of creating SNA needs to be included within the s32 report. Support regional mapping of significant aggregate/mineral deposits and to inform the creation of a viable policy pathway for quarrying within the areas identified. Agree that policy 23 includes a number of undefined terms which are similar to new definitions in the pRPS (e.g. 'enhances connectivity' versus 'ecological connectivity'). It is unclear how policy 23 and the new definitions interrelate.		
S162.008	Winstone Aggregates	FS20.276	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	FS20.276	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	Policy 23: Identifying indigenous ecosystems and habitats with significant indigenous biodiversity values - district and regional plans	Oppose	Ātiawa oppose the submissions from Aggregate and Quarry Association and Winstone Aggregates to the extent that the relief sought is inconsistent with national direction, particularly the NPS-FM. Ātiawa are particularly sensitive to aggregate extraction from awa, it is mana whenua who are guaranteed tino rangatiratanga over the land, waterways and all other taonga (including aggregate) through Te Tiriti o Waitangi. Historically aggregate extraction industry has failed to uphold the articles and the principles of Te Tiriti. Additionally, aggregate extraction has adverse effects on te taiao and mana whenua values. On the matter of 'balancing' national policy statements', recent case law states that the NPS-FM 2020 and NPS-UD 2020 are to be read together and reconciled under the regional policy statement and the district plans. It goes on to say, development capacity does not outweigh (trump) Te Mana o te Wai. Te Mana o te Wai is the fundamental concept of freshwater management: any thinking to the converse would not give effect to either national policy statement. Therefore, to reconcile national direction, it is not a balancing act, or even a compromise, the NPS-FM must be given effect to while achieving the purpose of the NPS-UD for example. This can be applied to aggregate extraction, the activity must be consistent with Te Mana o te Wai and the NPS-FM. The need for housing capacity is not license to forgo the requirements of the NPS-FM.	Disallow	Accept
S163.058	Wairarapa Federated Farmers			S163.058	Wairarapa Federated Farmers	Policy 23: Identifying indigenous ecosystems	Oppose	The case for urgent identification and evaluation of habitats with significant indigenous biodiversity values by 30 June 2025 has not been made and will likely to be a waste of effort and resources doing	That the amendments to Policy 23 be deleted Delete the FW icon.	Accept in part

S42A Appendix 2 - HS6 Indigenous Ecosystems - Summary Recommendation Table

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
						and habitats with significant indigenous biodiversity values - district and regional plans		such assessment in advance of a National Policy Statement on Indigenous Biodiversity.		
S163.058	Wairarapa Federated Farmers	FS7.101	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society (Forest & Bird)	FS7.101	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society (Forest & Bird)	Policy 23: Identifying indigenous ecosystems and habitats with significant indigenous biodiversity values - district and regional plans	Oppose	It is completely appropriate to include climate change, biodiversity and freshwater provisions in the plan change. This plan change creates efficiency by considering multiple policy directives from central government. The amendments sought by Federated Farmers fail to give effect to the NPSFM, the NPS for Indigenous Biodiversity, for which there is an exposure draft and the final version is due out this month, and do not achieve the purpose of the RMA or the Climate Change Response (Zero Carbon) Amendment Act 2019.	Disallow whole submission point.	Accept in part
S163.058	Wairarapa Federated Farmers	FS20.223	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	FS20.223	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	Policy 23: Identifying indigenous ecosystems and habitats with significant indigenous biodiversity values - district and regional plans	Oppose	Ātiawa oppose the entire submission by Wairarapa Federated Farmers. The relief sought by Federated Farmers is to effectively delete the entire proposed plan change (except for submission points S163.083, S163.084). The basis for deleting the proposed plan change is to delay decision-making. Ātiawa do not accept that delaying responding to national direction is an appropriate course of action, and will further compound environmental and resource management issues.	Disallow the entire submission by Wairarapa Federated Farmers.	Accept in part
S163.058	Wairarapa Federated Farmers	FS29.074	Ngā Hapu o Otaki	FS29.074	Ngā Hapu o Otaki	Policy 23: Identifying indigenous ecosystems and habitats with significant indigenous biodiversity values - district and regional plans	Oppose	Section 18, page 4: General Comments – OPPOSE Section 25, Page 5 Going Forward – OPPOSE It is disheartening to see that Wairarapa Federated Farmers aren't capable of recognizing the obligations GWRC must maintain with Treaty Partners. It must be understood that Manawhenua are not simply 'groups of people' but a representation of the signatories that signed the Treaty of Waitangi and the original kaitiaki and custodians of the taonga in question when considering how these plan changes are implemented. Wairarapa Federated Farmers indicate a lack of awareness to the value of manawhenua engagement. Their stated 'aspirations of delivering environmental improvements alongside a thriving bio-economy' aren't feasible without considering the	Not stated	Accept in part

S42A Appendix 2 - HS6 Indigenous Ecosystems - Summary Recommendation Table

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
								intergenerational insight and technical direction that only Mātauranga Māori can offer.		
S163.058	Wairarapa Federated Farmers	FS30.130	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Ltd	FS30.130	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Ltd	Policy 23: Identifying indigenous ecosystems and habitats with significant indigenous biodiversity values - district and regional plans	Support	B+LNZ agree that the scope of RPS PC1 should be restricted to those changes necessary to give effect to the National Policy Statement for Urban Development and that any other matters should be subject to proper review in the Schedule full review of the RPS in 2024 and in the scheduled reviews of the Natural Resources Plan in 2023 and 2024. Where alternative relief is provided, B+LNZ generally support this relief.	Allow	reject
S165.056	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society (Forest & Bird)			S165.056	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society (Forest & Bird)	Policy 23: Identifying indigenous ecosystems and habitats with significant indigenous biodiversity values - district and regional plans	Support in part	Concerned that some councils have still not identified SNAs in their plans e.g. the recently notified Wellington DP does not include residential SNAs. Other councils have not identified SNAs at all yet. We strongly support the inclusion of a June 2025 deadline, as delaying any further is contrary to s6(c). However, we see a risk for councils such as Wellington CC, that have done the work to identify SNAs but have not included them in the plan. We submitted on the Wgtn DP that the residential SNAs should be immediately reincluded. Allowing a further 3 years in those circumstances is unacceptable. We therefore seek amendment to how the deadline is expressed.	Amend as follows (or words to the same effect): "As soon as possible, and in any event no later than 30 June 2025" Amend explanation accordingly.	Accept in part
S165.056	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society (Forest & Bird)	FS27.018	Winstone Aggregates	FS27.018	Winstone Aggregates	Policy 23: Identifying indigenous ecosystems and habitats with significant indigenous biodiversity values - district and regional plans	Oppose	Winstone opposes the inclusion of the deadline to identify and evaluate indigenous ecosystems and habitats with significant indigenous biodiversity values that is a shorter timeframe than is currently indicated in the exposure draft of the NPS for Indigenous Biodiversity, for the reasons set out in Winstones submission	Disallow	reject
S165.056	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society (Forest & Bird)	FS30.319	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Ltd	FS30.319	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Ltd	Policy 23: Identifying indigenous ecosystems and habitats with significant indigenous	Oppose	B+LNZ generally oppose the submission on the grounds that's B+LNZ are seeking changes of the plan change are restricted to those necessary to give effect to the National Policy Statement for Urban Development and that any other matters should be subject to proper review in the Schedule full review of the RPS in 2024 and in the scheduled reviews of	Disallow	reject

S42A Appendix 2 - HS6 Indigenous Ecosystems - Summary Recommendation Table

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
						biodiversity values - district and regional plans		the Natural Resources Plan in 2023 and 2024. This is because the changes materially impact on communities, including rural communities and we do not consider that the necessary engagement has been undertaken to adequately inform these provisions or to meet the requirements of Part 3.2 of the NPS-FM. Furthermore, there is a risk that including matters relating to climate change and indigenous biodiversity before key national legislation is gazetted or implemented is premature and will lead to the inefficient implementation and confusion amongst those who it impacts materially.		
S167.087	Taranaki Whānui			S167.087	Taranaki Whānui	Policy 23: Identifying indigenous ecosystems and habitats with significant indigenous biodiversity values - district and regional plans	Support	Taranaki Whānui support the amendment of this policy. We support the inclusion of a timeframe. Taranaki Whānui will work in partnership to identify areas outlined in (e). We note the Method 32 to implement this policy and are keen to see assurances regarding resourcing.	Retain as notified.	Accept in part
S168.072	Rangitāne O Wairarapa Inc			S168.072	Rangitāne O Wairarapa Inc	Policy 23: Identifying indigenous ecosystems and habitats with significant indigenous biodiversity values - district and regional plans	Support	Rangitāne o Wairarapa support the inclusion of a deadline for completion of indigenous biodiversity identification.	Retain as notified	Accept in part
S168.072	Rangitāne O Wairarapa Inc	FS31.182	Sustainable Wairarapa Inc	FS31.182	Sustainable Wairarapa Inc	Policy 23: Identifying indigenous ecosystems and habitats with significant indigenous biodiversity values - district and regional plans	Support	Kia ora koutou, My name is Ian Gunn, Secretary Sustainable Wairarapa inc. contact # 021567134, address 4B McKay Street, Paraparaumu Beach 5032. Firstly we'd like to state the time frame provided to peruse over 900 pages of submissions is in our opinion an abuse of process. The benefit of further submissions is for you the council to listen and hear the views of its ratepayers. The timeframe in our case does not allow a rigorous review of the original submissions to council. On top of this we are a week before Christmas- a very busy and chaotic time for most members of the community. It is highly likely	Not stated	Accept in part

S42A Appendix 2 - HS6 Indigenous Ecosystems - Summary Recommendation Table

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
								that the majority of staff will take leave over the Christmas break so analysis of any further submissions will not occur until late January 2023-so why the short period to respond. While there is due process there is also good practise your management of the further submissions fails the good practise model. As a consequence we would like you to note Sustainable Wairarapa's strong support of the original submissions lodged with council by the two Wairarapa Iwi-Ngati Kahungunu and Rangitane. Its clear that there is a poor understanding of nature based solutions this term needs further explanation. Sustainable Wairarapa acknowledges that while nature based solutions offer a wide variety of options its not the only solution. We are heartened by the widespread support for the original document. Thanks for an opportunity to make a further submission. Nga mihi nui Ian Gun		
S170.033	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira			S170.033	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	Policy 23: Identifying indigenous ecosystems and habitats with significant indigenous biodiversity values - district and regional plans	Not Stated / Neutral	<p>Policy 23 and Policy 24 identifying and protecting Significant Natural Areas (SNAs) are a critical part of the RPS. It is concerning these values to be identified by June 2024. Policy 23 and 24 have been in effect for a long time and is not ideal some Councils have not given effect to these Policies and / or gave effect partially, either to include just Public SNAs and leaving out the private land areas.</p> <p>It is crucial that councils that are tentatively holding space for these policies implement Policy 23 and 24 since District Plans to map, identify the SNAs, and undertake public consultation, and finally performing plan change to give effect to SNAs protection in the form of provisions are long processes that jeopardise the protection of SNAs.</p> <p>An important development that involves the implementation of Policy 23 and 24, is the Ministry for the Environment released the exposure draft for the National Policy Statement Indigenous Biodiversity (NPS-IB). This means there will be further policy implications to Regional Plan and District Plans. Since the exposure draft is accepting public submissions, it will be sometime for policies to take effect then to be implemented in Regional and District Plans.</p> <p>The intention of Policy 23 and 24 becomes more important where all Councils are about to give effect to National Policy Statement-Urban Development (NPS-UD) prioritising housing and development needs. It is critical that SNAs are provided protection</p>	Ensure the provisions give effect to recent national direction.	Accept

S42A Appendix 2 - HS6 Indigenous Ecosystems - Summary Recommendation Table

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
								in this uncertain environment where the Councils still to give effect to NPS-IB but will give effect to NPS-UD before National Policy Statement - Freshwater Management (NPS-FM) and NPS-IB start to take effect providing protection for our freshwater and indigenous ecosystems. Note that these NPSs are not synchronised, it is imperative Policy 23 and 24 ensures the Plan is given effect as soon as practicable.		
S170.033	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	FS29.147	Ngā Hapu o Otaki	FS29.147	Ngā Hapu o Otaki	Policy 23: Identifying indigenous ecosystems and habitats with significant indigenous biodiversity values - district and regional plans	Support	<p>Co -design under a treaty house model is about shaping plans and resource management avenues alongside manawhenua that appropriately recognise the intergenerational prosperity of the uri of Ngā Hapu o Otaki and the wider community. There are ongoing concerns Ngā Hapu o Otaki maintain with GWRC in regard to the policies addressing Co-governance, Co-management, Co-leadership and Co-collabroative operational processes.</p> <p>This submission goes to great length to define where and how further considerations can be made recognising the interconnected nature of matauranga maori, the inequitable impact environmental decline will have on mana whenua/tangata whenua and offers insight to the intuitive and inherent awareness manawhenua need to maintain to ensure our intergenerational survival and prosperity.</p> <p>Objective 3: Lack of mana whenua / tangata whenua involvement in decision making – Support in principal FW Kaitiakitanga O1, O2, O3 – Support in principal Wai Mate O1,O2,O3 - Support in principal Climate Change and Freshwater objectives, CCFW-01, CCFW-02, CCFW-03, CCFW-04, CCFW-05, CCFW-06</p> <p>This submission appropriately articulates Kaitiakitanga, FW objectives regarding Climate Change, Wai mate, Wai ora and the lack of provisions to see balanced decision making between Treaty Partners. Ngā Hapu o Otaki support Te Runanga o Toa Rangatira expression and wish to speak further to such views during the hearing process. We have serious concerns for the degradation of our taonga, in particular our wai. This combined with the projected growth the next generation will see means manawhenua resilience and agility to climate grief and environmental decline is paramount. Ngā Hapu o Otaki seek to support our whanaunga and other Manawhenua groups to build the provisions we will</p>	Not stated	Accept in part

S42A Appendix 2 - HS6 Indigenous Ecosystems - Summary Recommendation Table

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
								need to solidify our Tino Rangatiratanga and ensure our intergenerational prosperity.		
S10.002	Transpower New Zealand Limited			S10.002	Transpower New Zealand Limited	Policy 24: Protecting indigenous ecosystems and habitats with significant indigenous biodiversity values - district and regional plans	Oppose in part	Transpower is concerned that the amendments to Policy 24 are overly broad in their application and potentially impractical to implement in practice. They do not recognise that some infrastructure has a functional or operational need to be constructed or operated in certain locations. In some situations this may mean that biodiversity offsetting or biodiversity compensation is required. Furthermore, Appendix 1A is very extensive in the ecosystems and specifies it applies to.	Amend Policy 24 to recognise that regionally significant infrastructure may have a functional or operational need to locate in a particular location. This could be achieved by adding a qualifying statement: This does not apply to nationally and regionally significant infrastructure that has a functional or operational need to locate in a particular location. In the case of the National Grid, following a route, site and method selection process and having regard to the technical and operational constraints of the network, new development or major upgrades of the National Grid shall seek to avoid adverse effects, and otherwise remedy or mitigate adverse effects, on ecosystems or habitats with significant indigenous biodiversity values.	Accept in part
S10.002	Transpower New Zealand Limited	FS17.021	Wellington International Airport Ltd (WIAL)	FS17.021	Wellington International Airport Ltd (WIAL)	Policy 24: Protecting indigenous ecosystems and habitats with significant indigenous biodiversity values - district and regional plans	Support in part	WIAL support the relief sought, subject to the relief sought in WIAL's primary submission, as it recognises the functional and operational need for regionally significant infrastructure to locate in a particular location	Allow	Accept in part
S10.002	Transpower New Zealand Limited	FS10.037	BP Oil NZ Ltd Mobil Oil NZ Ltd and Z Energy Ltd	FS10.037	BP Oil NZ Ltd Mobil Oil NZ Ltd and Z Energy Ltd (the	Policy 24: Protecting indigenous ecosystems	Support	Agree there is a need to recognise that some infrastructure has a functional or operational need to be constructed or operated in certain locations.	Allow submission and amend Policy 24 to recognise that regionally significant infrastructure may have a	Accept in part

S42A Appendix 2 - HS6 Indigenous Ecosystems - Summary Recommendation Table

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
			(the Fuel Companies)		Fuel Companies)	and habitats with significant indigenous biodiversity values - district and regional plans			functional or operational need to locate in a particular location.	
S10.002	Transpower New Zealand Limited	FS24.033	Powerco Limited	FS24.033	Powerco Limited	Policy 24: Protecting indigenous ecosystems and habitats with significant indigenous biodiversity values - district and regional plans	Support	Agree there is a need to recognise that some infrastructure has a functional or operational need to be constructed or operated in certain locations.	Allow submission and amend Policy 24 to recognise that regionally significant infrastructure may have a functional or operational need to locate in a particular location.	Accept in part
S10.002	Transpower New Zealand Limited	FS26.032	Meridian Energy Limited	FS26.032	Meridian Energy Limited	Policy 24: Protecting indigenous ecosystems and habitats with significant indigenous biodiversity values - district and regional plans	Support	<p>Transpower opposes the proposed amendments because they are too broad and impractical and do not recognise that some infrastructure has a functional or operational need to be constructed or operated in certain locations. The submission notes that the Minister for the Environment has confirmed that infrastructure will be exempt from complying with limits where it cannot be situated anywhere else https://www.beehive.govt.nz/speech/how-future-resource-management-system-will-better-enable-development-outcomes:</p> <p>The submission seeks the following addition: 'This does not apply to nationally and regionally significant infrastructure that has a functional or operational need to locate in a particular location. In the case of the National Grid, following a route, site and method selection process and having regard to the technical and operational constraints of the network, new development or major upgrades of the National Grid shall seek to avoid adverse effects, and otherwise remedy or mitigate adverse effects, on ecosystems or habitats with significant indigenous biodiversity values.'</p> <p>Meridian agrees with Transpower's approach and supports the requested amendments in principle, subject to any refinements necessary to align with the amendments requested in Meridian's own submission.</p>	Allow to the extent that any amendments are consistent with Meridian's own requested relief.	Accept in part

S42A Appendix 2 - HS6 Indigenous Ecosystems - Summary Recommendation Table

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
S16.067	Kāpiti Coast District Council			S16.067	Kāpiti Coast District Council	Policy 24: Protecting indigenous ecosystems and habitats with significant indigenous biodiversity values - district and regional plans	Support in part	Council has the same concerns regarding the arbitrary timeframe as we raise under Policy 23 above. Council supports the amendments to the policy that provide useful direction on how to consider biodiversity offsetting and biodiversity compensation. Such guidance would also be useful for the consideration of resource consents and notices of requirement.	Delete timeframe for giving effect to the policy. Amend to include the resource consent process.	Accept in part
S25.028	Carterton District Council			S25.028	Carterton District Council	Policy 24: Protecting indigenous ecosystems and habitats with significant indigenous biodiversity values - district and regional plans	Oppose	As per submission on Policy 23, CDC opposes the amendments to require that SNAs are identified by June 2025. CDC also considers that, due to the breadth of ecosystems and habitats included in Appendix 1A, the revised policy will effectively provide for no offsetting or compensation opportunities across many parts of the region.	Revert to original text of Policy 24.	Reject
S30.048	Porirua City Council			S30.048	Porirua City Council	Policy 24: Protecting indigenous ecosystems and habitats with significant indigenous biodiversity values - district and regional plans	Oppose	Council supports this policy being timebound in principle. It has already been given effect to through our PDP. However, Policy EI.1 requires a first principles approach to SNA identification and protection which would make it challenging for any council to meet this. The government has released an exposure draft of the NPS-IB which sets out additional requirements and a longer implementation timeframe. The RPS should align with these if/when the NPS-IB is gazetted.	Amend policy to either: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • remove 2025 time frame; or • align with NPS-IB timeframes once gazetted; or • provide for councils that have mapped and protected all SNA in their plan to give effect to this policy through their next full district plan review. 	Accept
S30.048	Porirua City Council	FS25.081	Peka Peka Farm Limited	FS25.081	Peka Peka Farm Limited	Policy 24: Protecting indigenous ecosystems and habitats with significant indigenous biodiversity values - district and regional plans	Support	The submission provides a comprehensive analysis of the proposed change including in relation to matters of scope and jurisdiction. It is supported without prejudice to the specific relief sought in the primary submission or this further submission by Peka Peka Farm Ltd.	Allow	Accept

S42A Appendix 2 - HS6 Indigenous Ecosystems - Summary Recommendation Table

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
S32.019	Director-General of Conservation			S32.019	Director-General of Conservation	Policy 24: Protecting indigenous ecosystems and habitats with significant indigenous biodiversity values - district and regional plans	Support	These proposed provisions are generally appropriate. However, if an NPS for Indigenous Biodiversity is gazetted prior to decisions being made on the provisions, then they should be reviewed for compliance with that document.	Retain as notified, subject to any changes which may be required to give effect to an NPS for Indigenous Biodiversity.	Accept
S32.019	Director-General of Conservation	FS30.297	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Ltd	FS30.297	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Ltd	Policy 24: Protecting indigenous ecosystems and habitats with significant indigenous biodiversity values - district and regional plans	Oppose	B+LNZ generally oppose the submission on the grounds that's B+LNZ are seeking changes of the plan change are restricted to those necessary to give effect to the National Policy Statement for Urban Development and that any other matters should be subject to proper review in the Schedule full review of the RPS in 2024 and in the scheduled reviews of the Natural Resources Plan in 2023 and 2024. This is because the changes materially impact on communities, including rural communities and B+LNZ do not consider that the necessary engagement has been undertaken to adequately inform these provisions or to meet the requirements of Part 3.2 of the NPS-FM. Furthermore, there is a risk that including matters relating to climate change and indigenous biodiversity before key national legislation is gazetted or implemented is premature and will lead to the inefficient implementation and confusion amongst those who it impacts materially.	Disallow	Reject
S34.075	Te Kaunihera o Te Awa Kairangi ki Uta, Upper Hutt City Council			S34.075	Te Kaunihera o Te Awa Kairangi ki Uta, Upper Hutt City Council	Policy 24: Protecting indigenous ecosystems and habitats with significant indigenous biodiversity values - district and regional plans	Oppose	Council fundamentally disagrees with going ahead in advance of NPS-IB being gazetted but notes that the intent of the provision by could be useful if the provision remains.	Retain as operationally written and review once NPS-IB has been gazetted.	Reject
S34.075	Te Kaunihera o Te Awa Kairangi ki Uta, Upper	FS26.038	Meridian Energy Limited	FS26.038	Meridian Energy Limited	Policy 24: Protecting indigenous ecosystems and habitats	Support	Upper Hutt CC fundamentally disagrees with going ahead in advance of the NPS-IB being gazetted and requests that the policy be reviewed the once NPS-IB has been gazetted.	Allow to the extent of making the amendments requested in Meridian's submission in the interim until any further changes are made, by RPS	Reject

S42A Appendix 2 - HS6 Indigenous Ecosystems - Summary Recommendation Table

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
	Hutt City Council					with significant indigenous biodiversity values - district and regional plans		Meridian considers it is premature to advance the scope of changes GWRC proposes to the RPS indigenous biodiversity provisions in the absence of settled guidance from a gazetted National Policy Statement, particularly where the proposed RPS changes relate to terrestrial indigenous biodiversity provisions beyond the scope of a freshwater planning instrument. If GWRC's proposed RPS provisions do not give effect to the future NPS-IB, the RPS will need to be amended in any event. Until settled NPS guidance is available, Meridian prefers the amendments requested in its own submission which reflect the provisions in the proposed Natural Resources Plan (recently settled by Environment Court mediation).	change or variation, to accommodate the future gazetted NPS-IB.	
S79.035	South Wairarapa District Council			S79.035	South Wairarapa District Council	Policy 24: Protecting indigenous ecosystems and habitats with significant indigenous biodiversity values - district and regional plans	Support in part	Support more clarity on the use of biodiversity offsetting. There is some concern in terms of the requirement of a 'minimum' 10% uplift and whether this meets the requirements of s.108AA when being applied.	Retain as notified	Accept in part
S100.016	Meridian Energy Limited			S100.016	Meridian Energy Limited	Policy 24: Protecting indigenous ecosystems and habitats with significant indigenous biodiversity values - district and regional plans	Oppose in part	The reason for inclusion of some habitats, ecosystems and species in Appendix 1A is not clear. The section 32 report does not make a case for a requirement for a minimum +10% gain in biodiversity. The proposed requirement is premature, pending gazettal of the National Policy Statement for Indigenous Biodiversity (currently under development). The exposure draft of the NPS signalled a 'net gain' approach but did not specify a minimum proportion of gain. The provisions of the proposed Natural Resources Plan on this point were settled, in early 2022, following mediation and the agreed outcome was a 'no net biodiversity loss' outcome. The proposed amendments to RPS Policy 24 undo the valuable work done through mediation of the PNRP appeals and are not supported by a robust s. 32. evaluation. Until clear guidance is provided by a gazetted NPS, the RPS should adopt the settled approach of the PNRP. The settled provisions of Schedule G2 of the PNRP include a	Delete clause (c); and Delete clause (d) or, in the alternative, replace clause (d) with a requirement for at least no net loss (and preferably a net gain) as follows (or similar) and amend the explanation to match the policy amendments: "By 30 June 2025, Ddistrict and regional plans shall include policies, rules and methods to protect indigenous ecosystems and habitats with significant indigenous biodiversity values from inappropriate subdivision, use and development.	Accept in part

S42A Appendix 2 - HS6 Indigenous Ecosystems - Summary Recommendation Table

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
								<p>definition of 'no net biodiversity loss' which could usefully be included in the RPS.</p>	<p>Where the policies and/or rules in district and regional plans enable the use of biodiversity offsetting or biodiversity compensation for an ecosystem or habitat with significant indigenous biodiversity values, they shall:</p> <p>(a) ...</p> <p>(b) ...</p> <p>(c) ecosystems and species known to meet any of the criteria in (a) or (b) are listed in Appendix 1A (Limits to biodiversity offsetting and biodiversity compensation);</p> <p>(d) require that the outcome sought from the use of biodiversity offsetting is at least a 10 percent net biodiversity gain, or from biodiversity compensation is at least a 10 percent net biodiversity benefit. achieves at least no net loss and preferably a net gain of biodiversity.</p> <p>....</p> <p>Explanation</p> <p>Policy 24 applies to provisions in regional and district plans. The policy provides clarity about the limits to, and expected outcomes from, biodiversity offsetting and biodiversity compensation for an ecosystem or habitat with significant indigenous biodiversity values. Ecosystems and species known to meet the criteria in clauses (a) and (b) are listed in Appendix 1A (Limits to biodiversity offsetting and biodiversity compensation). Calculating a 10 percent net biodiversity</p>	

S42A Appendix 2 - HS6 Indigenous Ecosystems - Summary Recommendation Table

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
									gain (offsetting) or a 10 percent net biodiversity benefit (compensation) employs the same or a similar calculation methodology used to determine 'no net loss or preferably net gain' under a standard offsetting approach. The distinction between 'net gain' and 'net benefit' is to recognise that the outcomes achievable through the use of offsetting and compensation are different. An offsetting 'net biodiversity gain' outcome is expected to achieve an objectively verifiable increase in biodiversity values while a compensation 'net biodiversity benefit' outcome is more subjective and less preferable.'	
S100.016	Meridian Energy Limited	FS27.019	Winstone Aggregates	FS27.019	Winstone Aggregates	Policy 24: Protecting indigenous ecosystems and habitats with significant indigenous biodiversity values - district and regional plans	Support in part	Winstone supports submission S100.016 in part, to the extent this submission is consistent with Winstones' submission. Winstone agrees that the requirement for 10% gain or benefit via offsetting or compensation is unjustified and more onerous than required by national direction. The request to remove references to the 10% benefit or gain is supported. Winstone is opposed to the inclusion of the 30 June 2025 date in its own submission.	Allow in part	Accept in part
S100.016	Meridian Energy Limited	FS3.027	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	FS3.027	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	Policy 24: Protecting indigenous ecosystems and habitats with significant indigenous biodiversity values - district and regional plans	Support	Waka Kotahi supports the ability to use a more targeted and catchment-based approach to biodiversity offsetting with specific rational given to appropriate methods on a case by case basis.	Allow	Accept in part
S102.056	Te Tumu Paeroa			S102.056	Te Tumu Paeroa Office	Policy 24: Protecting	Support in part	Generally supports Policy 24. However, Policy 24 should be changed to include text to state that	Amend Policy 24 subclause (a)(i) as follows:	Accept in part

S42A Appendix 2 - HS6 Indigenous Ecosystems - Summary Recommendation Table

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
	Office of the Māori Trustee				of the Māori Trustee	indigenous ecosystems and habitats with significant indigenous biodiversity values - district and regional plans		biodiversity offsetting should not be provided for "where it is not appropriate". This will provide greater clarity as there will likely be instances where offsetting is possible but not appropriate, particularly for whenua Māori.	(a) not provide for biodiversity offsetting: (i) where it is not appropriate , there is no appropriate site, knowledge, proven methods, expertise or mechanism available to design and implement an adequate biodiversity offset; or	
S102.056	Te Tumu Paeroa Office of the Māori Trustee	FS26.039	Meridian Energy Limited	FS26.039	Meridian Energy Limited	Policy 24: Protecting indigenous ecosystems and habitats with significant indigenous biodiversity values - district and regional plans	Oppose	Office of the Māori Trustee: considers that the following amendment needs to be made Policy 24: '(a) not provided for biodiversity offsetting: (i) where it is not appropriate , there is no appropriate site, knowledge, proven methods, expertise or mechanism available to design and implement an adequate biodiversity offset' ... Meridian considers the proposed insertion creates ambiguity.	Disallow	Accept in part
S114.002	Fulton Hogan Ltd			S114.002	Fulton Hogan Limited	Policy 24: Protecting indigenous ecosystems and habitats with significant indigenous biodiversity values - district and regional plans	Support in part	This policy appears to respond to the guidance provided by the NPS-IB, which is currently in draft. This policy should respond to the final version of the NPS-IB.	Retain as notified	Accept
S115.048	Hutt City Council			S115.048	Hutt City Council	Policy 24: Protecting indigenous ecosystems and habitats with significant indigenous biodiversity values - district and regional plans	Oppose	If the provisions are nonetheless added, then HCC seeks an amendment to the deadline date from 30 June 2025 to 5 years from the operative date of the proposed RPS change 1. This is because the deadline does not align with the deadline proposed in the most recent draft of the National Policy Statement on Indigenous Biodiversity (5 years from the commencement date of that NPS).	Delete amendments to Policy 24 and retain the Operative RPS Policy 24. Failing that, amend the deadline from 30 June 2025 to 5 years after RPS Change 1 becomes operative.	Accept in part
S115.048	Hutt City Council	FS10.020	BP Oil NZ Ltd Mobil Oil NZ Ltd and Z Energy Ltd	FS10.020	BP Oil NZ Ltd Mobil Oil NZ Ltd and Z	Policy 24: Protecting indigenous	Support	Agree that provisions relating to indigenous biodiversity should only be reviewed once the NPS-IB is gazetted, or as a minimum, the timeframes should	Allow the submission and delete all new provisions and amendments to existing	Accept in part

S42A Appendix 2 - HS6 Indigenous Ecosystems - Summary Recommendation Table

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
			(the Fuel Companies)		Energy Ltd (the Fuel Companies)	ecosystems and habitats with significant indigenous biodiversity values - district and regional plans		be amended to align with those set out in the most recent draft of the NPS-IB.	provisions relating to indigenous biodiversity and retain existing Operative RPS provisions.	
S115.048	Hutt City Council	FS24.016	Powerco Limited	FS24.016	Powerco Limited	Policy 24: Protecting indigenous ecosystems and habitats with significant indigenous biodiversity values - district and regional plans	Support	Agree that provisions relating to indigenous biodiversity should only be reviewed once the NPS-IB is gazetted, or as a minimum, the timeframes should be amended to align with those set out in the most recent draft of the NPS-IB.	Allow the submission and delete all new provisions and amendments to existing provisions relating to indigenous biodiversity and retain existing Operative RPS provisions.	Accept in part
S115.048	Hutt City Council	FS26.034	Meridian Energy Limited	FS26.034	Meridian Energy Limited	Policy 24: Protecting indigenous ecosystems and habitats with significant indigenous biodiversity values - district and regional plans	Support in part	Hutt CC requests deletion of the proposed amendments to Policy 24 and retention of the operative RPS Policy 24. Failing that, amendment of the deadline from 30.06.25 to 5 years after the RPS Change 1 becomes operative. As earlier noted, Meridian considers it is premature to advance the scope of amendments to RPS indigenous biodiversity provisions to the extent proposed by RPS Change 1, for terrestrial and aquatic indigenous biodiversity. Meridian agrees that the requested relief is a rational approach, pending gazettal of the NPS-IB.	Allow in part Allow as an alternative form of relief to the relief requested in Meridian's submission.	Accept in part
S123.015	Peter Thompson			S123.015	Peter Thompson	Policy 24: Protecting indigenous ecosystems and habitats with significant indigenous biodiversity values - district and regional plans	Support	This should have been completed years ago - the timeline of 2025 is useful	Retain as notified.	Accept in part
S131.072	Ātiawa ki Whakarongot			S131.072	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai	Policy 24: Protecting indigenous	Support in part	While Ātiawa supports provisions to protect indigenous ecosystems and habitats from inappropriate subdivision, use and development.	Amend to include new subclause: (a) not provide for biodiversity	Reject

S42A Appendix 2 - HS6 Indigenous Ecosystems - Summary Recommendation Table

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
	ai Charitable Trust				Charitable Trust	ecosystems and habitats with significant indigenous biodiversity values - district and regional plans		Ātiawa opposes the use of biodiversity offsetting and biodiversity compensation methods where an ecosystem or habitat contains mana whenua values (including spiritual, historical or cultural significance to mana whenua). We seek to work in partnership with Regional Council to identify ecosystems and habitats that contain mana whenua values.	offsetting: (i) where there is no appropriate site, knowledge, proven methods, expertise or mechanism available to design and implement an adequate biodiversity offset; or (ii) when an activity is anticipated to causes residual adverse effects on an area after an offset has been implemented if the ecosystem or species is threatened or the ecosystem is naturally uncommon;(iii) the ecosystem or habitat contains mana whenua values (including spiritual, historical or cultural significance to mana whenua). (b) not provide for biodiversity compensation where an activity is anticipated to cause residual adverse effects on an area if the ecosystem or species is threatened or the ecosystem is naturally uncommon, or, the ecosystem or habitat contains mana whenua values (including spiritual, historical or cultural significance to mana whenua).;	
S131.072	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	FS29.342	Ngā Hapu o Otaki	FS29.342	Ngā Hapu o Otaki	Policy 24: Protecting indigenous ecosystems and habitats with significant indigenous biodiversity values - district and regional plans	Support	Co -design under a treaty house model is about shaping plans and resource management avenues alongside manawhenua that appropriately recognise the intergenerational prosperity of the uri of Ngā Hapu o Otaki and the wider community. There are ongoing concerns Ngā Hapu o Otaki maintain with GWRC in regard to the policies addressing Co-governance, Co-management, Co-leadership and Co-collabroative operational processes. This submission goes to great length to define where and how further considerations can be made	Not stated	No recommendation

S42A Appendix 2 - HS6 Indigenous Ecosystems - Summary Recommendation Table

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
								<p>recognising the interconnected nature of matauranga maori, the inequitable impact environmental decline will have on mana whenua/tangata whenua and offers insight to the intuitive and inherent awareness manawhenua need to maintain to ensure our intergenerational survival and prosperity.</p> <p>3.4 Freshwater including Public Access – Support in Principal</p> <p>3.6 Indigenous Ecosystems – Support in Principal</p> <p>3.9 Regional Form, Design and Function – Support in Principal</p> <p>Ātiawa views regarding Freshwater, indigenous ecosystems and Regional design and function resonate with insights Ngā Hapu o Otaki maintain. Ngā Hapu o Otaki would like opportunity to speak further to such views during the hearing process. We share Ātiawas concerns for Mātauranga Māori as a foundation for equitable interchange of decision making. Their concerns regarding intensification and the further degradation of taonga across our coastline rings true to the ongoing journey we are on as manawhenua facing intense growth for the coming generation. We seek to join the conversation and endorse provisions that will see our whanaunga and other manawhenua groups recognise their environmental resilience and the cultural agility our shared whakapapa offers.</p>		
S134.011	Powerco Limited			S134.011	Powerco Limited	Policy 24: Protecting indigenous ecosystems and habitats with significant indigenous biodiversity values - district and regional plans	Oppose	<p>The requirement for a minimum 10% net biodiversity gain or benefit is not clear and is not justified in the section 32 report. This is more onerous than the direction set in the exposure draft of the NPS Indigenous Biodiversity around biodiversity gains or benefits. It is also more onerous than the requirement set by the Proposed Natural Resources Plan (PNRP), which sets an outcome of no net biodiversity loss. In lieu of clear direction being set through a gazetted NPS Indigenous Biodiversity, the RPS should be amended to adopt the approach set by the PNRP.</p>	<p>In lieu of the NPS Indigenous Biodiversity being gazetted, amend Policy 24 to ensure the requirements around offsetting are no more onerous than those set out in the Proposed Natural Resources Plan (PNRP), which sets an outcome of no net biodiversity loss. This could be achieved by making changes as follows or to the same effect:</p> <p>"By 30 June 2025, district and regional plans shall include policies, rules and methods to protect indigenous ecosystems and habitats with significant indigenous biodiversity values from</p>	Reject

S42A Appendix 2 - HS6 Indigenous Ecosystems - Summary Recommendation Table

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
									<p>inappropriate subdivision, use and development.</p> <p>Where the policies and/or rules in district and regional plans enable the use of biodiversity offsetting or biodiversity compensation for an ecosystem or habitat with significant indigenous biodiversity values, they shall:</p> <p>...</p> <p>(d) require that the outcome sought from the use of biodiversity offsetting is at least a 10 percent net biodiversity gain, or from biodiversity compensation is at least a 10 percent net biodiversity benefit. achieves no net biodiversity loss.</p> <p>Explanation</p> <p>Policy 24 applies to provisions in regional and district plans ...Calculating a 10 percent net biodiversity gain (offsetting) or a 10 percent net biodiversity benefit (compensation) employs the same or a similar calculation methodology used to determine 'no net loss or preferably net gain' under a standard offsetting approach. The distinction between 'net gain' and 'net benefit' is to recognise that the outcomes achievable through the use of offsetting and compensation are different..."</p>	
S134.011	Powerco Limited	FS27.020	Winstone Aggregates	FS27.020	Winstone Aggregates	Policy 24: Protecting indigenous ecosystems and habitats with significant indigenous biodiversity	Support in part	Winstone agrees that the requirement for 10% gain or benefit via offsetting or compensation is unjustified and more onerous than required by national direction. The request to remove references to the 10% benefit or gain is supported. Winstone is opposed to the inclusion of the 30 June 2025 date in its own submission.	Allow in part	Reject

S42A Appendix 2 - HS6 Indigenous Ecosystems - Summary Recommendation Table

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
						values - district and regional plans				
S134.011	Powerco Limited	FS26.035	Meridian Energy Limited	FS26.035	Meridian Energy Limited	Policy 24: Protecting indigenous ecosystems and habitats with significant indigenous biodiversity values - district and regional plans	Support	Powerco requests that, pending the NPS Indigenous Biodiversity being gazetted, Policy 24 should be amended to ensure the requirements around offsetting are no more onerous than those set out in the Proposed Natural Resources Plan (PNRP), which sets an outcome of no net biodiversity loss. Also requests deletion of the requirement for +10% net biodiversity gain. Meridian supports the approach of the proposed Natural Resources plan and agrees that the requested relief is a rational approach, pending the NPS Indigenous Biodiversity gazettal. Meridian opposes the 10% net gain requirement.	Allow in part Allow to the extent that any amendments are consistent with Meridian's own requested relief.	Accept in part
S137.018	Greater Wellington Regional Council (GWRC)			S137.018	Greater Wellington Regional Council (GWRC)	Policy 24: Protecting indigenous ecosystems and habitats with significant indigenous biodiversity values - district and regional plans	Support in part	Amendments are required to improve readability and clarity.	Amend Policy 24 as follows: By 30 June 2025, district and regional plans shall include policies, rules and/or methods to protect indigenous ecosystems and habitats with significant indigenous biodiversity values from inappropriate subdivision, use and development.	Accept
S137.018	Greater Wellington Regional Council (GWRC)	FS27.021	Winstone Aggregates	FS27.021	Winstone Aggregates	Policy 24: Protecting indigenous ecosystems and habitats with significant indigenous biodiversity values - district and regional plans	Oppose	Winstone opposes the changes to Policy 24 sought by GWRC, for the reasons set out in Winstones' submission.	Disallow	Reject
S137.019	Greater Wellington Regional Council (GWRC)			S137.019	Greater Wellington Regional Council (GWRC)	Policy 24: Protecting indigenous ecosystems and habitats with significant indigenous	Support in part	Amendments are required to improve readability and clarity.	Amend Policy 24 as follows: Where the policies and/or rules in district and regional plans enable the use of biodiversity offsetting or biodiversity compensation	Accept in part

S42A Appendix 2 - HS6 Indigenous Ecosystems - Summary Recommendation Table

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
						biodiversity values - district and regional plans			<p>(a) not provide for biodiversity offsetting; or an ecosystem or habitat with significant indigenous biodiversity values, they shall:</p> <p>(i) where there is no appropriate site, knowledge, proven methods, expertise or mechanism available to design and implement an adequate biodiversity offset; or</p> <p>(ii) when an activity is anticipated to cause residual adverse effects on an area after an offset has been implemented, if the ecosystem or species is threatened, or the ecosystem is naturally uncommon;</p> <p>(b) not provide for biodiversity compensation where an activity is anticipated to cause residual adverse effects on an area if the ecosystem or species is threatened or the ecosystem is naturally uncommon; and (c) ecosystems and species known to meet any of the criteria in (a) or (b) are listed in Appendix 1A (Limits to biodiversity offsetting and biodiversity compensation);</p> <p>(dc) require that the outcome sought from the use of biodiversity offsetting is at least a 10 percent net biodiversity gain, or from biodiversity compensation is at least a 10 percent net biodiversity benefit. Ecosystems and species known to meet any of the criteria in (a) or (b) are listed in Appendix 1A (Limits to biodiversity offsetting and biodiversity compensation).</p>	

S42A Appendix 2 - HS6 Indigenous Ecosystems - Summary Recommendation Table

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
S137.019	Greater Wellington Regional Council (GWRC)	FS27.022	Winstone Aggregates	FS27.022	Winstone Aggregates	Policy 24: Protecting indigenous ecosystems and habitats with significant indigenous biodiversity values - district and regional plans	Oppose	Winstone opposes the changes to Policy 24 sought by GWRC, for the reasons set out in Winstones' submission.	Disallow	Accept in part
S137.019	Greater Wellington Regional Council (GWRC)	FS30.029	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Ltd	FS30.029	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Ltd	Policy 24: Protecting indigenous ecosystems and habitats with significant indigenous biodiversity values - district and regional plans	Oppose	B+LNZ sought the withdrawal of provisions relating to indigenous biodiversity and seek these be redrafted once the NPS-IB becomes operative.	Disallow	Accept in part
S137.019	Greater Wellington Regional Council (GWRC)	FS26.031	Meridian Energy Limited	FS26.031	Meridian Energy Limited	Policy 24: Protecting indigenous ecosystems and habitats with significant indigenous biodiversity values - district and regional plans	Oppose	GWRC (p.4 of 9) has sought numerous amendments to 'improve readability and clarity'. Meridian does not agree that the requested amendments provide any greater readability or clarity. They potentially create further ambiguity.	Disallow	Accept in part
S137.020	Greater Wellington Regional Council (GWRC)			S137.020	Greater Wellington Regional Council (GWRC)	Policy 24: Protecting indigenous ecosystems and habitats with significant indigenous biodiversity values - district and regional plans	Support in part	Amendments are required to improve readability and clarity.	Add to bottom of explanation: Policy 47 determines which activities are 'inappropriate', being those that may adversely affect certain key ecological characteristics of an area.	Accept in part

S42A Appendix 2 - HS6 Indigenous Ecosystems - Summary Recommendation Table

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
S137.020	Greater Wellington Regional Council (GWRC)	FS30.030	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Ltd	FS30.030	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Ltd	Policy 24: Protecting indigenous ecosystems and habitats with significant indigenous biodiversity values - district and regional plans	Oppose	B+LNZ sought the withdrawal of provisions relating to indigenous biodiversity and seek these be redrafted once the NPS-IB becomes operative.	Disallow	Accept in part
S140.049	Wellington City Council (WCC)			S140.049	Wellington City Council (WCC)	Policy 24: Protecting indigenous ecosystems and habitats with significant indigenous biodiversity values - district and regional plans	Oppose	Reason set out in 'general' section above.	Remove deadline.	Accept in part
S144.020	Sustainable Wairarapa Inc			S144.020	Sustainable Wairarapa Inc	Policy 24: Protecting indigenous ecosystems and habitats with significant indigenous biodiversity values - district and regional plans	Support	This should have been completed years ago - the timeline of 2025 is useful	Retain as notified.	Accept in part
S147.023	Wellington Fish and Game Council			S147.023	Wellington Fish and Game Council	Policy 24: Protecting indigenous ecosystems and habitats with significant indigenous biodiversity values - district and regional plans	Support in part	The suggested amendment is intended to give better effect to the NPS-FM (including Policy 10). While the protection of indigenous ecosystems and habitats is vital, so too is the maintaining and enhancing of the whole environment, including those containing valued introduced species. An unduly narrow indigenous - centric focus could lead to lessening or removal of protections for non-indigenous dominant systems, habitats, and species. The loss of protections, enhancements, and restorations risks adverse environmental effects and weakened climate change resilience for the region.	Amend title and text: Policy 24: protecting indigenous ecosystems, and habitats with significant biodiversity or other values, in district and regional plans By 30 June 2025, district and regional plans shall include policies, rules and methods to protect indigenous ecosystems and habitats with significant indigenous biodiversity or other values	Reject

S42A Appendix 2 - HS6 Indigenous Ecosystems - Summary Recommendation Table

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
									from inappropriate subdivision, use and development. Where the policies and/or rules in district and regional plans enable the use of biodiversity offsetting or biodiversity compensation for an ecosystem or habitat with significant indigenous biodiversity or other values, they shall:	
S147.023	Wellington Fish and Game Council	FS27.023	Winstone Aggregates	FS27.023	Winstone Aggregates	Policy 24: Protecting indigenous ecosystems and habitats with significant indigenous biodiversity values - district and regional plans	Oppose	The wording change proposed in this submission would set a concerning precedent, is wholly unjustified and unquantified and is not supported by any national direction documents, and would have significant implications beyond those already outlined in Winstone's original submission on this policy.	Disallow	Accept
S147.023	Wellington Fish and Game Council	FS20.127	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	FS20.127	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	Policy 24: Protecting indigenous ecosystems and habitats with significant indigenous biodiversity values - district and regional plans	Oppose	Ātiawa do not support the rationale set out by Fish and Game, - indigenous ecosystems must be afforded the greatest protection above the protection of introduced ecosystems which already dominate te taiao, to the detriment of indigenous ecosystems. The relief sought by the submitter would like result in a status-quo outcome for indigenous ecosystems, Ātiawa are opposed to this outcome.	Disallow	Accept
S147.023	Wellington Fish and Game Council	FS19.087	Wellington Water Ltd ("Wellington Water")	FS19.087	Wellington Water Ltd ("Wellington Water")	Policy 24: Protecting indigenous ecosystems and habitats with significant indigenous biodiversity values - district and regional plans	Oppose	It is unnecessary and redundant to recreate NPSFM policies within the RPS. Most of the amendments sought do not in any event properly reflect the NPSFM. In particular, they do not accurately reflect the proviso to Policy 7, the requirements of clause 3.22, the limitation of Policy 10 to trout and salmon only, and the subservience of Policy 10 to Policy 9. Some of the amendments attempt to address matters that are already adequately covered by extant provisions or PC1 as notified. Some of the amendments undermine the more detailed content of PC1.	Disallow	Accept

S42A Appendix 2 - HS6 Indigenous Ecosystems - Summary Recommendation Table

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
S147.023	Wellington Fish and Game Council	FS30.192	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Ltd	FS30.192	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Ltd	Policy 24: Protecting indigenous ecosystems and habitats with significant indigenous biodiversity values - district and regional plans	Oppose	B+LNZ generally oppose the submission on the grounds that's B+LNZ are seeking changes of the plan change are restricted to those necessary to give effect to the National Policy Statement for Urban Development and that any other matters should be subject to proper review in the Schedule full review of the RPS in 2024 and in the scheduled reviews of the Natural Resources Plan in 2023 and 2024. This is because the changes materially impact on communities, including rural communities and we do not consider that the necessary engagement has been undertaken to adequately inform these provisions or to meet the requirements of Part 3.2 of the NPS-FM. Furthermore, there is a risk that including matters relating to climate change and indigenous biodiversity before key national legislation is gazetted is premature and will lead to the inefficient implementation and confusion amongst those who it impacts materially.	Disallow That the submission be disallowed with the exception of 147.007	Accept
S148.041	Wellington International Airport Ltd (WIAL)			S148.041	Wellington International Airport Ltd (WIAL)	Policy 24: Protecting indigenous ecosystems and habitats with significant indigenous biodiversity values - district and regional plans	Oppose	This policy is inappropriate in that it sets out limits and constraints as to when offsetting and compensation are available. These criteria are limiting and are written as a bottom line or hard limit. If they are not met the option of offsetting and/or compensation is no longer available to be used as part of any effects management response. These limits will likely foreclose offsetting and/or compensation even where it is likely to result in beneficial ecological or biodiversity outcomes in the region. The restrictions also depart from RMA section 104(1)(ab) which states that a consent authority "must" have regard to: "any measure proposed or agreed to by the applicant for the purpose of ensuring positive effects on the environment to offset or compensate for any adverse effects on the environment that will or may result from allowing the activity". Furthermore, RMA section 104(1)(b) (iii) requires that a consent authority "must" have regard to any relevant provisions of a National Policy Statement. While not yet operative, the draft NPSIB provides some direction about when consideration of biodiversity offsetting should be precluded from consideration – being circumstances when: (i) Residual adverse effects cannot be offset because of the irreplaceability or vulnerability of the	Delete the proposed amendments to the policy including the limits associated with offsetting and compensation within this policy (a) - (d).	Reject

S42A Appendix 2 - HS6 Indigenous Ecosystems - Summary Recommendation Table

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
								<p>indigenous biodiversity affected.</p> <p>(ii) There are no technically feasible or socially acceptable options by which to secure gains within acceptable timeframes.</p> <p>(iii) Effects on indigenous biodiversity are uncertain, unknown or little understood, but potential effects are significantly adverse. This is far more balanced and likely to give rise to good environmental outcomes through offsetting, while avoiding the loss of very important or irreplaceable biodiversity.</p>		
S148.041	Wellington International Airport Ltd (WIAL)	FS8.011	Guardians of the Bays Incorporated	FS8.011	Guardians of the Bays Incorporated	Policy 24: Protecting indigenous ecosystems and habitats with significant indigenous biodiversity values - district and regional plans	Oppose	Policy 24 Protecting indigenous ecosystems and habitats with significant indigenous biodiversity values is not inappropriate and needs to be retained.	Disallow	Accept
S148.041	Wellington International Airport Ltd (WIAL)	FS23.005	Transpower New Zealand Limited	FS23.005	Transpower New Zealand Limited	Policy 24: Protecting indigenous ecosystems and habitats with significant indigenous biodiversity values - district and regional plans	Support	<p>In its original submission Transpower opposed proposed Policy 24 on the basis the provisions are overly broad in their application and potentially impractical to implement in practice. They do not recognise that some infrastructure has a functional or operational need to be constructed or operated in certain locations. In some situations this may mean that biodiversity offsetting or biodiversity compensation is required. Furthermore, Appendix 1A is very extensive in the ecosystems and specifies it applies to.</p> <p>On this basis the relief sought by the submitter is supported.</p>	Allow	Reject
S148.041	Wellington International Airport Ltd (WIAL)	FS27.024	Winstone Aggregates	FS27.024	Winstone Aggregates	Policy 24: Protecting indigenous ecosystems and habitats with significant indigenous biodiversity values - district and regional plans	Support in part	Winstone agrees with WIA that Policy 24 is inappropriate and supports the deletion of the amendments to Policy 24 including the limits associated with offsetting and compensation for the reasons set out in Winstones submission.	Allow in part	Accept in part

S42A Appendix 2 - HS6 Indigenous Ecosystems - Summary Recommendation Table

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
S148.041	Wellington International Airport Ltd (WIAL)	FS26.040	Meridian Energy Limited	FS26.040	Meridian Energy Limited	Policy 24: Protecting indigenous ecosystems and habitats with significant indigenous biodiversity values - district and regional plans	Support	WIAL requests deletion of the proposed amendments to the policy including the limits associated with offsetting and compensation within this policy (a) -- (d). WIAL's request aligns with Meridian's own requested relief.	Allow to the extent that any amendments are consistent with Meridian's own requested relief.	Accept in part
S158.024	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities			S158.024	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	Policy 24: Protecting indigenous ecosystems and habitats with significant indigenous biodiversity values - district and regional plans	Support in part	Seeks that this policy is aligned within the NPS-IB once gazetted.	Amend the policy to align with the NPS-IB once gazetted.	Accept
S158.024	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	FS3.028	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	FS3.028	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	Policy 24: Protecting indigenous ecosystems and habitats with significant indigenous biodiversity values - district and regional plans	Support	Waka Kotahi agree that policies should be aligned with national direction including the NPS-IB.	Allow	Accept
S162.009	Winstone Aggregates			S162.009	Winstone Aggregates	Policy 24: Protecting indigenous ecosystems and habitats with significant indigenous biodiversity values - district and regional plans	Oppose	There are significant issues with the proposed policy, including– <ul style="list-style-type: none"> It is worded as a method, not a policy and therefore it is inappropriate to include in the policy framework. It is unclear how this links with Policy 23 – are the ecosystems and habitats identified in Appendix 1A done so in accordance with Policy 23, or additional to that Policy? The reference to Policy 23 in the explanation fails to clarify this. The basis for limiting offsetting and compensation is unclear. There is no national direction requiring these limits and there is no justification provided in the s32 report. 	Reject the proposed changes to this policy and delete any corresponding references to it.	Reject

S42A Appendix 2 - HS6 Indigenous Ecosystems - Summary Recommendation Table

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
								<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The language used in Policy 24 and the proposed method “no appropriate” “knowledge,” “proven methods,” species “known” is uncertain and introduces a subjective standard into a complex area which is inappropriate. It also removes the ability for even low risk adaptive management and new methodology/advances in ecological understanding. • Policy 24(a)(i) could be interpreted to suggest that where a district council does not have the necessary ecological expertise, it should not provide for offsetting in its district plan therefore making it unavailable to all applicants. • The wording in the explanation is equally confusing and uncertain in terms of “same,” “or similar” calculation methodology. Implementation of these policies at a district level will result in provisions that will arguably prevent reasonable use of private land. Council has a duty to ensure that there is certainty as to when these limits are intended to apply. • The list in Appendix 1A covers an enormous area of the region and limiting the use of offsetting and compensation in these areas has the potential to effectively halt any large-scale (and a lot of small-scale) development entirely, sterilising these sites. It would therefore appear that Policy 24 seeks the creation of a new raft of prohibited activities for activities where effects could not be avoided or mitigated, and would not allow for a site-specific consideration of effects, nor for consideration of other competing matters. The evidential basis for this approach is unclear and is not described in the s32 report. • Taking an ‘species based’ blanket approach is entirely inappropriate. • The explanation in Appendix 1A provides greater clarity as to how Policy 24 is intended to operate than the explanation to Policy 24 itself. If retained, the wording in Appendix 1A should be shifted into Policy 24. The s32 report does not acknowledge the potential significant costs of the policy from the limits it would place on key developments, including infrastructure and mineral extraction. It describes Policy 24 (p191 s32) as a “regional interpretation” for the limits to the use of biodiversity offsetting and compensation is entirely unwarranted. It is unclear what this means and why this has been applied. 		

S42A Appendix 2 - HS6 Indigenous Ecosystems - Summary Recommendation Table

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
S162.009	Winstone Aggregates	FS7.023	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society (Forest & Bird)	FS7.023	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society (Forest & Bird)	Policy 24: Protecting indigenous ecosystems and habitats with significant indigenous biodiversity values - district and regional plans	Oppose in part	Accept this policy could be improved however rejecting all proposed amendments would not achieve the purpose of the RMA	Disallow submission point	Accept
S162.009	Winstone Aggregates	FS11.011	Fulton Hogan Limited	FS11.011	Fulton Hogan Limited	Policy 24: Protecting indigenous ecosystems and habitats with significant indigenous biodiversity values - district and regional plans	Support	The reason for limiting offsetting and compensation in policy 24 is unclear. Also, the list in Appendix 1A covers a significant number of ecosystems and species within the region. We understand that the list is based on ecosystems and species that are 'naturally uncommon'. Further investigation into the costs of such an approach to develop Appendix 1A is required. Limiting the use of offsetting and compensation has the potential to effectively halt developments across a significant portion of the region where effects cannot be avoided or mitigated. This effectively sterilises the use of the site. This has significant implications for quarrying which can only occur where the resource is located. By limiting offsets and compensation in such a way, the policy effectively prohibits activities where effects cannot be avoided or mitigated, does not allow for a site specific consideration and may in fact result in missed opportunities for net biodiversity gain. It is unclear if Appendix 1A has been developed based on the criteria in policy 23	Allow	Reject
S162.009	Winstone Aggregates	FS20.277	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	FS20.277	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	Policy 24: Protecting indigenous ecosystems and habitats with significant indigenous biodiversity values - district and regional plans	Oppose	Ātiawa oppose the submissions from Aggregate and Quarry Association and Winstone Aggregates to the extent that the relief sought is inconsistent with national direction, particularly the NPS-FM. Ātiawa are particularly sensitive to aggregate extraction from awa, it is mana whenua who are guaranteed tino rangatiratanga over the land, waterways and all other taonga (including aggregate) through Te Tiriti o Waitangi. Historically aggregate extraction industry has failed to uphold the articles and the principles of Te Tiriti. Additionally, aggregate extraction has adverse effects on te taiao and mana whenua values.	Disallow	Accept

S42A Appendix 2 - HS6 Indigenous Ecosystems - Summary Recommendation Table

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
								On the matter of 'balancing' national policy statements', recent case law states that the NPS-FM 2020 and NPS-UD 2020 are to be read together and reconciled under the regional policy statement and the district plans. It goes on to say, development capacity does not outweigh (trump) Te Mana o te Wai. Te Mana o te Wai is the fundamental concept of freshwater management: any thinking to the converse would not give effect to either national policy statement. Therefore, to reconcile national direction, it is not a balancing act, or even a compromise, the NPS-FM must be given effect to while achieving the purpose of the NPS-UD for example. This can be applied to aggregate extraction, the activity must be consistent with Te Mana o te Wai and the NPS-FM. The need for housing capacity is not license to forgo the requirements of the NPS-FM.		
S163.059	Wairarapa Federated Farmers			S163.059	Wairarapa Federated Farmers	Policy 24: Protecting indigenous ecosystems and habitats with significant indigenous biodiversity values - district and regional plans	Oppose	Concern that these matters have very recently been the subject of mediated agreements during the pNRP Hearing and are being relitigated through RPS Change One. Concern that this provision is more ambitious and precautionary than the exposure draft of the NPS-IB and that there is almost a blanket prohibition on offsets. Other concerns include that this policy may be significantly at odds with aspirations to increase "nature based solutions" (NBS), eg, creating or restoring wetlands and that offsets cannot be proposed in any forest remnants outside the Tararuas. Refer to submission for more detail on other concerns with this policy.	That the amendments to Policy 24 be deleted Delete the FW icon	Accept in part
S163.059	Wairarapa Federated Farmers	FS7.102	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society (Forest & Bird)	FS7.102	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society (Forest & Bird)	Policy 24: Protecting indigenous ecosystems and habitats with significant indigenous biodiversity values - district and regional plans	Oppose	It is completely appropriate to include climate change, biodiversity and freshwater provisions in the plan change. This plan change creates efficiency by considering multiple policy directives from central government. The amendments sought by Federated Farmers fail to give effect to the NPSFM, the NPS for Indigenous Biodiversity, for which there is an exposure draft and the final version is due out this month, and do not achieve the purpose of the RMA or the Climate Change Response (Zero Carbon) Amendment Act 2019.	Disallow whole submission	Accept in part
S163.059	Wairarapa Federated Farmers	FS20.224	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	FS20.224	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai	Policy 24: Protecting indigenous	Oppose	Ātiawa oppose the entire submission by Wairarapa Federated Farmers. The relief sought by Federated Farmers is to effectively delete the entire proposed	Disallow the entire submission by Wairarapa Federated Farmers.	Accept in part

S42A Appendix 2 - HS6 Indigenous Ecosystems - Summary Recommendation Table

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
					Charitable Trust	ecosystems and habitats with significant indigenous biodiversity values - district and regional plans		plan change (except for submission points S163.083, S163.084). The basis for deleting the proposed plan change is to delay decision-making. Ātiawa do not accept that delaying responding to national direction is an appropriate course of action, and will further compound environmental and resource management issues.		
S163.059	Wairarapa Federated Farmers	FS29.075	Ngā Hapu o Otaki	FS29.075	Ngā Hapu o Otaki	Policy 24: Protecting indigenous ecosystems and habitats with significant indigenous biodiversity values - district and regional plans	Oppose	Section 18, page 4: General Comments – OPPOSE Section 25, Page 5 Going Forward – OPPOSE It is disheartening to see that Wairarapa Federated Farmers aren't capable of recognizing the obligations GWRC must maintain with Treaty Partners. It must be understood that Manawhenua are not simply 'groups of people' but a representation of the signatories that signed the Treaty of Waitangi and the original kaitiaki and custodians of the taonga in question when considering how these plan changes are implemented. Wairarapa Federated Farmers indicate a lack of awareness to the value of manawhenua engagement. Their stated 'aspirations of delivering environmental improvements alongside a thriving bio-economy' aren't feasible without considering the intergenerational insight and technical direction that only Mātauranga Māori can offer.	Not stated	Accept in part
S163.059	Wairarapa Federated Farmers	FS30.131	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Ltd	FS30.131	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Ltd	Policy 24: Protecting indigenous ecosystems and habitats with significant indigenous biodiversity values - district and regional plans	Support	B+LNZ agree that the scope of RPS PC1 should be restricted to those changes necessary to give effect to the National Policy Statement for Urban Development and that any other matters should be subject to proper review in the Schedule full review of the RPS in 2024 and in the scheduled reviews of the Natural Resources Plan in 2023 and 2024. Where alternative relief is provided, B+LNZ generally support this relief.	Allow	Accept in part
S165.057	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society (Forest & Bird)			S165.057	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society (Forest & Bird)	Policy 24: Protecting indigenous ecosystems and habitats with significant indigenous biodiversity values - district	Support in part	Any delay to protecting SNAs should be the shortest possible. The requirement in policy 24(a)(i) should apply equally to compensation. Where compensation is proposed by an applicant, there must be sufficient certainty that the techniques, methods, site etc are appropriate to achieve the claimed biodiversity outcomes, even where those aren't quite an offset. This policy only deals with the limits to offsetting and compensation. However, district plans may not	Amend as follows (or words to the same effect): " As soon as possible, and in any event no later than 30 June 2025 " Amend to apply the requirement in pol. 24(a)(i) to compensation. Include a full set of offsetting and compensation principles	Accept in part

S42A Appendix 2 - HS6 Indigenous Ecosystems - Summary Recommendation Table

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
						and regional plans		include full sets of principles. Including a full set in the RPS would aid consistency across the district plans. Additionally, Policy 47 directs considerations of the limits to offsetting in policy 24, but not any of the other generally accepted parameters for offsetting and compensation. Policy 24(c) could be misinterpreted as indicating only those areas and species identified in Appendix 1A are covered. Oppose Policy 24(d) as drafted. The reference to a net biodiversity benefit adds a new concept that is unnecessary and adds complexity. The reference to a 10% gain or benefit is inappropriate. It is arbitrary and meaningless, especially in the context of compensation. The 10% requires some form of calculation of losses and gains and presupposes there is adequate information about the ecosystem that allows for such a calculation. There are situations where there may not be adequate information upon which to make such a calculation with the necessary level of accuracy.	either in policy 24 or elsewhere in the RPS. Amend Policy to make it clear that the list is not exhaustive and if species or ecosystems meeting the criteria are identified elsewhere, they are covered by the policy. Delete Policy 24(d). Amend explanation accordingly.	
S165.057	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society (Forest & Bird)	FS27.025	Winstone Aggregates	FS27.025	Winstone Aggregates	Policy 24: Protecting indigenous ecosystems and habitats with significant indigenous biodiversity values - district and regional plans	Oppose	Winstone opposes Policy 24 including the limits associated with offsetting and compensation for the reasons set out in Winstones submission.	Disallow	Accept in part
S165.057	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society (Forest & Bird)	FS26.033	Meridian Energy Limited	FS26.033	Meridian Energy Limited	Policy 24: Protecting indigenous ecosystems and habitats with significant indigenous biodiversity values - district and regional plans	Oppose in part	Forest & Bird considers the requirement in policy 24(a)(i) should apply equally to compensation. The limitation on biodiversity offsetting reflects the settled approach of Schedule G2 of the proposed Natural Resources Plan and is an appropriate and relevant constraint for offsetting. It is not a relevant or appropriate constraint for biodiversity compensation. Forest & Bird requests deletion of Policy 24 (d). Meridian supports deletion of clause (d) (Meridian opposes the proposed 10% net gain notion for the reasons explained in its own submission).	Disallow in part Disallow the first submission point and allow the second submission point to the extent consistent with other relief requested in Meridian's submissions.	Accept in part
S165.057	Royal Forest and Bird Protection	FS30.319	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Ltd	FS30.319	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Ltd	Policy 24: Protecting indigenous	Oppose	B+LNZ generally oppose the submission on the grounds that's B+LNZ are seeking changes of the plan change are restricted to those necessary to give	Disallow	Accept in part

S42A Appendix 2 - HS6 Indigenous Ecosystems - Summary Recommendation Table

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
	Society (Forest & Bird)					ecosystems and habitats with significant indigenous biodiversity values - district and regional plans		effect to the National Policy Statement for Urban Development and that any other matters should be subject to proper review in the Schedule full review of the RPS in 2024 and in the scheduled reviews of the Natural Resources Plan in 2023 and 2024. This is because the changes materially impact on communities, including rural communities and we do not consider that the necessary engagement has been undertaken to adequately inform these provisions or to meet the requirements of Part 3.2 of the NPS-FM. Furthermore, there is a risk that including matters relating to climate change and indigenous biodiversity before key national legislation is gazetted or implemented is premature and will lead to the inefficient implementation and confusion amongst those who it impacts materially.		
S166.030	Masterton District Council			S166.030	Masterton District Council	Policy 24: Protecting indigenous ecosystems and habitats with significant indigenous biodiversity values - district and regional plans	Not Stated / Neutral	This is currently being looked at as part of the Wairarapa Combined District Plan review, as part of the NPS Indigenous Biodiversity.	No decision sought.	No recommendation
S167.088	Taranaki Whānui			S167.088	Taranaki Whānui	Policy 24: Protecting indigenous ecosystems and habitats with significant indigenous biodiversity values - district and regional plans	Oppose in part	Categories of offset. Appendix 1A.	Taranaki Whānui are concerned that adding a pathway for biodiversity offsetting and compensation will inherently create a pathway for further adverse impacts. Taranaki Whānui feel strongly that mana whenua needs to partner in the development, management/regulation, and monitoring of this policy. [Note: the decision sought in this submission point cross-references to the decision sought in relation to Appendix 1A in S167.0192.]	Accept in part
S167.088	Taranaki Whānui	FS26.037	Meridian Energy Limited	FS26.037	Meridian Energy Limited	Policy 24: Protecting	Oppose in part	Taranaki Whānui are concerned that adding a pathway for biodiversity offsetting and compensation	Disallow in part	Accept in part

S42A Appendix 2 - HS6 Indigenous Ecosystems - Summary Recommendation Table

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
						indigenous ecosystems and habitats with significant indigenous biodiversity values - district and regional plans		will inherently create a pathway for further adverse impacts. Biodiversity offsetting and compensation have been endorsed as legitimate approaches in numerous Environment Court decisions and in the recently settled proposed Natural Resources Plan.	Disallow any deletion of biodiversity offsetting and compensation as options in the RPS effects management hierarchy.	
S168.073	Rangitāne O Wairarapa Inc			S168.073	Rangitāne O Wairarapa Inc	Policy 24: Protecting indigenous ecosystems and habitats with significant indigenous biodiversity values - district and regional plans	Oppose in part	The intention of the amendments to Policy 24 is supported, including the addition of a timeframe. However, Rangitāne o Wairarapa considers that amendments are required to ensure that the policy achieves its intent and provides clear outcomes. The use of the term 'enable' is inappropriate in this context. Biodiversity Offsetting and Biodiversity Compensation are measures to be considered once all other management measures have been explored and discounted. The wording should accurately reflect the role of offsetting and compensation. The wording of the policy does not accurately reflect the intention of the Exposure Draft of the NPS IB, particularly with regard to the limits to offsetting and compensation. It is not helpful to paraphrase the Exposure Draft NPS IB policy where no additional local context is provided.	Accurately reflect the role of offsetting and compensation as provided for by the Exposure Draft of the NPS IB; Be consistent with and give effect to the NPS IB (on the presumption this is expected to be gazetted before the plan change hearings commence, and on the basis the wording of the NPS is unlikely to change), particularly with respect to the limits to offsetting and compensation,	Accept in part
S168.073	Rangitāne O Wairarapa Inc	FS26.036	Meridian Energy Limited	FS26.036	Meridian Energy Limited	Policy 24: Protecting indigenous ecosystems and habitats with significant indigenous biodiversity values - district and regional plans	Oppose	Rangitane o Wairarapa requests amendment of the policy to: -- Accurately reflect the role of offsetting and compensation as provided for by the Exposure Draft of the NPS IB; and -- be consistent with and give effect to the NPS IB (on the presumption this is expected to be gazetted before the plan change hearings commence, and on the basis the wording of the NPS is unlikely to change), particularly with respect to the limits to offsetting and compensation. Meridian considers it is premature changes based on an exposure draft of the NPS Indigenous Biodiversity. If GWRC's proposed RPS provisions do not give effect to the future NPSIB, the RPS will need to be amended in any event.	Disallow	Accept in part
S168.073	Rangitāne O Wairarapa Inc	FS31.183	Sustainable Wairarapa Inc	FS31.183	Sustainable Wairarapa Inc	Policy 24: Protecting indigenous ecosystems and habitats	Support	Kia ora koutou, My name is Ian Gunn, Secretary Sustainable Wairarapa inc. contact # 021567134, address 4B McKay Street, Paraparaumu Beach 5032. Firstly we'd like to state the time frame provided to peruse over 900 pages of submissions is in our	Not stated	Accept in part

S42A Appendix 2 - HS6 Indigenous Ecosystems - Summary Recommendation Table

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
						with significant indigenous biodiversity values - district and regional plans		opinion an abuse of process. The benefit of further submissions is for you the council to listen and hear the views of its ratepayers. The timeframe in our case does not allow a rigorous review of the original submissions to council. On top of this we are a week before Christmas- a very busy and chaotic time for most members of the community. It is highly likely that the majority of staff will take leave over the Christmas break so analysis of any further submissions will not occur until late January 2023-so why the short period to respond. While there is due process there is also good practise your management of the further submissions fails the good practise model. As a consequence we would like you to note Sustainable Wairarapa's strong support of the original submissions lodged with council by the two Wairarapa Iwi-Ngati Kahungunu and Rangitane. Its clear that there is a poor understanding of nature based solutions this term needs further explanation. Sustainable Wairarapa acknowledges that while nature based solutions offer a wide variety of options its not the only solution. We are heartened by the widespread support for the original document. Thanks for an opportunity to make a further submission. Nga mihi nui lan Gun		
S168.074	Rangitāne O Wairarapa Inc			S168.074	Rangitāne O Wairarapa Inc	Policy 24: Protecting indigenous ecosystems and habitats with significant indigenous biodiversity values - district and regional plans	Oppose in part	Clause (c) in particular, does not make grammatical sense and it is therefore difficult to understand how it will achieve the intended outcomes.	Amend clause c so that it makes grammatical sense,	Accept
S168.074	Rangitāne O Wairarapa Inc	FS31.184	Sustainable Wairarapa Inc	FS31.184	Sustainable Wairarapa Inc	Policy 24: Protecting indigenous ecosystems and habitats with significant indigenous biodiversity values - district	Support	Kia ora koutou, My name is lan Gunn, Secretary Sustainable Wairarapa inc. contact # 021567134, address 4B McKay Street, Paraparaumu Beach 5032. Firstly we'd like to state the time frame provided to peruse over 900 pages of submissions is in our opinion an abuse of process. The benefit of further submissions is for you the council to listen and hear the views of its ratepayers. The timeframe in our case does not allow a rigorous review of the original submissions to council. On top of this we are a week	Not stated	Accept

S42A Appendix 2 - HS6 Indigenous Ecosystems - Summary Recommendation Table

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
						and regional plans		before Christmas- a very busy and chaotic time for most members of the community. It is highly likely that the majority of staff will take leave over the Christmas break so analysis of any further submissions will not occur until late January 2023-so why the short period to respond. While there is due process there is also good practise your management of the further submissions fails the good practise model. As a consequence we would like you to note Sustainable Wairarapa's strong support of the original submissions lodged with council by the two Wairarapa Iwi-Ngati Kahungunu and Rangitane. Its clear that there is a poor understanding of nature based solutions this term needs further explanation. Sustainable Wairarapa acknowledges that while nature based solutions offer a wide variety of options its not the only solution. We are heartened by the widespread support for the original document. Thanks for an opportunity to make a further submission. Nga mihi nui lan Gun		
S168.075	Rangitāne O Wairarapa Inc			S168.075	Rangitāne O Wairarapa Inc	Policy 24: Protecting indigenous ecosystems and habitats with significant indigenous biodiversity values - district and regional plans	Oppose in part	There are additional principles to offsetting and compensation provided in the NPS IB, the offsetting principles are particularly important. A reference to these principles and the NPS IB in the supporting text would be helpful in highlighting this.	Ensure the policy wording and proposed definitions adopt a consistent approach with respect to the 10% net gain for offsetting and 10% net benefit for compensation.	Accept
S168.075	Rangitāne O Wairarapa Inc	FS31.185	Sustainable Wairarapa Inc	FS31.185	Sustainable Wairarapa Inc	Policy 24: Protecting indigenous ecosystems and habitats with significant indigenous biodiversity values - district and regional plans	Support	Kia ora koutou, My name is lan Gunn, Secretary Sustainable Wairarapa inc. contact # 021567134, address 4B McKay Street, Paraparaumu Beach 5032. Firstly we'd like to state the time frame provided to peruse over 900 pages of submissions is in our opinion an abuse of process. The benefit of further submissions is for you the council to listen and hear the views of its ratepayers. The timeframe in our case does not allow a rigorous review of the original submissions to council. On top of this we are a week before Christmas- a very busy and chaotic time for most members of the community. It is highly likely that the majority of staff will take leave over the Christmas break so analysis of any further submissions will not occur until late January 2023-so	Not stated	Accept

S42A Appendix 2 - HS6 Indigenous Ecosystems - Summary Recommendation Table

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
								why the short period to respond. While there is due process there is also good practise your management of the further submissions fails the good practise model. As a consequence we would like you to note Sustainable Wairarapa's strong support of the original submissions lodged with council by the two Wairarapa Iwi-Ngati Kahungunu and Rangitane. Its clear that there is a poor understanding of nature based solutions this term needs further explanation. Sustainable Wairarapa acknowledges that while nature based solutions offer a wide variety of options its not the only solution. We are heartened by the widespread support for the original document. Thanks for an opportunity to make a further submission. Nga mihi nui Ian Gun		
S168.076	Rangitāne O Wairarapa Inc			S168.076	Rangitāne O Wairarapa Inc	Policy 24: Protecting indigenous ecosystems and habitats with significant indigenous biodiversity values - district and regional plans	Not Stated / Neutral		The inclusion of known ecosystems and species that meet the limiting criteria in Appendix 1A is supported for clarity, acknowledging that this list is not necessarily limiting and additional ecosystems or species may be included.	Accept
S168.076	Rangitāne O Wairarapa Inc	FS31.186	Sustainable Wairarapa Inc	FS31.186	Sustainable Wairarapa Inc	Policy 24: Protecting indigenous ecosystems and habitats with significant indigenous biodiversity values - district and regional plans	Support	Kia ora koutou, My name is Ian Gunn, Secretary Sustainable Wairarapa inc. contact # 021567134, address 4B McKay Street, Paraparaumu Beach 5032. Firstly we'd like to state the time frame provided to peruse over 900 pages of submissions is in our opinion an abuse of process. The benefit of further submissions is for you the council to listen and hear the views of its ratepayers. The timeframe in our case does not allow a rigorous review of the original submissions to council. On top of this we are a week before Christmas- a very busy and chaotic time for most members of the community. It is highly likely that the majority of staff will take leave over the Christmas break so analysis of any further submissions will not occur until late January 2023-so why the short period to respond. While there is due process there is also good practise your management of the further submissions fails the good practise model. As a consequence we would like you to note Sustainable Wairarapa's strong support of the	Not stated	Accept

S42A Appendix 2 - HS6 Indigenous Ecosystems - Summary Recommendation Table

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
								original submissions lodged with council by the two Wairarapa Iwi-Ngati Kahungunu and Rangitane. Its clear that there is a poor understanding of nature based solutions this term needs further explanation. Sustainable Wairarapa acknowledges that while nature based solutions offer a wide variety of options its not the only solution. We are heartened by the widespread support for the original document. Thanks for an opportunity to make a further submission. Nga mihi nui Ian Gun		
S170.034	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira			S170.034	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	Policy 24: Protecting indigenous ecosystems and habitats with significant indigenous biodiversity values - district and regional plans	Not Stated / Neutral	<p>Policy 23 and Policy 24 identifying and protecting Significant Natural Areas (SNAs) are a critical part of the RPS. It is concerning these values to be identified by June 2024. Policy 23 and 24 have been in effect for a long time and is not ideal some Councils have not given effect to these Policies and / or gave effect partially, either to include just Public SNAs and leaving out the private land areas.</p> <p>It is crucial that councils that are tentatively holding space for these policies implement Policy 23 and 24 since District Plans to map, identify the SNAs, and undertake public consultation, and finally performing plan change to give effect to SNAs protection in the form of provisions are long processes that jeopardise the protection of SNAs.</p> <p>An important development that involves the implementation of Policy 23 and 24, is the Ministry for the Environment released the exposure draft for the National Policy Statement Indigenous Biodiversity (NPS-IB). This means there will be further policy implications to Regional Plan and District Plans. Since the exposure draft is accepting public submissions, it will be sometime for policies to take effect then to be implemented in Regional and District Plans.</p> <p>The intention of Policy 23 and 24 becomes more important where all Councils are about to give effect to National Policy Statement-Urban Development (NPS-UD) prioritising housing and development needs. It is critical that SNAs are provided protection in this uncertain environment where the Councils still to give effect to NPS-IB but will give effect to NPS-UD before National Policy Statement - Freshwater Management (NPS-FM) and NPS-IB start to take effect providing protection for our freshwater and indigenous ecosystems. Note that these NPSs are not synchronised, it is imperative Policy 23 and 24</p>	Ensure the provisions give effect to recent national direction.	Accept

S42A Appendix 2 - HS6 Indigenous Ecosystems - Summary Recommendation Table

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
								ensures the Plan is given effect as soon as practicable.		
		FS29.148	Ngā Hapu o Otaki	FS29.148	Ngā Hapu o Otaki	Policy 24: Protecting indigenous ecosystems and habitats with significant indigenous biodiversity values - district and regional plans	Support	<p>Co -design under a treaty house model is about shaping plans and resource management avenues alongside manawhenua that appropriately recognise the intergenerational prosperity of the uri of Ngā Hapu o Otaki and the wider community. There are ongoing concerns Ngā Hapu o Otaki maintain with GWRC in regard to the policies addressing Co-governance, Co-management, Co-leadership and Co-collabroative operational processes.</p> <p>This submission goes to great length to define where and how further considerations can be made recognising the interconnected nature of matauranga maori, the inequitable impact environmental decline will have on mana whenua/tangata whenua and offers insight to the intuitive and inherent awareness manawhenua need to maintain to ensure our intergenerational survival and prosperity.</p> <p>Objective 3: Lack of mana whenua / tangata whenua involvement in decision making – Support in principal FW Kaitiakitanga O1, O2, O3 – Support in principal Wai Mate O1,O2,O3 - Support in principal Climate Change and Freshwater objectives, CCFW-01, CCFW-02, CCFW-03, CCFW-04, CCFW-05, CCFW-06</p> <p>This submission appropriately articulates Kaitiakitanga, FW objectives regarding Climate Change, Wai mate, Wai ora and the lack of provisions to see balanced decision making between Treaty Partners. Ngā Hapu o Otaki support Te Runanga o Toa Rangatira expression and wish to speak further to such views during the hearing process. We have serious concerns for the degradation of our taonga, in particular our wai. This combined with the projected growth the next generation will see means manawhenua resilience and agility to climate grief and environmental decline is paramount. Ngā Hapu o Otaki seek to support our whanaunga and other Manawhenua groups to build the provisions we will need to solidify our Tino Rangatiratanga and ensure our intergenerational prosperity.</p>	Not stated	No recommendation
S170.035	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira			S170.035	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	Policy 24: Protecting indigenous ecosystems	Support	The clause (a) of this Policy, that the offsetting should not be applied if the species or ecosystems are threatened, or the ecosystem is uncommon is supported.	Retain (a) as notified.	Accept in part

S42A Appendix 2 - HS6 Indigenous Ecosystems - Summary Recommendation Table

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
						and habitats with significant indigenous biodiversity values - district and regional plans				
S170.035	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	FS29.149	Ngā Hapu o Otaki	FS29.149	Ngā Hapu o Otaki	Policy 24: Protecting indigenous ecosystems and habitats with significant indigenous biodiversity values - district and regional plans	Support	<p>Co -design under a treaty house model is about shaping plans and resource management avenues alongside manawhenua that appropriately recognise the intergenerational prosperity of the uri of Ngā Hapu o Otaki and the wider community.</p> <p>There are ongoing concerns Ngā Hapu o Otaki maintain with GWRC in regard to the policies addressing Co-governance, Co-management, Co-leadership and Co-collabroative operational processes.</p> <p>This submission goes to great length to define where and how further considerations can be made recognising the interconnected nature of matauranga maori, the inequitable impact environmental decline will have on mana whenua/tangata whenua and offers insight to the intuitive and inherent awareness manawhenua need to maintain to ensure our intergenerational survival and prosperity.</p> <p>Objective 3: Lack of mana whenua / tangata whenua involvement in decision making – Support in principal FW Kaitiakitanga O1, O2, O3 – Support in principal Wai Mate O1,O2,O3 - Support in principal Climate Change and Freshwater objectives, CCFW-01, CCFW-02, CCFW-03, CCFW-04, CCFW-05, CCFW-06</p> <p>This submission appropriately articulates Kaitiakitanga, FW objectives regarding Climate Change, Wai mate, Wai ora and the lack of provisions to see balanced decision making between Treaty Partners. Ngā Hapu o Otaki support Te Runanga o Toa Rangatira expression and wish to speak further to such views during the hearing process. We have serious concerns for the degradation of our taonga, in particular our wai. This combined with the projected growth the next generation will see means manawhenua resilience and agility to climate grief and environmental decline is paramount. Ngā Hapu o Otaki seek to support our whanaunga and other Manawhenua groups to build the provisions we will need to solidify our Tino Rangatiratanga and ensure our intergenerational prosperity.</p>	Not stated	No recommendation

S42A Appendix 2 - HS6 Indigenous Ecosystems - Summary Recommendation Table

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
S170.080	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira			S170.080	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	Policy 24: Protecting indigenous ecosystems and habitats with significant indigenous biodiversity values - district and regional plans	Not Stated / Neutral	It is unclear how the clause (b) come to the number 'at least 10%'. How do we identify the benefits of and understand the results of 10%? How do we make sure that the biodiversity compensation is adequate or enough to protect what we want to protect? Given that most of the species and ecosystems in Greater Wellington, in part, are limited, in danger or threatened, we are unsure the biodiversity value loss and gain can be in balance.	Ensure biodiversity compensation is adequate or enough to protect what we want to protect.	Accept in part
S170.080	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	FS29.194	Ngā Hapu o Otaki	FS29.194	Ngā Hapu o Otaki	Policy 24: Protecting indigenous ecosystems and habitats with significant indigenous biodiversity values - district and regional plans	Support	Co -design under a treaty house model is about shaping plans and resource management avenues alongside manawhenua that appropriately recognise the intergenerational prosperity of the uri of Ngā Hapu o Otaki and the wider community. There are ongoing concerns Ngā Hapu o Otaki maintain with GWRC in regard to the policies addressing Co-governance, Co-management, Co-leadership and Co-collabroative operational processes. This submission goes to great length to define where and how further considerations can be made recognising the interconnected nature of matauranga maori, the inequitable impact environmental decline will have on mana whenua/tangata whenua and offers insight to the intuitive and inherent awareness manawhenua need to maintain to ensure our intergenerational survival and prosperity. Objective 3: Lack of mana whenua / tangata whenua involvement in decision making – Support in principal FW Kaitiakitanga O1, O2, O3 – Support in principal Wai Mate O1,O2,O3 - Support in principal Climate Change and Freshwater objectives, CCFW-01, CCFW-02, CCFW-03, CCFW-04, CCFW-05, CCFW-06 This submission appropriately articulates Kaitiakitanga, FW objectives regarding Climate Change, Wai mate, Wai ora and the lack of provisions to see balanced decision making between Treaty Partners. Ngā Hapu o Otaki support Te Runanga o Toa Rangatira expression and wish to speak further to such views during the hearing process. We have serious concerns for the degradation of our taonga, in particular our wai. This combined with the projected growth the next generation will see means manawhenua resilience and agility to climate grief and environmental decline is paramount. Ngā Hapu o	Not stated	No recommendation

S42A Appendix 2 - HS6 Indigenous Ecosystems - Summary Recommendation Table

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
								Otaki seek to support our whanaunga and other Manawhenua groups to build the provisions we will need to solidify our Tino Rangatiratanga and ensure our intergenerational prosperity.		
S16.062	Kāpiti Coast District Council			S16.062	Kāpiti Coast District Council	Policy IE.1: Giving effect to mana whenua / tangata whenua roles and values when managing indigenous biodiversity - district and regional plans	Oppose	Although the principle of the policy is not opposed, Council notes the proposed policy is not supported by any legislative requirements under the RMA or higher level statutory planning processes, yet it imposes significant additional costs on city and district councils though requiring changes to district plans to give effect to it. This makes it difficult to justify under section 32 of the RMA. Council notes it is a common theme within the plan change that the draft NPS-IB is proposed to be implemented in the RPS despite the NPS-IB not being in force or in its final form - and therefore the NPS- IB lacks any legal weight under the RMA.	Delete Policy IE.1.	reject
S16.062	Kāpiti Coast District Council	FS20.052	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	FS20.052	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	Policy IE.1: Giving effect to mana whenua / tangata whenua roles and values when managing indigenous biodiversity - district and regional plans	Oppose	Ātiawa strongly oppose the reasoning set out by Kāpiti Coast District Council. The rationale is flawed and unfounded, Te Tiriti o Waitangi, the RMA and the NPS-FM all provide for mana whenua to exercise their kaitiakitanga over our ancestral lands, water, sites, wāhi tapu and other taonga. Ātiawa note that indigenous biodiversity includes freshwater ecosystems.	Disallow	Accept
S30.049	Porirua City Council			S30.049	Porirua City Council	Policy IE.1: Giving effect to mana whenua / tangata whenua roles and values when managing indigenous biodiversity - district and regional plans	Support	The requirement to partner with mana whenua in the development of district plans is broader than what this policy addresses. It is already a requirement of s8 of the RMA, if it is to be repeated in the RPS it should be a separate overarching policy. Such a policy should also provide meaningful direction as to the actions that should be taken in respect of partnering. Further, it is possible that this policy will not align with the NPS-IB, the exposure draft released by the Government did not allow the effects management hierarchy to be applied to a broad range of effects including any removal of indigenous vegetation.	Either delete this policy, or amend in line with the gazetted NPS-IB but only where it will provide additional guidance at a regional level in consultation with mana whenua.	Accept in part
S30.049	Porirua City Council	FS25.082	Peka Peka Farm Limited	FS25.082	Peka Peka Farm Limited	Policy IE.1: Giving effect to mana whenua / tangata	Support	The submission provides a comprehensive analysis of the proposed change including in relation to matters of scope and jurisdiction. It is supported without prejudice to the specific relief sought in the primary	Allow	Accept in part

S42A Appendix 2 - HS6 Indigenous Ecosystems - Summary Recommendation Table

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
						whenua roles and values when managing indigenous biodiversity - district and regional plans		submission or this further submission by Peka Peka Farm Ltd.		
S30.049	Porirua City Council	FS25.208	Peka Peka Farm Limited	FS25.208	Peka Peka Farm Limited	Policy IE.1: Giving effect to mana whenua / tangata whenua roles and values when managing indigenous biodiversity - district and regional plans	Support	The submission provides a comprehensive analysis of the proposed change including in relation to matters of scope and jurisdiction. It is supported without prejudice to the specific relief sought in the primary submission or this further submission by Peka Peka Farm Ltd.	Allow	Accept in part
S34.083	Te Kaunihera o Te Awa Kairangi ki Uta, Upper Hutt City Council			S34.083	Te Kaunihera o Te Awa Kairangi ki Uta, Upper Hutt City Council	Policy IE.1: Giving effect to mana whenua / tangata whenua roles and values when managing indigenous biodiversity - district and regional plans	Support	Notwithstanding the general comments on waiting for the NPS- IB, we support the need to recognise mana whenua values. However, the district or regional plan components of this method need to occur once the NPS-IB has been gazetted, in order to avoid duplication and unnecessary waste of Council effort, mana whenua resources and ratepayer's money.	Retain provision as notified.	Accept in part
S102.057	Te Tumu Paeroa Office of the Māori Trustee			S102.057	Te Tumu Paeroa Office of the Māori Trustee	Policy IE.1: Giving effect to mana whenua / tangata whenua roles and values when managing indigenous biodiversity - district and regional plans	Support in part	Generally support Policy IE.2. However, Policy IE.1 should include a provision for giving local effect to Te Rito o te Harakeke, to be consistent with Policy IE.2. Furthermore, Policy IE.1 should allow for Māori landowners to exercise kaitiakitanga on their whenua as not all Māori within the same iwi or hapū have the same tikanga when managing and monitoring indigenous biodiversity on their land.	Amend Policy IE.1 clause (a) as follows: (a) apply mātauranga Māori frameworks, and support mana whenua / tangata whenua and Māori landowners to exercise their kaitiakitanga, in managing and monitoring indigenous biodiversity, including giving effect to Te Rito o te Harakeke.	reject

S42A Appendix 2 - HS6 Indigenous Ecosystems - Summary Recommendation Table

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
S115.049	Hutt City Council			S115.049	Hutt City Council	Policy IE.1: Giving effect to mana whenua / tangata whenua roles and values when managing indigenous biodiversity - district and regional plans	Oppose	If the provisions are nonetheless added, then HCC seeks an amendment to the deadline date from 30 June 2025 to 5 years from the operative date of the proposed RPS change 1. This is because the deadline does not align with the deadline proposed in the most recent draft of the National Policy Statement on Indigenous Biodiversity (5 years from the commencement date of that NPS).	Delete new Policy IE.1.	reject
S115.049	Hutt City Council	FS10.021	BP Oil NZ Ltd Mobil Oil NZ Ltd and Z Energy Ltd (the Fuel Companies)	FS10.021	BP Oil NZ Ltd Mobil Oil NZ Ltd and Z Energy Ltd (the Fuel Companies)	Policy IE.1: Giving effect to mana whenua / tangata whenua roles and values when managing indigenous biodiversity - district and regional plans	Support	Agree that provisions relating to indigenous biodiversity should only be reviewed once the NPS-IB is gazetted, or as a minimum, the timeframes should be amended to align with those set out in the most recent draft of the NPS-IB.	Allow the submission and delete all new provisions and amendments to existing provisions relating to indigenous biodiversity and retain existing Operative RPS provisions.	reject
S115.049	Hutt City Council	FS24.017	Powerco Limited	FS24.017	Powerco Limited	Policy IE.1: Giving effect to mana whenua / tangata whenua roles and values when managing indigenous biodiversity - district and regional plans	Support	Agree that provisions relating to indigenous biodiversity should only be reviewed once the NPS-IB is gazetted, or as a minimum, the timeframes should be amended to align with those set out in the most recent draft of the NPS-IB.	Allow the submission and delete all new provisions and amendments to existing provisions relating to indigenous biodiversity and retain existing Operative RPS provisions.	reject
S131.073	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust			S131.073	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	Policy IE.1: Giving effect to mana whenua / tangata whenua roles and values when managing indigenous biodiversity -	Support	Ātiawa supports the role of mana whenua to be recognised and provided for through Policy IE.1. The policy clearly sets out ways to enable mana whenua to exercise their kaitiakitanga.	Retain as notified.	Accept

S42A Appendix 2 - HS6 Indigenous Ecosystems - Summary Recommendation Table

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
						district and regional plans				
S131.073	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	FS29.343	Ngā Hapu o Otaki	FS29.343	Ngā Hapu o Otaki	Policy IE.1: Giving effect to mana whenua / tangata whenua roles and values when managing indigenous biodiversity - district and regional plans	Support	<p>Co -design under a treaty house model is about shaping plans and resource management avenues alongside manawhenua that appropriately recognise the intergenerational prosperity of the uri of Ngā Hapu o Otaki and the wider community. There are ongoing concerns Ngā Hapu o Otaki maintain with GWRC in regard to the policies addressing Co-governance, Co-management, Co-leadership and Co-collabroative operational processes.</p> <p>This submission goes to great length to define where and how further considerations can be made recognising the interconnected nature of matauranga maori, the inequitable impact environmental decline will have on mana whenua/tangata whenua and offers insight to the intuitive and inherent awareness manawhenua need to maintain to ensure our intergenerational survival and prosperity.</p> <p>3.4 Freshwater including Public Access – Support in Principal</p> <p>3.6 Indigenous Ecosystems – Support in Principal</p> <p>3.9 Regional Form, Design and Function – Support in Principal</p> <p>Ātiawa views regarding Freshwater, indigenous ecosystems and Regional design and function resonate with insights Ngā Hapu o Otaki maintain. Ngā Hapu o Otaki would like opportunity to speak further to such views during the hearing process. We share Ātiawas concerns for Mātauranga Māori as a foundation for equitable interchange of decision making. Their concerns regarding intensification and the further degredation of taonga across our coastline rings true to the ongoing journey we are on as manawhenua facing intense growth for the coming generation. We seek to join the conversation and endorse provisions that will see our whanaunga and other manawhenua groups recognise their environmental resilience and the cultural agility our shared whakapapa offers.</p>	Not stated	Accept
S133.022	Muaūpoko Tribal Authority			S133.022	Muaūpoko Tribal Authority	Policy IE.1: Giving effect to mana whenua / tangata whenua roles	Support in part	Supports the requirement to partner with mana whenua/tangata whenua, but request that Muaūpoko are also recognised.	Recognise Muaūpoko as also having connection to indigenous biodiversity in Te-Whanganui-a-Tara. OR	reject

S42A Appendix 2 - HS6 Indigenous Ecosystems - Summary Recommendation Table

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
						and values when managing indigenous biodiversity - district and regional plans			Alternative relief that may be necessary or appropriate to ensure Muaūpoko connection to Te Whanganui-a-Tara is recognised.	
S133.022	Muaūpoko Tribal Authority	FS6.052	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira on behalf of Ngāti Toa Rangatira	FS6.052	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira on behalf of Ngāti Toa Rangatira	Policy IE.1: Giving effect to mana whenua / tangata whenua roles and values when managing indigenous biodiversity - district and regional plans	Oppose	We oppose this submission because as Muaūpoko claims are inappropriate. This not only causes confusion around which iwi are Tangata Whenua in Te Whanganui a Tara rohe and which iwi to engage with, but also portrays a false perception of who the mana whenua are, which is also inappropriate.	Disallow We seek that this part of the submission is disallowed.	Accept in part
S133.022	Muaūpoko Tribal Authority	FS20.369	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	FS20.369	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	Policy IE.1: Giving effect to mana whenua / tangata whenua roles and values when managing indigenous biodiversity - district and regional plans	Oppose	Ātiawa vehemently oppose the submission and claims made by Muaūpoko Tribal Authority. The assertions made by Muāupoko Tribal Authority are categorically incorrect and highly offensive to Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai. While Muaūpoko may have historical associations with Te Whanganui-a-Tara and Kāpiti. These associations are recognised as historical only. Ātiawa refer to the evidence provided by Ngārongo Iwikatea Nicholson in support of Ngāti Toarangatira's claims which were upheld and settled by the Crown. Pages 26-34 sets out the extinguishment of Muaūpoko rights in our rohe. From both a tikanga Māori perspective and a Crown law perspective, Muaūpoko do not hold mana whenua (including for the purposes of the Resource Management Act). There is therefore no basis for Muaūpoko Tribal Authority to be recognised as being kaitiaki in the rohe; to do so would be incomprehensible and irreconcilable to Ātiawa, and more generally an affront to tikanga Māori. Muaūpoko Tribal Authority have cited Te Kāhui Māngai mapping as evidence of the spatial extent that they exercise kaitiakitanga. This in itself evidences the lack of basis to their claims, in that Te Kāhui Māngai map simply reflects claims made by Māori groups, and from our previous inquiry to Te Puni Kōkiri who are responsible for this map, we	Disallow the whole submission	Accept in part

S42A Appendix 2 - HS6 Indigenous Ecosystems - Summary Recommendation Table

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
								learned that Muaūpoko Tribal Authority included that spatial extent in their Agreement in Principle. Agreements in Principle provide claimants the opportunity to set out everything that a claimant wants from the Crown. They have no legal effect and are therefore not legally recognised. We strongly advise the Council to remain conscious that it is not appropriate for regional planning processes to be exploited in the manner suggested by the Muaūpoko Tribal Authority, that dealing with the false claims of groups like these must be left to the Crown, and that settlements must not pre-empted. Whilst Muaūpoko Tribal Authority may wish to seek out new territories through online maps, this is not of course how mana whenua is gained or held. We remain as ahi kā and mana whenua on the land, as we have undisturbed for over 198 years.		
S140.050	Wellington City Council (WCC)			S140.050	Wellington City Council (WCC)	Policy IE.1: Giving effect to mana whenua / tangata whenua roles and values when managing indigenous biodiversity - district and regional plans	Support	This policy should be clear in the text that it relates to indigenous biodiversity management.	Amend with this text, or similar: When considering an application for a resource consent, notice of requirement, or a plan change, variation or review of a district plan, as it relates to managing indigenous biodiversity for subdivision, use or development, particular regard shall be given to enabling mana whenua / tangata whenua to exercise their role as kaitiaki ...	Accept
S147.034	Wellington Fish and Game Council			S147.034	Wellington Fish and Game Council	Policy IE.1: Giving effect to mana whenua / tangata whenua roles and values when managing indigenous biodiversity - district and regional plans	Support in part	Support the intention of this objective to ensure that mana whenua/tangata whenua values are properly recognised and provided for and their role as kaitiaki is supported. At the same time, in order to give full effect to the NPS-FM, those values must be considered alongside other recognised values and achieved in partnership with statutory managers of freshwater species and their habitats. The suggested amendment also aligns the language of this objective with the language of s 30(ga) RMA, which accords Regional Councils responsibility for "maintaining" rather than "managing" indigenous biodiversity.	Amend title Policy IE.1: Giving effect to mana whenua / tangata whenua roles and values when managing maintaining indigenous biodiversity - district and regional plans	reject

S42A Appendix 2 - HS6 Indigenous Ecosystems - Summary Recommendation Table

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
S147.034	Wellington Fish and Game Council	FS20.149	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	FS20.149	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	Policy IE.1: Giving effect to mana whenua / tangata whenua roles and values when managing indigenous biodiversity - district and regional plans	Oppose in part	Ātiawa oppose the relief sought, mana whenua have an important role as Treaty Partners in the management and maintenance of indigenous biodiversity. The relief sought seeks to minimise this role.	Disallow	Accept
S147.034	Wellington Fish and Game Council	FS19.098	Wellington Water Ltd ("Wellington Water")	FS19.098	Wellington Water Ltd ("Wellington Water")	Policy IE.1: Giving effect to mana whenua / tangata whenua roles and values when managing indigenous biodiversity - district and regional plans	Oppose	It is unnecessary and redundant to recreate NPSFM policies within the RPS. Most of the amendments sought do not in any event properly reflect the NPSFM. In particular, they do not accurately reflect the proviso to Policy 7, the requirements of clause 3.22, the limitation of Policy 10 to trout and salmon only, and the subservience of Policy 10 to Policy 9. Some of the amendments attempt to address matters that are already adequately covered by extant provisions or PC1 as notified. Some of the amendments undermine the more detailed content of PC1.	Disallow	Accept
S147.034	Wellington Fish and Game Council	FS30.203	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Ltd	FS30.203	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Ltd	Policy IE.1: Giving effect to mana whenua / tangata whenua roles and values when managing indigenous biodiversity - district and regional plans	Oppose	B+LNZ generally oppose the submission on the grounds that's B+LNZ are seeking changes of the plan change are restricted to those necessary to give effect to the National Policy Statement for Urban Development and that any other matters should be subject to proper review in the Schedule full review of the RPS in 2024 and in the scheduled reviews of the Natural Resources Plan in 2023 and 2024. This is because the changes materially impact on communities, including rural communities and we do not consider that the necessary engagement has been undertaken to adequately inform these provisions or to meet the requirements of Part 3.2 of the NPS-FM. Furthermore, there is a risk that including matters relating to climate change and indigenous biodiversity before key national legislation is gazetted is premature and will lead to the inefficient implementation and confusion amongst those who it impacts materially.	Disallow That the submission be disallowed with the exception of 147.007	Accept in part

S42A Appendix 2 - HS6 Indigenous Ecosystems - Summary Recommendation Table

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
S147.035	Wellington Fish and Game Council			S147.035	Wellington Fish and Game Council	Policy IE.1: Giving effect to mana whenua / tangata whenua roles and values when managing indigenous biodiversity - district and regional plans	Support in part	Support the intention of this objective to ensure that mana whenua/tangata whenua values are properly recognised and provided for and their role as kaitiaki is supported. At the same time, in order to give full effect to the NPS-FM, those values must be considered alongside other recognised values and achieved in partnership with statutory managers of freshwater species and their habitats. The suggested amendment also aligns the language of this objective with the language of s 30(ga) RMA, which accords Regional Councils responsibility for "maintaining" rather than "managing" indigenous biodiversity.	amend subclause: (a) apply mātauranga Māori frameworks, and support mana whenua / tangata whenua to exercise their kaitiakitanga, in managing maintaining and monitoring indigenous biodiversity within a wider framework of equal weighting given to community values around indigenous and valued introduced biodiversity;	reject
S147.035	Wellington Fish and Game Council	FS20.147	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	FS20.147	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	Policy IE.1: Giving effect to mana whenua / tangata whenua roles and values when managing indigenous biodiversity - district and regional plans	Oppose in part	As Treaty Partners, Ātiawa do not support the submission point which seeks to provide community values, and introduced biodiversity equal weighting to indigenous biodiversity. It is evident that indigenous ecosystems must be provided with the greatest protection. To accept the relief sought by the submitter would be contrary to Te Tiriti o Waitangi and national resource management direction.	Disallow in part Disallow the relief sought that references: "within a wider framework of equal weighting given to community values around indigenous and valued biodiversity".	Accept
S147.035	Wellington Fish and Game Council	FS19.099	Wellington Water Ltd ("Wellington Water")	FS19.099	Wellington Water Ltd ("Wellington Water")	Policy IE.1: Giving effect to mana whenua / tangata whenua roles and values when managing indigenous biodiversity - district and regional plans	Oppose	It is unnecessary and redundant to recreate NPSFM policies within the RPS. Most of the amendments sought do not in any event properly reflect the NPSFM. In particular, they do not accurately reflect the proviso to Policy 7, the requirements of clause 3.22, the limitation of Policy 10 to trout and salmon only, and the subservience of Policy 10 to Policy 9. Some of the amendments attempt to address matters that are already adequately covered by extant provisions or PC1 as notified. Some of the amendments undermine the more detailed content of PC1.	Disallow	Accept
S147.035	Wellington Fish and Game Council	FS30.204	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Ltd	FS30.204	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Ltd	Policy IE.1: Giving effect to mana whenua / tangata whenua roles and values when	Oppose	B+LNZ generally oppose the submission on the grounds that's B+LNZ are seeking changes of the plan change are restricted to those necessary to give effect to the National Policy Statement for Urban Development and that any other matters should be subject to proper review in the Schedule full review of the RPS in 2024 and in the scheduled reviews of	Disallow That the submission be disallowed with the exception of 147.007	Accept in part

S42A Appendix 2 - HS6 Indigenous Ecosystems - Summary Recommendation Table

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
						managing indigenous biodiversity - district and regional plans		the Natural Resources Plan in 2023 and 2024. This is because the changes materially impact on communities, including rural communities and we do not consider that the necessary engagement has been undertaken to adequately inform these provisions or to meet the requirements of Part 3.2 of the NPS-FM. Furthermore, there is a risk that including matters relating to climate change and indigenous biodiversity before key national legislation is gazetted is premature and will lead to the inefficient implementation and confusion amongst those who it impacts materially.		
S163.060	Wairarapa Federated Farmers			S163.060	Wairarapa Federated Farmers	Policy IE.1: Giving effect to mana whenua / tangata whenua roles and values when managing indigenous biodiversity - district and regional plans	Oppose	Defer to full review of the RPS in 2024	That the amendments to Policy IE.1 be deleted Delete the FW icon	Accept in part
S163.060	Wairarapa Federated Farmers	FS7.103	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society (Forest & Bird)	FS7.103	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society (Forest & Bird)	Policy IE.1: Giving effect to mana whenua / tangata whenua roles and values when managing indigenous biodiversity - district and regional plans	Oppose	It is completely appropriate to include climate change, biodiversity and freshwater provisions in the plan change. This plan change creates efficiency by considering multiple policy directives from central government. The amendments sought by Federated Farmers fail to give effect to the NPSFM, the NPS for Indigenous Biodiversity, for which there is an exposure draft and the final version is due out this month, and do not achieve the purpose of the RMA or the Climate Change Response (Zero Carbon) Amendment Act 2019.	Disallow whole submission	Accept in part
S163.060	Wairarapa Federated Farmers	FS20.225	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	FS20.225	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	Policy IE.1: Giving effect to mana whenua / tangata whenua roles and values when managing indigenous biodiversity -	Oppose	Ātiawa oppose the entire submission by Wairarapa Federated Farmers. The relief sought by Federated Farmers is to effectively delete the entire proposed plan change (except for submission points S163.083, S163.084). The basis for deleting the proposed plan change is to delay decision-making. Ātiawa do not accept that delaying responding to national direction is an appropriate course of action, and will further compound environmental and resource management issues.	Disallow the entire submission by Wairarapa Federated Farmers.	Accept in part

S42A Appendix 2 - HS6 Indigenous Ecosystems - Summary Recommendation Table

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
						district and regional plans				

S42A Appendix 2 - HS6 Indigenous Ecosystems - Summary Recommendation Table

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
S163.060	Wairarapa Federated Farmers	FS29.076	Ngā Hapu o Otaki	FS29.076	Ngā Hapu o Otaki	Policy IE.1: Giving effect to mana whenua / tangata whenua roles and values when managing indigenous biodiversity - district and regional plans	Oppose	Section 18, page 4: General Comments – OPPOSE Section 25, Page 5 Going Forward – OPPOSE It is disheartening to see that Wairarapa Federated Farmers aren't capable of recognizing the obligations GWRC must maintain with Treaty Partners. It must be understood that Manawhenua are not simply 'groups of people' but a representation of the signatories that signed the Treaty of Waitangi and the original kaitiaki and custodians of the taonga in question when considering how these plan changes are implemented. Wairarapa Federated Farmers indicate a lack of awareness to the value of manawhenua engagement. Their stated 'aspirations of delivering environmental improvements alongside a thriving bio-economy' aren't feasible without considering the intergenerational insight and technical direction that only Mātauranga Māori can offer.	Not stated	Accept in part
S163.060	Wairarapa Federated Farmers	FS30.132	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Ltd	FS30.132	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Ltd	Policy IE.1: Giving effect to mana whenua / tangata whenua roles and values when managing indigenous biodiversity - district and regional plans	Support	B+LNZ agree that the scope of RPS PC1 should be restricted to those changes necessary to give effect to the National Policy Statement for Urban Development and that any other matters should be subject to proper review in the Schedule full review of the RPS in 2024 and in the scheduled reviews of the Natural Resources Plan in 2023 and 2024. Where alternative relief is provided, B+LNZ generally support this relief.	Allow	Reject
S167.089	Taranaki Whānui			S167.089	Taranaki Whānui	Policy IE.1: Giving effect to mana whenua / tangata whenua roles and values when managing indigenous biodiversity - district and regional plans	Support in part	Support with stronger protections for taonga	Insert a new clause: (d) protect ecosystems and habitats that contains characteristics of special spiritual, historical or cultural significance to mana whenua / tangata whenua	Accept in part
S167.089	Taranaki Whānui	FS6.030	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira on behalf of	FS6.030	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira on behalf of	Policy IE.1: Giving effect to mana whenua / tangata	Support	We support this submission because the suggested amendments will provide stronger protection for	Allow	Accept in part

S42A Appendix 2 - HS6 Indigenous Ecosystems - Summary Recommendation Table

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
			Ngāti Toa Rangatira		Ngāti Toa Rangatira	whenua roles and values when managing indigenous biodiversity - district and regional plans		ecosystems and habitats of significance to mana whenua/ tangata whenua.		
S168.078	Rangitāne O Wairarapa Inc			S168.078	Rangitāne O Wairarapa Inc	Policy IE.1: Giving effect to mana whenua / tangata whenua roles and values when managing indigenous biodiversity - district and regional plans	Support in part	This policy is supported, specifically the acknowledgement of the requirement to partner with mana whenua/tangata whenua. The explanation of this policy should also acknowledge partnership with tangata whenua.	Retain policy as notified but amend the explanation as follows: Explanation Policy IE.1 directs regional and district plans to partner with mana whenua/tangata whenua to recognise and provide for Māori values for indigenous biodiversity, and for the role of mana whenua as kaitiaki in the region.	Accept
S168.078	Rangitāne O Wairarapa Inc	FS31.188	Sustainable Wairarapa Inc	FS31.188	Sustainable Wairarapa Inc	Policy IE.1: Giving effect to mana whenua / tangata whenua roles and values when managing indigenous biodiversity - district and regional plans	Support	Kia ora koutou, My name is Ian Gunn, Secretary Sustainable Wairarapa inc. contact # 021567134, address 4B McKay Street, Paraparaumu Beach 5032. Firstly we'd like to state the time frame provided to peruse over 900 pages of submissions is in our opinion an abuse of process. The benefit of further submissions is for you the council to listen and hear the views of its ratepayers. The timeframe in our case does not allow a rigorous review of the original submissions to council. On top of this we are a week before Christmas- a very busy and chaotic time for most members of the community. It is highly likely that the majority of staff will take leave over the Christmas break so analysis of any further submissions will not occur until late January 2023-so why the short period to respond. While there is due process there is also good practise your management of the further submissions fails the good practise model. As a consequence we would like you to note Sustainable Wairarapa's strong support of the original submissions lodged with council by the two Wairarapa Iwi-Ngati Kahungunu and Rangitane. Its clear that there is a poor understanding of nature based solutions this term needs further explanation. Sustainable Wairarapa acknowledges that while nature based solutions offer a wide variety of options	Not stated	Accept

S42A Appendix 2 - HS6 Indigenous Ecosystems - Summary Recommendation Table

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
								its not the only solution. We are heartened by the widespread support for the original document. Thanks for an opportunity to make a further submission. Nga mihi nui Ian Gun		
S170.036	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira			S170.036	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	Policy 24	Support in part	This policy is a pleasant improvement from the current framework that the RPS provides for. Clauses (a), (b), and (c) allows Mana Whenua to exercise their rights, and these clauses can be strengthened. District and regional plans can only provide a Mātauranga framework when iwi desires to share this framework as it applies to indigenous biodiversity. This clause to say: partner with iwi to apply a mātauranga Māori framework for the management and monitoring of indigenous biodiversity' would be better.	Amend clause (a) to read: (a) partner with iwi to apply a mātauranga Māori framework for the management and monitoring of indigenous biodiversity apply mātauranga Māori frameworks, and support mana whenua / tangata whenua to exercise their kaitiakitanga, in managing and monitoring indigenous biodiversity;	Awaiting recommendation [This submission point was originally coded to the provision Policy IE.1 however, it has been updated to the corrected to the provision Policy 24].
S170.036	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	FS29.150	Ngā Hapu o Otaki	FS29.150	Ngā Hapu o Otaki	Policy 24	Support	Co -design under a treaty house model is about shaping plans and resource management avenues alongside manawhenua that appropriately recognise the intergenerational prosperity of the uri of Ngā Hapu o Otaki and the wider community. There are ongoing concerns Ngā Hapu o Otaki maintain with GWRC in regard to the policies addressing Co-governance, Co-management, Co-leadership and Co-collabroative operational processes. This submission goes to great length to define where and how further considerations can be made recognising the interconnected nature of matauranga maori, the inequitable impact environmental decline will have on mana whenua/tangata whenua and offers insight to the intuitive and inherent awareness manawhenua need to maintain to ensure our intergenerational survival and prosperity. Objective 3: Lack of mana whenua / tangata whenua involvement in decision making – Support in principal FW Kaitiakitanga O1, O2, O3 – Support in principal Wai Mate O1,O2,O3 - Support in principal Climate Change and Freshwater objectives, CCFW-01, CCFW-02, CCFW-03, CCFW-04, CCFW-05, CCFW-06 This submission appropriately articulates	Not stated	Awaiting recommendation [This submission point was originally coded to the provision Policy IE.1 however, it has been updated to the corrected to the provision Policy 24].

S42A Appendix 2 - HS6 Indigenous Ecosystems - Summary Recommendation Table

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
								Kaitiakitanga, FW objectives regarding Climate Change, Wai mate, Wai ora and the lack of provisions to see balanced decision making between Treaty Partners. Ngā Hapu o Otaki support Te Runanga o Toa Rangatira expression and wish to speak further to such views during the hearing process. We have serious concerns for the degradation of our taonga, in particular our wai. This combined with the projected growth the next generation will see means manawhenua resilience and agility to climate grief and environmental decline is paramount. Ngā Hapu o Otaki seek to support our whanaunga and other Manawhenua groups to build the provisions we will need to solidify our Tino Rangatiratanga and ensure our intergenerational prosperity.		
S170.037	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira			S170.037	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	Policy 24	Support in part	This policy is a pleasant improvement from the current framework that the RPS provides for. Clauses (a), (b), and (c) allows Mana Whenua to exercise their rights, and these clauses can be strengthened. Clause (b) should not say actively involve as Tangata Whenua holds the kaitiakitanga status; they will plan, decide, and monitor how indigenous biodiversity is tracking. Kaitiaki Monitoring Framework should be included here and be binding for District and Regional Plans. These Plans should spell out how the monitoring will be applied.	Clause (b) should not say actively involve as Tangata Whenua holds the kaitiakitanga status; they will plan, decide, and monitor how indigenous biodiversity is tracking. Kaitiaki Monitoring Framework should be included here and be binding for District and Regional Plans. These Plans should spell out how the monitoring will be applied.	Awaiting recommendation [This submission point was originally coded to the provision Policy IE.1 however, it has been updated to the corrected to the provision Policy 24].
S170.037	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	FS29.151	Ngā Hapu o Otaki	FS29.151	Ngā Hapu o Otaki	Policy 24	Support	Co -design under a treaty house model is about shaping plans and resource management avenues alongside manawhenua that appropriately recognise the intergenerational prosperity of the uri of Ngā Hapu o Otaki and the wider community. There are ongoing concerns Ngā Hapu o Otaki maintain with GWRC in regard to the policies addressing Co-governance, Co-management, Co-leadership and Co-collabroative operational processes. This submission goes to great length to define where and how further considerations can be made recognising the interconnected nature of matauranga maori, the inequitable impact environmental decline	Not stated	Awaiting recommendation [This submission point was originally coded to the provision Policy IE.1 however, it has been updated to the corrected

S42A Appendix 2 - HS6 Indigenous Ecosystems - Summary Recommendation Table

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
								will have on mana whenua/tangata whenua and offers insight to the intuitive and inherent awareness manawhenua need to maintain to ensure our intergenerational survival and prosperity. Objective 3: Lack of mana whenua / tangata whenua involvement in decision making – Support in principal FW Kaitiakitanga O1, O2, O3 – Support in principal Wai Mate O1,O2,O3 - Support in principal Climate Change and Freshwater objectives, CCFW-01, CCFW-02, CCFW-03, CCFW-04, CCFW-05, CCFW-06 This submission appropriately articulates Kaitiakitanga, FW objectives regarding Climate Change, Wai mate, Wai ora and the lack of provisions to see balanced decision making between Treaty Partners. Ngā Hapu o Otaki support Te Runanga o Toa Rangatira expression and wish to speak further to such views during the hearing process. We have serious concerns for the degradation of our taonga, in particular our wai. This combined with the projected growth the next generation will see means manawhenua resilience and agility to climate grief and environmental decline is paramount. Ngā Hapu o Otaki seek to support our whanaunga and other Manawhenua groups to build the provisions we will need to solidify our Tino Rangatiratanga and ensure our intergenerational prosperity.		to the provision Policy 24].
S170.038	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira			S170.038	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	Policy 24	Support in part	This policy is a pleasant improvement from the current framework that the RPS provides for. Clauses (a), (b), and (c) allows Mana Whenua to exercise their rights, and these clauses can be strengthened. Clause (c) is not clear whether the (c) is allowing Mana Whenua to access and use indigenous biodiversity. This could be reworded to say Mana Whenua has access and use rights, and District and Regional Plans should acknowledge these rights and set up processes to ensure that their access and use are not limited and restricted in any way.	Reword the policy to say Mana Whenua has access and use rights, and District and Regional Plans should acknowledge these rights and set up processes to ensure that their access and use are not limited and restricted in any way.	Awaiting recommendation [This submission point was originally coded to the provision Policy IE.1 however, it has been updated to the corrected to the provision Policy 24].
S170.038	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	FS29.152	Ngā Hapu o Otaki	FS29.152	Ngā Hapu o Otaki	Policy 24	Support	Co -design under a treaty house model is about shaping plans and resource management avenues alongside manawhenua that appropriately recognise	Not stated	Awaiting recommendation

S42A Appendix 2 - HS6 Indigenous Ecosystems - Summary Recommendation Table

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
								<p>the intergenerational prosperity of the uri of Ngā Hapu o Otaki and the wider community. There are ongoing concerns Ngā Hapu o Otaki maintain with GWRC in regard to the policies addressing Co-governance, Co-management, Co-leadership and Co-collabroative operational processes.</p> <p>This submission goes to great length to define where and how further considerations can be made recognising the interconnected nature of matauranga maori, the inequitable impact environmental decline will have on mana whenua/tangata whenua and offers insight to the intuitive and inherent awareness manawhenua need to maintain to ensure our intergenerational survival and prosperity.</p> <p>Objective 3: Lack of mana whenua / tangata whenua involvement in decision making – Support in principal FW Kaitiakitanga O1, O2, O3 – Support in principal Wai Mate O1,O2,O3 - Support in principal Climate Change and Freshwater objectives, CCFW-01, CCFW-02, CCFW-03, CCFW-04, CCFW-05, CCFW-06</p> <p>This submission appropriately articulates Kaitiakitanga, FW objectives regarding Climate Change, Wai mate, Wai ora and the lack of provisions to see balanced decision making between Treaty Partners. Ngā Hapu o Otaki support Te Runanga o Toa Rangatira expression and wish to speak further to such views during the hearing process. We have serious concerns for the degradation of our taonga, in particular our wai. This combined with the projected growth the next generation will see means manawhenua resilience and agility to climate grief and environmental decline is paramount. Ngā Hapu o Otaki seek to support our whanaunga and other Manawhenua groups to build the provisions we will need to solidify our Tino Rangatiratanga and ensure our intergenerational prosperity.</p>		[This submission point was originally coded to the provision Policy IE.1 however, it has been updated to the corrected to the provision Policy 24].
S170.086	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira			S170.086	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	Policy 24	Not Stated / Neutral	<p>Policy IE.3 Giving effect to mana whenua roles and values when managing indigenous biodiversity - consideration</p> <p>It is confusing mana whenua roles and values are recognised in this particular policy and given consideration for a resource consent, however in other parts of the RPS we do not see them. Policy 49 has connections to Policy IE.3 and all taonga will need to be linked to a kaitiaki monitoring framework; it is confusing why the plan picks out a regime of giving</p>	<p>Require mana whenua roles and values to be given consideration in consent applications.</p> <p>All taonga need to be linked to a kaitiaki monitoring framework</p>	<p>Awaiting recommendation</p> <p>[This submission point was originally coded to the provision</p>

S42A Appendix 2 - HS6 Indigenous Ecosystems - Summary Recommendation Table

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
								effect to mana whenua values and roles particularly managing indigenous biodiversity but not other parts of the Plan.		Policy IE.1 however, it has been updated to the corrected to the provision Policy 24].
S170.086	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	FS29.200	Ngā Hapu o Otaki	FS29.200	Ngā Hapu o Otaki	Policy 24	Support	<p>Co -design under a treaty house model is about shaping plans and resource management avenues alongside manawhenua that appropriately recognise the intergenerational prosperity of the uri of Ngā Hapu o Otaki and the wider community. There are ongoing concerns Ngā Hapu o Otaki maintain with GWRC in regard to the policies addressing Co-governance, Co-management, Co-leadership and Co-collabroative operational processes.</p> <p>This submission goes to great length to define where and how further considerations can be made recognising the interconnected nature of matauranga maori, the inequitable impact environmental decline will have on mana whenua/tangata whenua and offers insight to the intuitive and inherent awareness manawhenua need to maintain to ensure our intergenerational survival and prosperity.</p> <p>Objective 3: Lack of mana whenua / tangata whenua involvement in decision making – Support in principal FW Kaitiakitanga O1, O2, O3 – Support in principal Wai Mate O1,O2,O3 - Support in principal Climate Change and Freshwater objectives, CCFW-01, CCFW-02, CCFW-03, CCFW-04, CCFW-05, CCFW-06</p> <p>This submission appropriately articulates Kaitiakitanga, FW objectives regarding Climate Change, Wai mate, Wai ora and the lack of provisions to see balanced decision making between Treaty Partners. Ngā Hapu o Otaki support Te Runanga o Toa Rangatira expression and wish to speak further to such views during the hearing process. We have serious concerns for the degradation of our taonga, in particular our wai. This combined with the projected growth the next generation will see means manawhenua resilience and agility to climate grief and environmental decline is paramount. Ngā Hapu o Otaki seek to support our whanaunga and other Manawhenua groups to build the provisions we will</p>	Not stated	<p>Awaiting recommendat ion</p> <p>[This submission point was originally coded to the provision Policy IE.1 however, it has been updated to the corrected to the provision Policy 24].</p>

S42A Appendix 2 - HS6 Indigenous Ecosystems - Summary Recommendation Table

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
								need to solidify our Tino Rangatiranga and ensure our intergenerational prosperity.		
S20.003	Mangaroa Peatland Focus Group_Paul Dyson			S20.003	Mangaroa Peatland Focus Group_Paul Dyson	Policy 47: Managing effects on indigenous ecosystems and habitats with significant indigenous biodiversity values - consideration	Oppose in part	The entire concept of buffering has not been adequately defined and there has been no consultation with communities that would have been impacted. There has been no definition as to the dimensions of any buffer zone, no definition as to what constitutes 'adequate' nor has there been any clear direction as to what activities within the buffer would be constrained. To consult meaningfully, we need to understand matters like the dimensions of any buffer zone, the scientific basis on which those buffers being drawn, what constitutes 'adequate' and the restrictions that might be imposed on activities within the buffer. To reiterate, before a buffer zone could be imposed, there would need to be effective consultation with the landowner where the SNA is situated as well as consultation for landowners within the buffer zone.	Clearly define the concept of buffering, including all relevant factors and rules that would apply to the buffer zone. Undertake extensive community consultation prior to issuing a consultation document.	Accept in part
S21.003	Mangaroa Peatland Focus Group_Liorah Atkinson			S21.003	Mangaroa Peatland Focus Group_Liorah Atkinson	Policy 47: Managing effects on indigenous ecosystems and habitats with significant indigenous biodiversity values - consideration	Oppose in part	The entire concept of buffering has not been adequately defined and there has been no consultation with communities that would have been impacted. There has been no definition as to the dimensions of any buffer zone, no definition as to what constitutes 'adequate' nor has there been any clear direction as to what activities within the buffer would be constrained. To consult meaningfully, we need to understand matters like the dimensions of any buffer zone, the scientific basis on which those buffers being drawn, what constitutes 'adequate' and the restrictions that might be imposed on activities within the buffer. To reiterate, before a buffer zone could be imposed, there would need to be effective consultation with the landowner where the SNA is situated as well as consultation for landowners within the buffer zone.	Clearly define the concept of buffering, including all relevant factors and rules that would apply to the buffer zone. Undertake extensive community consultation prior to issuing a consultation document.	Accept in part
S23.003	Mangaroa Peatland Focus Group_Ian Spendlove			S23.003	Mangaroa Peatland Focus Group_Ian Spendlove	Policy 47: Managing effects on indigenous ecosystems and habitats with significant indigenous biodiversity	Oppose in part	The entire concept of buffering has not been adequately defined and there has been no consultation with communities that would have been impacted. There has been no definition as to the dimensions of any buffer zone, no definition as to what constitutes 'adequate' nor has there been any clear direction as to what activities within the buffer would be constrained. To consult meaningfully, we need to understand matters like the dimensions of any buffer zone, the scientific basis on which those	Clearly define the concept of buffering, including all relevant factors and rules that would apply to the buffer zone. Undertake extensive community consultation prior to issuing a consultation document.	Accept in part

S42A Appendix 2 - HS6 Indigenous Ecosystems - Summary Recommendation Table

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
						values - consideration		buffers being drawn, what constitutes 'adequate' and the restrictions that might be imposed on activities within the buffer. To reiterate, before a buffer zone could be imposed, there would need to be effective consultation with the landowner where the SNA is situated as well as consultation for landowners within the buffer zone.		
S26.003	Mangaroa Peatland Focus Group_Andrea Follett			S26.003	Mangaroa Peatland Focus Group_Andrea Follett	Policy 47: Managing effects on indigenous ecosystems and habitats with significant indigenous biodiversity values - consideration	Oppose in part	The entire concept of buffering has not been adequately defined and there has been no consultation with communities that would have been impacted. There has been no definition as to the dimensions of any buffer zone, no definition as to what constitutes 'adequate' nor has there been any clear direction as to what activities within the buffer would be constrained. To consult meaningfully, we need to understand matters like the dimensions of any buffer zone, the scientific basis on which those buffers being drawn, what constitutes 'adequate' and the restrictions that might be imposed on activities within the buffer. To reiterate, before a buffer zone could be imposed, there would need to be effective consultation with the landowner where the SNA is situated as well as consultation for landowners within the buffer zone.	Clearly define the concept of buffering, including all relevant factors and rules that would apply to the buffer zone. Undertake extensive community consultation prior to issuing a consultation document.	Accept in part
S31.026	Robert Anker			S31.026	Robert Anker	Policy 47: Managing effects on indigenous ecosystems and habitats with significant indigenous biodiversity values - consideration	Oppose in part	The entire concept of buffering has not been adequately defined and there has been no consultation with communities that would be impacted. There has been no definition as to the dimensions of any buffer zone, no definition as to what constitutes 'adequate' nor has there been any clear direction as to what activities within the buffer would be constrained. Not only will there need to be effective consultation with the landowner where the SNA is situated but there would also need to be another layer of consultation for those landowners within the buffer zone. This concept has not been thoroughly thought through and GWRC has failed in its obligation to consult.	GWRC to clearly define the concept of buffering including all relevant factors and rules that would apply to the buffer zone. GWRC to undertake extensive community consultation prior to issuing a consultation document. It is not acceptable for GWRC to be left to make up detailed regulations on the fly.	Accept in part
S33.003	Mangaroa Peatland Focus Group_Sandy, Judith, Kauika-Stevens			S33.003	Mangaroa Peatland Focus Group_Sandy, Judith, Kauika-Stevens	Policy 47: Managing effects on indigenous ecosystems and habitats with significant indigenous	Oppose in part	The entire concept of buffering has not been adequately defined and there has been no consultation with communities that would have been impacted. There has been no definition as to the dimensions of any buffer zone, no definition as to what constitutes 'adequate' nor has there been any clear direction as to what activities within the buffer would be constrained. To consult meaningfully, we	Clearly define the concept of buffering, including all relevant factors and rules that would apply to the buffer zone. Undertake extensive community consultation prior	Accept in part

S42A Appendix 2 - HS6 Indigenous Ecosystems - Summary Recommendation Table

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
						biodiversity values - consideration		need to understand matters like the dimensions of any buffer zone, the scientific basis on which those buffers being drawn, what constitutes 'adequate' and the restrictions that might be imposed on activities within the buffer. To reiterate, before a buffer zone could be imposed, there would need to be effective consultation with the landowner where the SNA is situated as well as consultation for landowners within the buffer zone.	to issuing a consultation document.	
S34.078	Te Kaunihera o Te Awa Kairangi ki Uta, Upper Hutt City Council			S34.078	Te Kaunihera o Te Awa Kairangi ki Uta, Upper Hutt City Council	Policy 47: Managing effects on indigenous ecosystems and habitats with significant indigenous biodiversity values - consideration	Oppose	Council is concerned that this policy aims to direct territorial authorities in advance of identifying indigenous ecosystems under Policy 23 and 24 (the timelines of which Council opposes). It is impractical to apply requirements, or consider whether a proposed activity is inappropriate, ahead of the NPS-IB or appropriately considered criteria and is likely to result in inconsistencies should changes be made to Policy 23 and 24.	Retain as operationally written and review once NPS-IB has been gazetted.	Accept in part
S34.078	Te Kaunihera o Te Awa Kairangi ki Uta, Upper Hutt City Council	FS26.062	Meridian Energy Limited	FS26.062	Meridian Energy Limited	Policy 47: Managing effects on indigenous ecosystems and habitats with significant indigenous biodiversity values - consideration	Support in part	Upper Hutt CC fundamentally disagrees with going ahead in advance of the NPS-IB being gazetted and requests that the policy be reviewed the once NPS-IB has been gazetted. Meridian considers it is premature to advance the scope of changes GWRC proposes to the RPS indigenous biodiversity provisions in the absence of settled guidance from a gazetted National Policy Statement, particularly where the proposed RPS changes relate to terrestrial indigenous biodiversity provisions beyond the scope of a freshwater planning instrument. If GWRC's proposed RPS provisions do not give effect to the future NPS-IB, the RPS will need to be amended in any event. Until settled NPS guidance is available, Meridian prefers the amendments requested in its own submission which reflect the provisions in the proposed Natural Resources Plan (recently settled by Environment Court mediation).	Allow in part Allow to the extent of making the amendments requested in Meridian's submission in the interim until any further changes are made, by RPS change or variation, to accommodate the future gazetted NPS-IB.	Accept in part
S38.003	Mangaroa Peatland Focus Group_Heather McKay			S38.003	Mangaroa Peatland Focus Group_Heather McKay	Policy 47: Managing effects on indigenous ecosystems and habitats with significant	Oppose in part	The entire concept of buffering has not been adequately defined and there has been no consultation with communities that would have been impacted. There has been no definition as to the dimensions of any buffer zone, no definition as to what constitutes 'adequate' nor has there been any clear direction as to what activities within the buffer	Clearly define the concept of buffering, including all relevant factors and rules that would apply to the buffer zone. Undertake extensive community consultation prior	Accept in part

S42A Appendix 2 - HS6 Indigenous Ecosystems - Summary Recommendation Table

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
						indigenous biodiversity values - consideration		would be constrained. To consult meaningfully, we need to understand matters like the dimensions of any buffer zone, the scientific basis on which those buffers being drawn, what constitutes 'adequate' and the restrictions that might be imposed on activities within the buffer. To reiterate, before a buffer zone could be imposed, there would need to be effective consultation with the landowner where the SNA is situated as well as consultation for landowners within the buffer zone.	to issuing a consultation document.	
S39.003	Mangaroa Peatland Focus Group_Colin Hawes			S39.003	Mangaroa Peatland Focus Group_Colin Hawes	Policy 47: Managing effects on indigenous ecosystems and habitats with significant indigenous biodiversity values - consideration	Oppose in part	The entire concept of buffering has not been adequately defined and there has been no consultation with communities that would have been impacted. There has been no definition as to the dimensions of any buffer zone, no definition as to what constitutes 'adequate' nor has there been any clear direction as to what activities within the buffer would be constrained. To consult meaningfully, we need to understand matters like the dimensions of any buffer zone, the scientific basis on which those buffers being drawn, what constitutes 'adequate' and the restrictions that might be imposed on activities within the buffer. To reiterate, before a buffer zone could be imposed, there would need to be effective consultation with the landowner where the SNA is situated as well as consultation for landowners within the buffer zone.	Clearly define the concept of buffering, including all relevant factors and rules that would apply to the buffer zone. Undertake extensive community consultation prior to issuing a consultation document.	Accept in part
S40.003	Mangaroa Peatland Focus Group_Lauritz & Julie Rust			S40.003	Mangaroa Peatland Focus Group_Lauritz & Julie Rust	Policy 47: Managing effects on indigenous ecosystems and habitats with significant indigenous biodiversity values - consideration	Oppose in part	The entire concept of buffering has not been adequately defined and there has been no consultation with communities that would have been impacted. There has been no definition as to the dimensions of any buffer zone, no definition as to what constitutes 'adequate' nor has there been any clear direction as to what activities within the buffer would be constrained. To consult meaningfully, we need to understand matters like the dimensions of any buffer zone, the scientific basis on which those buffers being drawn, what constitutes 'adequate' and the restrictions that might be imposed on activities within the buffer. To reiterate, before a buffer zone could be imposed, there would need to be effective consultation with the landowner where the SNA is situated as well as consultation for landowners within the buffer zone.	Clearly define the concept of buffering, including all relevant factors and rules that would apply to the buffer zone. Undertake extensive community consultation prior to issuing a consultation document.	Accept in part
S41.003	Mangaroa Peatland			S41.003	Mangaroa Peatland Focus	Policy 47: Managing	Oppose in part	The entire concept of buffering has not been adequately defined and there has been no	Clearly define the concept of buffering, including all	Accept in part

S42A Appendix 2 - HS6 Indigenous Ecosystems - Summary Recommendation Table

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
	Focus Group_Andrew Ayrton & Carol Reeves				Group_Andrew Ayrton & Carol Reeves	effects on indigenous ecosystems and habitats with significant indigenous biodiversity values - consideration		consultation with communities that would have been impacted. There has been no definition as to the dimensions of any buffer zone, no definition as to what constitutes 'adequate' nor has there been any clear direction as to what activities within the buffer would be constrained. To consult meaningfully, we need to understand matters like the dimensions of any buffer zone, the scientific basis on which those buffers being drawn, what constitutes 'adequate' and the restrictions that might be imposed on activities within the buffer. To reiterate, before a buffer zone could be imposed, there would need to be effective consultation with the landowner where the SNA is situated as well as consultation for landowners within the buffer zone.	relevant factors and rules that would apply to the buffer zone. Undertake extensive community consultation prior to issuing a consultation document.	
S42.003	Mangaroa Peatland Focus Group_Gregor & Stephanie Kempt			S42.003	Mangaroa Peatland Focus Group_Gregor & Stephanie Kempt	Policy 47: Managing effects on indigenous ecosystems and habitats with significant indigenous biodiversity values - consideration	Oppose in part	The entire concept of buffering has not been adequately defined and there has been no consultation with communities that would have been impacted. There has been no definition as to the dimensions of any buffer zone, no definition as to what constitutes 'adequate' nor has there been any clear direction as to what activities within the buffer would be constrained. To consult meaningfully, we need to understand matters like the dimensions of any buffer zone, the scientific basis on which those buffers being drawn, what constitutes 'adequate' and the restrictions that might be imposed on activities within the buffer. To reiterate, before a buffer zone could be imposed, there would need to be effective consultation with the landowner where the SNA is situated as well as consultation for landowners within the buffer zone.	Clearly define the concept of buffering, including all relevant factors and rules that would apply to the buffer zone. Undertake extensive community consultation prior to issuing a consultation document.	Accept in part
S43.003	Mangaroa Peatland Focus Group_Carol Dormer			S43.003	Mangaroa Peatland Focus Group_Carol Dormer	Policy 47: Managing effects on indigenous ecosystems and habitats with significant indigenous biodiversity values - consideration	Oppose in part	The entire concept of buffering has not been adequately defined and there has been no consultation with communities that would have been impacted. There has been no definition as to the dimensions of any buffer zone, no definition as to what constitutes 'adequate' nor has there been any clear direction as to what activities within the buffer would be constrained. To consult meaningfully, we need to understand matters like the dimensions of any buffer zone, the scientific basis on which those buffers being drawn, what constitutes 'adequate' and the restrictions that might be imposed on activities within the buffer. To reiterate, before a buffer zone could be imposed,	Clearly define the concept of buffering, including all relevant factors and rules that would apply to the buffer zone. Undertake extensive community consultation prior to issuing a consultation document.	Accept in part

S42A Appendix 2 - HS6 Indigenous Ecosystems - Summary Recommendation Table

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
								there would need to be effective consultation with the landowner where the SNA is situated as well as consultation for landowners within the buffer zone.		
S44.003	Mangaroa Peatland Focus Group_Richard Dormer			S44.003	Mangaroa Peatland Focus Group_Richard Dormer	Policy 47: Managing effects on indigenous ecosystems and habitats with significant indigenous biodiversity values - consideration	Oppose in part	The entire concept of buffering has not been adequately defined and there has been no consultation with communities that would have been impacted. There has been no definition as to the dimensions of any buffer zone, no definition as to what constitutes 'adequate' nor has there been any clear direction as to what activities within the buffer would be constrained. To consult meaningfully, we need to understand matters like the dimensions of any buffer zone, the scientific basis on which those buffers being drawn, what constitutes 'adequate' and the restrictions that might be imposed on activities within the buffer. To reiterate, before a buffer zone could be imposed, there would need to be effective consultation with the landowner where the SNA is situated as well as consultation for landowners within the buffer zone.	Clearly define the concept of buffering, including all relevant factors and rules that would apply to the buffer zone. Undertake extensive community consultation prior to issuing a consultation document.	Accept in part
S45.003	Mangaroa Peatland Focus Group_Weston Hill			S45.003	Mangaroa Peatland Focus Group_Weston Hill	Policy 47: Managing effects on indigenous ecosystems and habitats with significant indigenous biodiversity values - consideration	Oppose in part	The entire concept of buffering has not been adequately defined and there has been no consultation with communities that would have been impacted. There has been no definition as to the dimensions of any buffer zone, no definition as to what constitutes 'adequate' nor has there been any clear direction as to what activities within the buffer would be constrained. To consult meaningfully, we need to understand matters like the dimensions of any buffer zone, the scientific basis on which those buffers being drawn, what constitutes 'adequate' and the restrictions that might be imposed on activities within the buffer. To reiterate, before a buffer zone could be imposed, there would need to be effective consultation with the landowner where the SNA is situated as well as consultation for landowners within the buffer zone.	Clearly define the concept of buffering, including all relevant factors and rules that would apply to the buffer zone. Undertake extensive community consultation prior to issuing a consultation document.	Accept in part
S46.003	Mangaroa Peatland Focus Group_Lynne Hill			S46.003	Mangaroa Peatland Focus Group_Lynne Hill	Policy 47: Managing effects on indigenous ecosystems and habitats with significant indigenous biodiversity	Oppose in part	The entire concept of buffering has not been adequately defined and there has been no consultation with communities that would have been impacted. There has been no definition as to the dimensions of any buffer zone, no definition as to what constitutes 'adequate' nor has there been any clear direction as to what activities within the buffer would be constrained. To consult meaningfully, we need to understand matters like the dimensions of	Clearly define the concept of buffering, including all relevant factors and rules that would apply to the buffer zone. Undertake extensive community consultation prior to issuing a consultation document.	Accept in part

S42A Appendix 2 - HS6 Indigenous Ecosystems - Summary Recommendation Table

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
						values - consideration		any buffer zone, the scientific basis on which those buffers being drawn, what constitutes 'adequate' and the restrictions that might be imposed on activities within the buffer. To reiterate, before a buffer zone could be imposed, there would need to be effective consultation with the landowner where the SNA is situated as well as consultation for landowners within the buffer zone.		
S47.003	Mangaroa Peatland Focus Group_Norman Hill			S47.003	Mangaroa Peatland Focus Group_Norman Hill	Policy 47: Managing effects on indigenous ecosystems and habitats with significant indigenous biodiversity values - consideration	Oppose in part	The entire concept of buffering has not been adequately defined and there has been no consultation with communities that would have been impacted. There has been no definition as to the dimensions of any buffer zone, no definition as to what constitutes 'adequate' nor has there been any clear direction as to what activities within the buffer would be constrained. To consult meaningfully, we need to understand matters like the dimensions of any buffer zone, the scientific basis on which those buffers being drawn, what constitutes 'adequate' and the restrictions that might be imposed on activities within the buffer. To reiterate, before a buffer zone could be imposed, there would need to be effective consultation with the landowner where the SNA is situated as well as consultation for landowners within the buffer zone.	Clearly define the concept of buffering, including all relevant factors and rules that would apply to the buffer zone. Undertake extensive community consultation prior to issuing a consultation document.	Accept in part
S48.003	Mangaroa Peatland Focus Group_Duncan Carmichael			S48.003	Mangaroa Peatland Focus Group_Duncan Carmichael	Policy 47: Managing effects on indigenous ecosystems and habitats with significant indigenous biodiversity values - consideration	Oppose in part	The entire concept of buffering has not been adequately defined and there has been no consultation with communities that would have been impacted. There has been no definition as to the dimensions of any buffer zone, no definition as to what constitutes 'adequate' nor has there been any clear direction as to what activities within the buffer would be constrained. To consult meaningfully, we need to understand matters like the dimensions of any buffer zone, the scientific basis on which those buffers being drawn, what constitutes 'adequate' and the restrictions that might be imposed on activities within the buffer. To reiterate, before a buffer zone could be imposed, there would need to be effective consultation with the landowner where the SNA is situated as well as consultation for landowners within the buffer zone.	Clearly define the concept of buffering, including all relevant factors and rules that would apply to the buffer zone.	Accept in part
S52.004	Gerald Keown_Mangaroa			S52.004	Gerald Keown_Mangaroa Peatland Focus Group	Policy 47: Managing effects on indigenous	Oppose in part	The entire concept of buffering has not been adequately defined and there has been no consultation with communities that would have been impacted. There has been no definition as to the	Clearly define the concept of buffering, including all relevant factors and rules that would apply to the buffer	Accept in part

S42A Appendix 2 - HS6 Indigenous Ecosystems - Summary Recommendation Table

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
	Peatland Focus Group					ecosystems and habitats with significant indigenous biodiversity values - consideration		dimensions of any buffer zone, no definition as to what constitutes 'adequate' nor has there been any clear direction as to what activities within the buffer would be constrained. To consult meaningfully, we need to understand matters like the dimensions of any buffer zone, the scientific basis on which those buffers being drawn, what constitutes 'adequate' and the restrictions that might be imposed on activities within the buffer. To reiterate, before a buffer zone could be imposed, there would need to be effective consultation with the landowner where the SNA is situated as well as consultation for landowners within the buffer zone.	zone. Undertake extensive community consultation prior to issuing a consultation document.	
S54.003	Mangaroa Peatland Focus Group_Helen Masters			S54.003	Mangaroa Peatland Focus Group_Helen Masters	Policy 47: Managing effects on indigenous ecosystems and habitats with significant indigenous biodiversity values - consideration	Oppose in part	The entire concept of buffering has not been adequately defined and there has been no consultation with communities that would have been impacted. There has been no definition as to the dimensions of any buffer zone, no definition as to what constitutes 'adequate' nor has there been any clear direction as to what activities within the buffer would be constrained. To consult meaningfully, we need to understand matters like the dimensions of any buffer zone, the scientific basis on which those buffers being drawn, what constitutes 'adequate' and the restrictions that might be imposed on activities within the buffer. To reiterate, before a buffer zone could be imposed, there would need to be effective consultation with the landowner where the SNA is situated as well as consultation for landowners within the buffer zone.	Clearly define the concept of buffering, including all relevant factors and rules that would apply to the buffer zone. Undertake extensive community consultation prior to issuing a consultation document.	Accept in part
S55.003	Mangaroa Peatland Focus Group_Matthew Scrimshaw			S55.003	Mangaroa Peatland Focus Group_Matthew Scrimshaw	Policy 47: Managing effects on indigenous ecosystems and habitats with significant indigenous biodiversity values - consideration	Oppose in part	The entire concept of buffering has not been adequately defined and there has been no consultation with communities that would have been impacted. There has been no definition as to the dimensions of any buffer zone, no definition as to what constitutes 'adequate' nor has there been any clear direction as to what activities within the buffer would be constrained. To consult meaningfully, we need to understand matters like the dimensions of any buffer zone, the scientific basis on which those buffers being drawn, what constitutes 'adequate' and the restrictions that might be imposed on activities within the buffer. To reiterate, before a buffer zone could be imposed, there would need to be effective consultation with	Clearly define the concept of buffering, including all relevant factors and rules that would apply to the buffer zone. Undertake extensive community consultation prior to issuing a consultation document.	Accept in part

S42A Appendix 2 - HS6 Indigenous Ecosystems - Summary Recommendation Table

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
								the landowner where the SNA is situated as well as consultation for landowners within the buffer zone.		
S57.004	Colleen Munro _Mangaroa Peatland Focus Group			S57.004	Colleen Munro _Mangaroa Peatland Focus Group	Policy 47: Managing effects on indigenous ecosystems and habitats with significant indigenous biodiversity values - consideration	Oppose in part	The entire concept of buffering has not been adequately defined and there has been no consultation with communities that would have been impacted. There has been no definition as to the dimensions of any buffer zone, no definition as to what constitutes 'adequate' nor has there been any clear direction as to what activities within the buffer would be constrained. To consult meaningfully, we need to understand matters like the dimensions of any buffer zone, the scientific basis on which those buffers being drawn, what constitutes 'adequate' and the restrictions that might be imposed on activities within the buffer. To reiterate, before a buffer zone could be imposed, there would need to be effective consultation with the landowner where the SNA is situated as well as consultation for landowners within the buffer zone.	Clearly define the concept of buffering, including all relevant factors and rules that would apply to the buffer zone. Undertake extensive community consultation prior to issuing a consultation document.	Accept in part
S58.004	Grant Munro _Mangaroa Peatland Focus Group			S58.004	Grant Munro _Mangaroa Peatland Focus Group	Policy 47: Managing effects on indigenous ecosystems and habitats with significant indigenous biodiversity values - consideration	Oppose in part	The entire concept of buffering has not been adequately defined and there has been no consultation with communities that would have been impacted. There has been no definition as to the dimensions of any buffer zone, no definition as to what constitutes 'adequate' nor has there been any clear direction as to what activities within the buffer would be constrained. To consult meaningfully, we need to understand matters like the dimensions of any buffer zone, the scientific basis on which those buffers being drawn, what constitutes 'adequate' and the restrictions that might be imposed on activities within the buffer. To reiterate, before a buffer zone could be imposed, there would need to be effective consultation with the landowner where the SNA is situated as well as consultation for landowners within the buffer zone.	Clearly define the concept of buffering, including all relevant factors and rules that would apply to the buffer zone. Undertake extensive community consultation prior to issuing a consultation document.	Accept in part
S58.004	Grant Munro _Mangaroa Peatland Focus Group	FS7.003	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society (Forest & Bird)	FS7.003	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society (Forest & Bird)	Policy 47: Managing effects on indigenous ecosystems and habitats with significant indigenous biodiversity	Oppose	The concept of buffering, amendment to its definition and rules that apply to a buffer zone is out of scope of this plan change.	Disallow whole submission point	Accept in part

S42A Appendix 2 - HS6 Indigenous Ecosystems - Summary Recommendation Table

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
						values - consideration				
S59.003	Mangaroa Peatland Focus Group_Sandra & Mat Gerrard			S59.003	Mangaroa Peatland Focus Group_Sandra & Mat Gerrard	Policy 47: Managing effects on indigenous ecosystems and habitats with significant indigenous biodiversity values - consideration	Oppose in part	The entire concept of buffering has not been adequately defined and there has been no consultation with communities that would have been impacted. There has been no definition as to the dimensions of any buffer zone, no definition as to what constitutes 'adequate' nor has there been any clear direction as to what activities within the buffer would be constrained. To consult meaningfully, we need to understand matters like the dimensions of any buffer zone, the scientific basis on which those buffers being drawn, what constitutes 'adequate' and the restrictions that might be imposed on activities within the buffer. To reiterate, before a buffer zone could be imposed, there would need to be effective consultation with the landowner where the SNA is situated as well as consultation for landowners within the buffer zone.	Clearly define the concept of buffering, including all relevant factors and rules that would apply to the buffer zone. Undertake extensive community consultation prior to issuing a consultation document.	Accept in part
S62.025	Philip Clegg			S62.025	Philip Clegg	Policy 47: Managing effects on indigenous ecosystems and habitats with significant indigenous biodiversity values - consideration	Oppose in part	The entire concept of buffering has not been adequately defined and there has been no consultation with communities that would have been impacted. There has been no definition as to the dimensions of any buffer zone, no definition as to what constitutes 'adequate' nor has there been any clear direction as to what activities within the buffer would be constrained. To consult meaningfully, we need to understand matters like the dimensions of any buffer zone, the scientific basis on which those buffers being drawn, what constitutes 'adequate' and the restrictions that might be imposed on activities within the buffer. To reiterate, before a buffer zone could be imposed, there would need to be effective consultation with the landowner where the SNA is situated as well as consultation for landowners within the buffer zone.	GWRC be required to clearly define the concept of buffering, including all relevant factors and rules that would apply to the buffer zone. GWRC be required to collaborate closely with the community in developing rules to ensure workability.	Accept in part
S87.003	Roger O'Brien_Mangaroa Peatland Focus Group_			S87.003	Roger O'Brien_Mangaroa Peatland Focus Group_	Policy 47: Managing effects on indigenous ecosystems and habitats with significant indigenous biodiversity	Oppose in part	The entire concept of buffering has not been adequately defined and there has been no consultation with communities that would have been impacted. There has been no definition as to the dimensions of any buffer zone, no definition as to what constitutes 'adequate' nor has there been any clear direction as to what activities within the buffer would be constrained. To consult meaningfully, we need to understand matters like the dimensions of any buffer zone, the scientific basis on which those	Clearly define the concept of buffering, including all relevant factors and rules that would apply to the buffer zone. Undertake extensive community consultation prior to issuing a consultation document.	Accept in part

S42A Appendix 2 - HS6 Indigenous Ecosystems - Summary Recommendation Table

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
						values - consideration		buffers being drawn, what constitutes 'adequate' and the restrictions that might be imposed on activities within the buffer. To reiterate, before a buffer zone could be imposed, there would need to be effective consultation with the landowner where the SNA is situated as well as consultation for landowners within the buffer zone.		
S91.003	Mangaroa Peatland Focus Group_Gavin Kirton			S91.003	Mangaroa Peatland Focus Group_Gavin Kirton	Policy 47: Managing effects on indigenous ecosystems and habitats with significant indigenous biodiversity values - consideration	Oppose in part	The entire concept of buffering has not been adequately defined and there has been no consultation with communities that would have been impacted. There has been no definition as to the dimensions of any buffer zone, no definition as to what constitutes 'adequate' nor has there been any clear direction as to what activities within the buffer would be constrained. To consult meaningfully, we need to understand matters like the dimensions of any buffer zone, the scientific basis on which those buffers being drawn, what constitutes 'adequate' and the restrictions that might be imposed on activities within the buffer. To reiterate, before a buffer zone could be imposed, there would need to be effective consultation with the landowner where the SNA is situated as well as consultation for landowners within the buffer zone.	Clearly define the concept of buffering, including all relevant factors and rules that would apply to the buffer zone. Undertake extensive community consultation prior to issuing a consultation document.	Accept in part
S96.021	Sarah (Dr) Kerkin			S96.021	Sarah (Dr) Kerkin	Policy 47: Managing effects on indigenous ecosystems and habitats with significant indigenous biodiversity values - consideration	Oppose in part	The entire concept of buffering has not been adequately defined and there has been no consultation with communities that would have been impacted. There has been no definition as to the dimensions of any buffer zone, no definition as to what constitutes 'adequate' nor has there been any clear direction as to what activities within the buffer would be constrained. To consult meaningfully, we need to understand matters like the dimensions of any buffer zone, the scientific basis on which those buffers being drawn, what constitutes 'adequate' and the restrictions that might be imposed on activities within the buffer. To reiterate, before a buffer zone could be imposed, there would need to be effective consultation with the landowner where the SNA is situated as well as consultation for landowners within the buffer zone.	GWRC be required to clearly define the concept of buffering, including all relevant factors and rules that would apply to the buffer zone. GWRC be required to collaborate closely with the community in developing rules to ensure workability.	Accept in part
S97.003	Mangaroa Peatland Focus Group_Nicola Rothwell			S97.003	Mangaroa Peatland Focus Group_Nicola Rothwell	Policy 47: Managing effects on indigenous ecosystems	Oppose in part	The entire concept of buffering has not been adequately defined and there has been no consultation with communities that would have been impacted. There has been no definition as to the dimensions of any buffer zone, no definition as to	Clearly define the concept of buffering, including all relevant factors and rules that would apply to the buffer zone.	Accept in part

S42A Appendix 2 - HS6 Indigenous Ecosystems - Summary Recommendation Table

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
						and habitats with significant indigenous biodiversity values - consideration		what constitutes 'adequate' nor has there been any clear direction as to what activities within the buffer would be constrained. To consult meaningfully, we need to understand matters like the dimensions of any buffer zone, the scientific basis on which those buffers being drawn, what constitutes 'adequate' and the restrictions that might be imposed on activities within the buffer. To reiterate, before a buffer zone could be imposed, there would need to be effective consultation with the landowner where the SNA is situated as well as consultation for landowners within the buffer zone.	Undertake extensive community consultation prior to issuing a consultation document.	
S100.021	Meridian Energy Limited			S100.021	Meridian Energy Limited	Policy 47: Managing effects on indigenous ecosystems and habitats with significant indigenous biodiversity values - consideration	Oppose in part	The focus of the RPS should be on 'natural' wetlands.	Amend Policy 47 by referring to 'natural wetlands' as follows: When considering an application for a resource consent, notice of requirement, or a change, variation or review of a district or regional plan, a determination shall be made as to whether an activity may affect indigenous ecosystems and habitats with significant indigenous biodiversity values, and in determining whether the proposed activity is inappropriate particular regard shall be given to: (a) ... (b) ... (c) managing natural wetlands for the purpose of aquatic ecosystem health, recognising the wider benefits, such as for indigenous biodiversity, water quality and holding water in the landscape; (d) ...	reject
S100.021	Meridian Energy Limited	FS19.029	Wellington Water Ltd ("Wellington Water")	FS19.029	Wellington Water Ltd ("Wellington Water")	Policy 47: Managing effects on indigenous ecosystems and habitats	Support	Important for enabling water treatment through artificial wetlands.	Allow	reject

S42A Appendix 2 - HS6 Indigenous Ecosystems - Summary Recommendation Table

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
						with significant indigenous biodiversity values - consideration				
S101.003	Mangaroa Peatland Focus Group_Made line Keown			S101.003	Mangaroa Peatland Focus Group_Madeline Keown	Policy 47: Managing effects on indigenous ecosystems and habitats with significant indigenous biodiversity values - consideration	Oppose in part	The entire concept of buffering has not been adequately defined and there has been no consultation with communities that would have been impacted. There has been no definition as to the dimensions of any buffer zone, no definition as to what constitutes 'adequate' nor has there been any clear direction as to what activities within the buffer would be constrained. To consult meaningfully, we need to understand matters like the dimensions of any buffer zone, the scientific basis on which those buffers being drawn, what constitutes 'adequate' and the restrictions that might be imposed on activities within the buffer. To reiterate, before a buffer zone could be imposed, there would need to be effective consultation with the landowner where the SNA is situated as well as consultation for landowners within the buffer zone.	Clearly define the concept of buffering, including all relevant factors and rules that would apply to the buffer zone. Undertake extensive community consultation prior to issuing a consultation document.	Accept in part
S102.058	Te Tumu Paeroa Office of the Māori Trustee			S102.058	Te Tumu Paeroa Office of the Māori Trustee	Policy 47: Managing effects on indigenous ecosystems and habitats with significant indigenous biodiversity values - consideration	Support in part	Generally supports the policies that need to be considered in the 'Indigenous ecosystems' chapter. However, under Policy 47, there is a need to expressly state that Māori values be included as part of any assessment of biodiversity values.	Insert a new clause in Policy 47, as follows: (j) identified historical, cultural and spiritual relationships and values tangata whenua have with indigenous biodiversity.	Accept in part
S103.003	Mangaroa Peatland Focus Group_Stagey Jack-Kino			S103.003	Mangaroa Peatland Focus Group_Stagey Jack-Kino	Policy 47: Managing effects on indigenous ecosystems and habitats with significant indigenous biodiversity values - consideration	Oppose in part	The entire concept of buffering has not been adequately defined and there has been no consultation with communities that would have been impacted. There has been no definition as to the dimensions of any buffer zone, no definition as to what constitutes 'adequate' nor has there been any clear direction as to what activities within the buffer would be constrained. To consult meaningfully, we need to understand matters like the dimensions of any buffer zone, the scientific basis on which those buffers being drawn, what constitutes 'adequate' and the restrictions that might be imposed on activities within the buffer.	Clearly define the concept of buffering, including all relevant factors and rules that would apply to the buffer zone. Undertake extensive community consultation prior to issuing a consultation document.	Accept in part

S42A Appendix 2 - HS6 Indigenous Ecosystems - Summary Recommendation Table

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
								To reiterate, before a buffer zone could be imposed, there would need to be effective consultation with the landowner where the SNA is situated as well as consultation for landowners within the buffer zone.		
S104.003	Hamish McDonald_Mangaroa Peatland Focus Group			S104.003	Hamish McDonald_Mangaroa Peatland Focus Group	Policy 47: Managing effects on indigenous ecosystems and habitats with significant indigenous biodiversity values - consideration	Oppose in part	The entire concept of buffering has not been adequately defined and there has been no consultation with communities that would have been impacted. There has been no definition as to the dimensions of any buffer zone, no definition as to what constitutes 'adequate' nor has there been any clear direction as to what activities within the buffer would be constrained. To consult meaningfully, we need to understand matters like the dimensions of any buffer zone, the scientific basis on which those buffers being drawn, what constitutes 'adequate' and the restrictions that might be imposed on activities within the buffer. To reiterate, before a buffer zone could be imposed, there would need to be effective consultation with the landowner where the SNA is situated as well as consultation for landowners within the buffer zone.	Clearly define the concept of buffering, including all relevant factors and rules that would apply to the buffer zone. Undertake extensive community consultation prior to issuing a consultation document.	Accept in part
S105.003	Sharlene McDonald_Mangaroa Peatland Focus Group			S105.003	Sharlene McDonald_Mangaroa Peatland Focus Group	Policy 47: Managing effects on indigenous ecosystems and habitats with significant indigenous biodiversity values - consideration	Oppose in part	The entire concept of buffering has not been adequately defined and there has been no consultation with communities that would have been impacted. There has been no definition as to the dimensions of any buffer zone, no definition as to what constitutes 'adequate' nor has there been any clear direction as to what activities within the buffer would be constrained. To consult meaningfully, we need to understand matters like the dimensions of any buffer zone, the scientific basis on which those buffers being drawn, what constitutes 'adequate' and the restrictions that might be imposed on activities within the buffer. To reiterate, before a buffer zone could be imposed, there would need to be effective consultation with the landowner where the SNA is situated as well as consultation for landowners within the buffer zone.	Clearly define the concept of buffering, including all relevant factors and rules that would apply to the buffer zone. Undertake extensive community consultation prior to issuing a consultation document.	Accept in part
S107.004	Lisa Keown_Mangaroa Peatland Focus Group			S107.004	Lisa Keown_Mangaroa Peatland Focus Group	Policy 47: Managing effects on indigenous ecosystems and habitats with significant indigenous	Oppose in part	The entire concept of buffering has not been adequately defined and there has been no consultation with communities that would have been impacted. There has been no definition as to the dimensions of any buffer zone, no definition as to what constitutes 'adequate' nor has there been any clear direction as to what activities within the buffer would be constrained. To consult meaningfully, we	Clearly define the concept of buffering, including all relevant factors and rules that would apply to the buffer zone. Undertake extensive community consultation prior	Accept in part

S42A Appendix 2 - HS6 Indigenous Ecosystems - Summary Recommendation Table

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
						biodiversity values - consideration		need to understand matters like the dimensions of any buffer zone, the scientific basis on which those buffers being drawn, what constitutes 'adequate' and the restrictions that might be imposed on activities within the buffer. To reiterate, before a buffer zone could be imposed, there would need to be effective consultation with the landowner where the SNA is situated as well as consultation for landowners within the buffer zone.	to issuing a consultation document.	
S108.003	Mangaroa Peatland Focus Group_Kerry Ryan			S108.003	Mangaroa Peatland Focus Group_Kerry Ryan	Policy 47: Managing effects on indigenous ecosystems and habitats with significant indigenous biodiversity values - consideration	Oppose in part	The entire concept of buffering has not been adequately defined and there has been no consultation with communities that would have been impacted. There has been no definition as to the dimensions of any buffer zone, no definition as to what constitutes 'adequate' nor has there been any clear direction as to what activities within the buffer would be constrained. To consult meaningfully, we need to understand matters like the dimensions of any buffer zone, the scientific basis on which those buffers being drawn, what constitutes 'adequate' and the restrictions that might be imposed on activities within the buffer. To reiterate, before a buffer zone could be imposed, there would need to be effective consultation with the landowner where the SNA is situated as well as consultation for landowners within the buffer zone.	Clearly define the concept of buffering, including all relevant factors and rules that would apply to the buffer zone. Undertake extensive community consultation prior to issuing a consultation document.	Accept in part
S109.003	Mangaroa Peatland Focus Group_Christine withey			S109.003	Mangaroa Peatland Focus Group_Christine withey	Policy 47: Managing effects on indigenous ecosystems and habitats with significant indigenous biodiversity values - consideration	Oppose in part	The entire concept of buffering has not been adequately defined and there has been no consultation with communities that would have been impacted. There has been no definition as to the dimensions of any buffer zone, no definition as to what constitutes 'adequate' nor has there been any clear direction as to what activities within the buffer would be constrained. To consult meaningfully, we need to understand matters like the dimensions of any buffer zone, the scientific basis on which those buffers being drawn, what constitutes 'adequate' and the restrictions that might be imposed on activities within the buffer. To reiterate, before a buffer zone could be imposed, there would need to be effective consultation with the landowner where the SNA is situated as well as consultation for landowners within the buffer zone.	Clearly define the concept of buffering, including all relevant factors and rules that would apply to the buffer zone. Undertake extensive community consultation prior to issuing a consultation document.	Accept in part
S110.003	Mangaroa Peatland Focus			S110.003	Mangaroa Peatland Focus	Policy 47: Managing effects on	Oppose in part	The entire concept of buffering has not been adequately defined and there has been no consultation with communities that would have been	Clearly define the concept of buffering, including all relevant factors and rules that	Accept in part

S42A Appendix 2 - HS6 Indigenous Ecosystems - Summary Recommendation Table

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
	Group_John Ryan				Group_John Ryan	indigenous ecosystems and habitats with significant indigenous biodiversity values - consideration		impacted. There has been no definition as to the dimensions of any buffer zone, no definition as to what constitutes 'adequate' nor has there been any clear direction as to what activities within the buffer would be constrained. To consult meaningfully, we need to understand matters like the dimensions of any buffer zone, the scientific basis on which those buffers being drawn, what constitutes 'adequate' and the restrictions that might be imposed on activities within the buffer. To reiterate, before a buffer zone could be imposed, there would need to be effective consultation with the landowner where the SNA is situated as well as consultation for landowners within the buffer zone.	would apply to the buffer zone. Undertake extensive community consultation prior to issuing a consultation document.	
S111.003	Mangaroo Peatland Focus Group_Sheila Ryan			S111.003	Mangaroo Peatland Focus Group_Sheila Ryan	Policy 47: Managing effects on indigenous ecosystems and habitats with significant indigenous biodiversity values - consideration	Oppose in part	The entire concept of buffering has not been adequately defined and there has been no consultation with communities that would have been impacted. There has been no definition as to the dimensions of any buffer zone, no definition as to what constitutes 'adequate' nor has there been any clear direction as to what activities within the buffer would be constrained. To consult meaningfully, we need to understand matters like the dimensions of any buffer zone, the scientific basis on which those buffers being drawn, what constitutes 'adequate' and the restrictions that might be imposed on activities within the buffer. To reiterate, before a buffer zone could be imposed, there would need to be effective consultation with the landowner where the SNA is situated as well as consultation for landowners within the buffer zone.	Clearly define the concept of buffering, including all relevant factors and rules that would apply to the buffer zone. Undertake extensive community consultation prior to issuing a consultation document.	Accept in part
S112.003	Mangaroo Peatland Focus Group_Russell Flood-Smith			S112.003	Mangaroo Peatland Focus Group_Russell Flood-Smith	Policy 47: Managing effects on indigenous ecosystems and habitats with significant indigenous biodiversity values - consideration	Oppose in part	The entire concept of buffering has not been adequately defined and there has been no consultation with communities that would have been impacted. There has been no definition as to the dimensions of any buffer zone, no definition as to what constitutes 'adequate' nor has there been any clear direction as to what activities within the buffer would be constrained. To consult meaningfully, we need to understand matters like the dimensions of any buffer zone, the scientific basis on which those buffers being drawn, what constitutes 'adequate' and the restrictions that might be imposed on activities within the buffer. To reiterate, before a buffer zone could be imposed, there would need to be effective consultation with	Clearly define the concept of buffering, including all relevant factors and rules that would apply to the buffer zone. Undertake extensive community consultation prior to issuing a consultation document.	Accept in part

S42A Appendix 2 - HS6 Indigenous Ecosystems - Summary Recommendation Table

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
								the landowner where the SNA is situated as well as consultation for landowners within the buffer zone.		
S115.071	Hutt City Council			S115.071	Hutt City Council	Policy 47: Managing effects on indigenous ecosystems and habitats with significant indigenous biodiversity values - consideration	Oppose	While indigenous biodiversity is a key issue, we expect the government to soon gazette a National Policy Statement on Indigenous Biodiversity ("NPS-IB"). The proposed provisions may well conflict with the NPS-IB especially with regards to the process for identifying indigenous ecosystems. We request that all provisions relating to indigenous biodiversity be deleted and if regional direction is thought necessary after the NPS-IB is gazetted, that should occur through a variation or a separate policy statement change.	Delete all new provisions and amendments to existing provisions and retain existing Operative RPS provisions.	reject
S121.003	Mangaroa Peatland Focus Group_Shane Stratford			S121.003	Mangaroa Peatland Focus Group_Shane Stratford	Policy 47: Managing effects on indigenous ecosystems and habitats with significant indigenous biodiversity values - consideration	Oppose in part	The entire concept of buffering has not been adequately defined and there has been no consultation with communities that would have been impacted. There has been no definition as to the dimensions of any buffer zone, no definition as to what constitutes 'adequate' nor has there been any clear direction as to what activities within the buffer would be constrained. To consult meaningfully, we need to understand matters like the dimensions of any buffer zone, the scientific basis on which those buffers being drawn, what constitutes 'adequate' and the restrictions that might be imposed on activities within the buffer. To reiterate, before a buffer zone could be imposed, there would need to be effective consultation with the landowner where the SNA is situated as well as consultation for landowners within the buffer zone.	Clearly define the concept of buffering, including all relevant factors and rules that would apply to the buffer zone. Undertake extensive community consultation prior to issuing a consultation document.	Accept in part
S122.003	Mangaroa Peatland Focus Group_Jaime Walsh			S122.003	Mangaroa Peatland Focus Group_Jaime Walsh	Policy 47: Managing effects on indigenous ecosystems and habitats with significant indigenous biodiversity values - consideration	Oppose in part	The entire concept of buffering has not been adequately defined and there has been no consultation with communities that would have been impacted. There has been no definition as to the dimensions of any buffer zone, no definition as to what constitutes 'adequate' nor has there been any clear direction as to what activities within the buffer would be constrained. To consult meaningfully, we need to understand matters like the dimensions of any buffer zone, the scientific basis on which those buffers being drawn, what constitutes 'adequate' and the restrictions that might be imposed on activities within the buffer. To reiterate, before a buffer zone could be imposed, there would need to be effective consultation with	Clearly define the concept of buffering, including all relevant factors and rules that would apply to the buffer zone. Undertake extensive community consultation prior to issuing a consultation document.	Accept in part

S42A Appendix 2 - HS6 Indigenous Ecosystems - Summary Recommendation Table

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
								the landowner where the SNA is situated as well as consultation for landowners within the buffer zone.		
S123.018	Peter Thompson			S123.018	Peter Thompson	Policy 47: Managing effects on indigenous ecosystems and habitats with significant indigenous biodiversity values - consideration	Support	The addition points added in this policy are important ones that will aid resilience to climate	Retain as notified.	Accept in part
S127.007	Neo Leaf Global			S127.007	Neo Leaf Global	Policy 47: Managing effects on indigenous ecosystems and habitats with significant indigenous biodiversity values - consideration	Oppose in part	The entire concept of buffering has not been adequately defined and there has been no consultation with communities, including infrastructure service providers, relevant landowners and occupiers that would be impacted. There has been no definition as to the dimensions of any buffer zone, no definition as to what constitutes 'adequate' nor has there been any clear direction as to what activities within the buffer would be constrained.	Remove clause (b).	reject
S129.023	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency			S129.023	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	Policy 47: Managing effects on indigenous ecosystems and habitats with significant indigenous biodiversity values - consideration	Support in part	Policy should be aligned with the NPS-IB exposure draft.	Align Policy 47 with the NPS-IB exposure draft and clarify how to manage effects.	Accept
S129.023	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	FS27.029	Winstone Aggregates	FS27.029	Winstone Aggregates	Policy 47: Managing effects on indigenous ecosystems and habitats with significant indigenous biodiversity	Oppose	Pre-empting the direction of national policy documents, including by giving effect to exposure drafts, is inappropriate and that it is more appropriate to address various National Policy Statements in 2023 when they have been finalised.	Disallow	reject

S42A Appendix 2 - HS6 Indigenous Ecosystems - Summary Recommendation Table

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
						values - consideration				
S131.095	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust			S131.095	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	Policy 47: Managing effects on indigenous ecosystems and habitats with significant indigenous biodiversity values - consideration	Support	Ātiawa supports the amendments made to Policy 47 to provide for indigenous ecosystems and habitats. We seek reference to mana whenua values associated with indigenous ecosystems and habitats are provided for in Policy 47 to ensure our values are considered as part of any assessment.	Amend to:(j) recognising and providing for indigenous ecosystems and habitats that contain mana whenua values (including spiritual, historical and cultural characteristics)	Accept in part
S131.095	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	FS29.365	Ngā Hapu o Otaki	FS29.365	Ngā Hapu o Otaki	Policy 47: Managing effects on indigenous ecosystems and habitats with significant indigenous biodiversity values - consideration	Support	Co -design under a treaty house model is about shaping plans and resource management avenues alongside manawhenua that appropriately recognise the intergenerational prosperity of the uri of Ngā Hapu o Otaki and the wider community. There are ongoing concerns Ngā Hapu o Otaki maintain with GWRC in regard to the policies addressing Co-governance, Co-management, Co-leadership and Co-collabroative operational processes. This submission goes to great length to define where and how further considerations can be made recognising the interconnected nature of matauranga maori, the inequitable impact environmental decline will have on mana whenua/tangata whenua and offers insight to the intuitive and inherent awareness manawhenua need to maintain to ensure our intergenerational survival and prosperity. 3.4 Freshwater including Public Access – Support in Principal 3.6 Indigenous Ecosystems – Support in Principal 3.9 Regional Form, Design and Function – Support in Principal Ātiawa views regarding Freshwater, indigenous ecosystems and Regional design and function resonate with insights Ngā Hapu o Otaki maintain. Ngā Hapu o Otaki would like opportunity to speak further to such views during the hearing process. We share Ātiawas concerns for Mātauranga Māori as a foundation for equitable interchange of decision making. Their concerns regarding intensification and the further degredation of taonga across our coastline rings true to the ongoing journey we are on	Not stated	Accept

S42A Appendix 2 - HS6 Indigenous Ecosystems - Summary Recommendation Table

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
								as manawhenua facing intense growth for the coming generation. We seek to join the conversation and endorse provisions that will see our whanaunga and other manawhenua groups recognise their environmental resilience and the cultural agility our shared whakapapa offers.		
S133.021	Muaūpoko Tribal Authority			S133.021	Muaūpoko Tribal Authority	Policy 47: Managing effects on indigenous ecosystems and habitats with significant indigenous biodiversity values - consideration	Support	Supports acknowledgement of the limits to offsetting.	Retain as notified. OR Alternative relief that may be necessary or appropriate to ensure Muaūpoko connection to Te-Whanganui-a-Tara is recognised.	Accept in part
S133.021	Muaūpoko Tribal Authority	FS6.051	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira on behalf of Ngāti Toa Rangatira	FS6.051	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira on behalf of Ngāti Toa Rangatira	Policy 47: Managing effects on indigenous ecosystems and habitats with significant indigenous biodiversity values - consideration	Oppose	We oppose this submission because as Muaūpoko claims are inappropriate. This not only causes confusion around which iwi are Tangata Whenua in Te Whanganui a Tara rohe and which iwi to engage with, but also portrays a false perception of who the mana whenua are, which is also inappropriate.	Disallow We seek that this part of the submission is disallowed.	reject
S133.021	Muaūpoko Tribal Authority	FS20.368	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	FS20.368	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	Policy 47: Managing effects on indigenous ecosystems and habitats with significant indigenous biodiversity values - consideration	Oppose	Ātiawa vehemently oppose the submission and claims made by Muaūpoko Tribal Authority. The assertions made by Muāupoko Tribal Authority are categorically incorrect and highly offensive to Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai. While Muaūpoko may have historical associations with Te Whanganui-a-Tara and Kāpiti. These associations are recognised as historical only. Ātiawa refer to the evidence provided by Ngārongo Iwikatea Nicholson in support of Ngāti Toarangatira's claims which were upheld and settled by the Crown. Pages 26-34 sets out the extinguishment of Muaūpoko rights in our rohe. From both a tikanga Māori perspective and a Crown law perspective, Muaūpoko do not hold mana whenua (including for the purposes of the Resource Management Act). There is therefore no basis for Muaūpoko Tribal Authority to be recognised as being kaitiaki in the rohe; to do so would be	Disallow the whole submission	reject

S42A Appendix 2 - HS6 Indigenous Ecosystems - Summary Recommendation Table

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
								incomprehensible and irreconcilable to Ātiawa, and more generally an affront to tikanga Māori. Muaūpoko Tribal Authority have cited Te Kāhui Māngai mapping as evidence of the spatial extent that they exercise kaitiakitanga. This in itself evidences the lack of basis to their claims, in that Te Kāhui Māngai map simply reflects claims made by Māori groups, and from our previous inquiry to Te Puni Kōkiri who are responsible for this map, we learned that Muaūpoko Tribal Authority included that spatial extent in their Agreement in Principle. Agreements in Principle provide claimants the opportunity to set out everything that a claimant wants from the Crown. They have no legal effect and are therefore not legally recognised. We strongly advise the Council to remain conscious that it is not appropriate for regional planning processes to be exploited in the manner suggested by the Muaūpoko Tribal Authority, that dealing with the false claims of groups like these must be left to the Crown, and that settlements must not pre-empted. Whilst Muaūpoko Tribal Authority may wish to seek out new territories through online maps, this is not of course how mana whenua is gained or held. We remain as ahi kā and mana whenua on the land, as we have undisturbed for over 198 years.		
S138.003	Mangaroa Peatland Focus Group_Jody Sinclair & Josh Lowny			S138.003	Mangaroa Peatland Focus Group_Jody Sinclair & Josh Lowny	Policy 47: Managing effects on indigenous ecosystems and habitats with significant indigenous biodiversity values - consideration	Oppose in part	The entire concept of buffering has not been adequately defined and there has been no consultation with communities that would have been impacted. There has been no definition as to the dimensions of any buffer zone, no definition as to what constitutes 'adequate' nor has there been any clear direction as to what activities within the buffer would be constrained. To consult meaningfully, we need to understand matters like the dimensions of any buffer zone, the scientific basis on which those buffers being drawn, what constitutes 'adequate' and the restrictions that might be imposed on activities within the buffer. To reiterate, before a buffer zone could be imposed, there would need to be effective consultation with the landowner where the SNA is situated as well as consultation for landowners within the buffer zone.	Clearly define the concept of buffering, including all relevant factors and rules that would apply to the buffer zone. Undertake extensive community consultation prior to issuing a consultation document.	Accept in part
S140.072	Wellington City Council (WCC)			S140.072	Wellington City Council (WCC)	Policy 47: Managing effects on	Support	Support as proposed.	Retain as notified.	Accept in part

S42A Appendix 2 - HS6 Indigenous Ecosystems - Summary Recommendation Table

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
						indigenous ecosystems and habitats with significant indigenous biodiversity values - consideration				
S142.005	Combined Cycle Submitters (CCS)			S142.005	Combined Cycle Submitters (CCS)	Policy 47: Managing effects on indigenous ecosystems and habitats with significant indigenous biodiversity values - consideration	Support in part	Supports amendments in Policy 57 which further and more explicitly embed decarbonisation and mode shift considerations; however request retention of the term 'attractive' given further definition provided by the Environment Court.	Amend clause (e) as follows: (e) provides for well-connected, safe, attractive and accessible multi modal transport networks....	reject
S144.023	Sustainable Wairarapa Inc			S144.023	Sustainable Wairarapa Inc	Policy 47: Managing effects on indigenous ecosystems and habitats with significant indigenous biodiversity values - consideration	Support	The addition points added in this policy are important ones that will aid resilience to climate change and minimise impacts on biodiversity	Retain as notified.	Accept in part
S146.003	Mangaroa Peatland Focus Group_Alan Rothwell			S146.003	Mangaroa Peatland Focus Group_Alan Rothwell	Policy 47: Managing effects on indigenous ecosystems and habitats with significant indigenous biodiversity values - consideration	Oppose in part	The entire concept of buffering has not been adequately defined and there has been no consultation with communities that would have been impacted. There has been no definition as to the dimensions of any buffer zone, no definition as to what constitutes 'adequate' nor has there been any clear direction as to what activities within the buffer would be constrained. To consult meaningfully, we need to understand matters like the dimensions of any buffer zone, the scientific basis on which those buffers being drawn, what constitutes 'adequate' and the restrictions that might be imposed on activities within the buffer. To reiterate, before a buffer zone could be imposed, there would need to be effective consultation with	Clearly define the concept of buffering, including all relevant factors and rules that would apply to the buffer zone. Undertake extensive community consultation prior to issuing a consultation document.	Accept in part

S42A Appendix 2 - HS6 Indigenous Ecosystems - Summary Recommendation Table

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
								the landowner where the SNA is situated as well as consultation for landowners within the buffer zone.		
S147.027	Wellington Fish and Game Council			S147.027	Wellington Fish and Game Council	Policy 47: Managing effects on indigenous ecosystems and habitats with significant indigenous biodiversity values - consideration	Support in part	The suggested amendment follows from the suggested amendment to Objective 16, above, and is intended to give better effect to the NPS-FM (including Policies 9 and 10). While the protections of indigenous ecosystems and habitats is vital, so too is the maintaining and enhancing of the whole environment, including those containing valued introduced species. An unduly narrow indigenous - centric focus could lead to lessening of protections for non-indigenous dominant systems and the subsequent adverse environmental effects on these (and the whole system).	Amend title and text: Policy 47: Managing effects on indigenous ecosystems and habitats with significant indigenous biodiversity and other values - consideration When considering an application for a resource consent, notice of requirement, or a change, variation or review of a district or regional plan, a determination shall be made as to whether an activity may affect indigenous ecosystems and habitats with significant indigenous biodiversity or other values, and in determining whether the proposed activity is inappropriate particular regard shall be given to:	reject
S147.027	Wellington Fish and Game Council	FS27.032	Winstone Aggregates	FS27.032	Winstone Aggregates	Policy 47: Managing effects on indigenous ecosystems and habitats with significant indigenous biodiversity values - consideration	Oppose	Winstone opposes the widening of Policy 47 to managing effects on other values.	Disallow	Accept
S147.027	Wellington Fish and Game Council	FS20.129	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	FS20.129	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	Policy 47: Managing effects on indigenous ecosystems and habitats with significant indigenous biodiversity values - consideration	Oppose	Ātiawa do not support the rationale set out by Fish and Game, - indigenous ecosystems must be afforded the greatest protection above the protection of introduced ecosystems which already dominate te taiao, to the detriment of indigenous ecosystems. The relief sought by the submitter would like result in a status-quo outcome for indigenous ecosystems, Ātiawa are opposed to this outcome.	Disallow	Accept

S42A Appendix 2 - HS6 Indigenous Ecosystems - Summary Recommendation Table

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
S147.027	Wellington Fish and Game Council	FS19.091	Wellington Water Ltd ("Wellington Water")	FS19.091	Wellington Water Ltd ("Wellington Water")	Policy 47: Managing effects on indigenous ecosystems and habitats with significant indigenous biodiversity values - consideration	Oppose	It is unnecessary and redundant to recreate NPSFM policies within the RPS. Most of the amendments sought do not in any event properly reflect the NPSFM. In particular, they do not accurately reflect the proviso to Policy 7, the requirements of clause 3.22, the limitation of Policy 10 to trout and salmon only, and the subservience of Policy 10 to Policy 9. Some of the amendments attempt to address matters that are already adequately covered by extant provisions or PC1 as notified. Some of the amendments undermine the more detailed content of PC1.	Disallow	Accept
S147.027	Wellington Fish and Game Council	FS30.196	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Ltd	FS30.196	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Ltd	Policy 47: Managing effects on indigenous ecosystems and habitats with significant indigenous biodiversity values - consideration	Oppose	B+LNZ generally oppose the submission on the grounds that's B+LNZ are seeking changes of the plan change are restricted to those necessary to give effect to the National Policy Statement for Urban Development and that any other matters should be subject to proper review in the Schedule full review of the RPS in 2024 and in the scheduled reviews of the Natural Resources Plan in 2023 and 2024. This is because the changes materially impact on communities, including rural communities and we do not consider that the necessary engagement has been undertaken to adequately inform these provisions or to meet the requirements of Part 3.2 of the NPS-FM. Furthermore, there is a risk that including matters relating to climate change and indigenous biodiversity before key national legislation is gazetted is premature and will lead to the inefficient implementation and confusion amongst those who it impacts materially.	Disallow That the submission be disallowed with the exception of 147.007	Accept in part
S147.028	Wellington Fish and Game Council			S147.028	Wellington Fish and Game Council	Policy 47: Managing effects on indigenous ecosystems and habitats with significant indigenous biodiversity values - consideration	Support in part	The suggested amendment follows from the suggested amendment to Objective 16, above, and is intended to give better effect to the NPS-FM (including Policies 9 and 10). While the protections of indigenous ecosystems and habitats is vital, so too is the maintaining and enhancing of the whole environment, including those containing valued introduced species. An unduly narrow indigenous - centric focus could lead to lessening of protections for non-indigenous dominant systems and the subsequent adverse environmental effects on these (and the whole system).	new subclause:(j) protecting the habitats of indigenous freshwater species, trout, and salmon.	reject

S42A Appendix 2 - HS6 Indigenous Ecosystems - Summary Recommendation Table

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
S147.028	Wellington Fish and Game Council	FS20.130	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	FS20.130	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	Policy 47: Managing effects on indigenous ecosystems and habitats with significant indigenous biodiversity values - consideration	Oppose	Ātiawa do not support the rationale set out by Fish and Game, - indigenous ecosystems must be afforded the greatest protection above the protection of introduced ecosystems which already dominate te taiao, to the detriment of indigenous ecosystems. The relief sought by the submitter would like result in a status-quo outcome for indigenous ecosystems, Ātiawa are opposed to this outcome.	Disallow	Accept
S147.028	Wellington Fish and Game Council	FS19.092	Wellington Water Ltd ("Wellington Water")	FS19.092	Wellington Water Ltd ("Wellington Water")	Policy 47: Managing effects on indigenous ecosystems and habitats with significant indigenous biodiversity values - consideration	Oppose	It is unnecessary and redundant to recreate NPSFM policies within the RPS. Most of the amendments sought do not in any event properly reflect the NPSFM. In particular, they do not accurately reflect the proviso to Policy 7, the requirements of clause 3.22, the limitation of Policy 10 to trout and salmon only, and the subservience of Policy 10 to Policy 9. Some of the amendments attempt to address matters that are already adequately covered by extant provisions or PC1 as notified. Some of the amendments undermine the more detailed content of PC1.	Disallow	Accept
S147.028	Wellington Fish and Game Council	FS30.197	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Ltd	FS30.197	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Ltd	Policy 47: Managing effects on indigenous ecosystems and habitats with significant indigenous biodiversity values - consideration	Oppose	B+LNZ generally oppose the submission on the grounds that's B+LNZ are seeking changes of the plan change are restricted to those necessary to give effect to the National Policy Statement for Urban Development and that any other matters should be subject to proper review in the Schedule full review of the RPS in 2024 and in the scheduled reviews of the Natural Resources Plan in 2023 and 2024. This is because the changes materially impact on communities, including rural communities and we do not consider that the necessary engagement has been undertaken to adequately inform these provisions or to meet the requirements of Part 3.2 of the NPS-FM. Furthermore, there is a risk that including matters relating to climate change and indigenous biodiversity before key national legislation is gazetted is premature and will lead to the inefficient implementation and confusion amongst those who it impacts materially.	Disallow That the submission be disallowed with the exception of 147.007	Accept in part
S148.042	Wellington International			S148.042	Wellington International	Policy 47: Managing effects on	Oppose in part	WIAL is concerned that there are inappropriate limits on offsetting and compensation in Policy 24 which is	Delete subparagraph (i) including the reference to	reject

S42A Appendix 2 - HS6 Indigenous Ecosystems - Summary Recommendation Table

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
	Airport Ltd (WIAL)				Airport Ltd (WIAL)	indigenous ecosystems and habitats with significant indigenous biodiversity values - consideration		cross referred to in this policy. These reasons are set out above.	Policy 24 and the limits on offsetting and compensation.	
S148.042	Wellington International Airport Ltd (WIAL)	FS27.030	Winstone Aggregates	FS27.030	Winstone Aggregates	Policy 47: Managing effects on indigenous ecosystems and habitats with significant indigenous biodiversity values - consideration	Support	For the same reasons as outlined in its original submission, Winstone agrees that the limits to use of offsetting or compensation is unjustified and more onerous than required by national direction. Winstone supports the removal of reference to Policy 24 from this provision.	Allow	reject
S148.042	Wellington International Airport Ltd (WIAL)	FS26.063	Meridian Energy Limited	FS26.063	Meridian Energy Limited	Policy 47: Managing effects on indigenous ecosystems and habitats with significant indigenous biodiversity values - consideration	Support in part	WIAL is concerned that there are inappropriate limits on offsetting and compensation in Policy 24 which is cross referenced in this policy. The submission requests deletion of subparagraph (i) including the reference to Policy 24 and the limits on offsetting and compensation. Meridian agrees that the limits proposed in Policy 24 are inappropriately stringent and agrees they should not be accepted as settled in Policy 47.	Allow to the extent that any amendments are consistent with Meridian's own requested relief.	reject
S149.003	Mangaroa Peatland Focus Group_Matthew Rothwell			S149.003	Mangaroa Peatland Focus Group_Matthew Rothwell	Policy 47: Managing effects on indigenous ecosystems and habitats with significant indigenous biodiversity values - consideration	Oppose in part	The entire concept of buffering has not been adequately defined and there has been no consultation with communities that would have been impacted. There has been no definition as to the dimensions of any buffer zone, no definition as to what constitutes 'adequate' nor has there been any clear direction as to what activities within the buffer would be constrained. To consult meaningfully, we need to understand matters like the dimensions of any buffer zone, the scientific basis on which those buffers being drawn, what constitutes 'adequate' and the restrictions that might be imposed on activities within the buffer. To reiterate, before a buffer zone could be imposed, there would need to be effective consultation with	Clearly define the concept of buffering, including all relevant factors and rules that would apply to the buffer zone. Undertake extensive community consultation prior to issuing a consultation document.	Accept in part

S42A Appendix 2 - HS6 Indigenous Ecosystems - Summary Recommendation Table

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
								the landowner where the SNA is situated as well as consultation for landowners within the buffer zone.		
S150.003	Mangaroa Peatland Focus Group_Aнна Brodie & Mark Leckie			S150.003	Mangaroa Peatland Focus Group_Aнна Brodie & Mark Leckie	Policy 47: Managing effects on indigenous ecosystems and habitats with significant indigenous biodiversity values - consideration	Oppose in part	<p>The entire concept of buffering has not been adequately defined and there has been no consultation with communities that would have been impacted. There has been no definition as to the dimensions of any buffer zone, no definition as to what constitutes 'adequate' nor has there been any clear direction as to what activities within the buffer would be constrained. To consult meaningfully, we need to understand matters like the dimensions of any buffer zone, the scientific basis on which those buffers being drawn, what constitutes 'adequate' and the restrictions that might be imposed on activities within the buffer.</p> <p>To reiterate, before a buffer zone could be imposed, there would need to be effective consultation with the landowner where the SNA is situated as well as consultation for landowners within the buffer zone.</p>	Clearly define the concept of buffering, including all relevant factors and rules that would apply to the buffer zone. Undertake extensive community consultation prior to issuing a consultation document.	Accept in part
S156.003	Mangaroa Peatland Focus Group_Tim Rothwell			S156.003	Mangaroa Peatland Focus Group_Tim Rothwell	Policy 47: Managing effects on indigenous ecosystems and habitats with significant indigenous biodiversity values - consideration	Oppose in part	<p>The entire concept of buffering has not been adequately defined and there has been no consultation with communities that would have been impacted. There has been no definition as to the dimensions of any buffer zone, no definition as to what constitutes 'adequate' nor has there been any clear direction as to what activities within the buffer would be constrained. To consult meaningfully, we need to understand matters like the dimensions of any buffer zone, the scientific basis on which those buffers being drawn, what constitutes 'adequate' and the restrictions that might be imposed on activities within the buffer.</p> <p>To reiterate, before a buffer zone could be imposed, there would need to be effective consultation with the landowner where the SNA is situated as well as consultation for landowners within the buffer zone.</p>	Clearly define the concept of buffering, including all relevant factors and rules that would apply to the buffer zone. Undertake extensive community consultation prior to issuing a consultation document.	Accept in part
S159.003	Mangaroa Peatland Focus Group_Anton y & Jemma Ragg			S159.003	Mangaroa Peatland Focus Group_Anton y & Jemma Ragg	Policy 47: Managing effects on indigenous ecosystems and habitats with significant indigenous biodiversity	Oppose in part	<p>The entire concept of buffering has not been adequately defined and there has been no consultation with communities that would have been impacted. There has been no definition as to the dimensions of any buffer zone, no definition as to what constitutes 'adequate' nor has there been any clear direction as to what activities within the buffer would be constrained. To consult meaningfully, we need to understand matters like the dimensions of any buffer zone, the scientific basis on which those</p>	Clearly define the concept of buffering, including all relevant factors and rules that would apply to the buffer zone. Undertake extensive community consultation prior to issuing a consultation document.	Accept in part

S42A Appendix 2 - HS6 Indigenous Ecosystems - Summary Recommendation Table

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
						values - consideration		buffers being drawn, what constitutes 'adequate' and the restrictions that might be imposed on activities within the buffer. To reiterate, before a buffer zone could be imposed, there would need to be effective consultation with the landowner where the SNA is situated as well as consultation for landowners within the buffer zone.		
S160.003	Mangaroa Peatland Focus Group_Jen & Chris Priest			S160.003	Mangaroa Peatland Focus Group_Jen & Chris Priest	Policy 47: Managing effects on indigenous ecosystems and habitats with significant indigenous biodiversity values - consideration	Oppose in part	The entire concept of buffering has not been adequately defined and there has been no consultation with communities that would have been impacted. There has been no definition as to the dimensions of any buffer zone, no definition as to what constitutes 'adequate' nor has there been any clear direction as to what activities within the buffer would be constrained. To consult meaningfully, we need to understand matters like the dimensions of any buffer zone, the scientific basis on which those buffers being drawn, what constitutes 'adequate' and the restrictions that might be imposed on activities within the buffer. To reiterate, before a buffer zone could be imposed, there would need to be effective consultation with the landowner where the SNA is situated as well as consultation for landowners within the buffer zone.	Clearly define the concept of buffering, including all relevant factors and rules that would apply to the buffer zone. Undertake extensive community consultation prior to issuing a consultation document.	Accept in part
S161.003	Grant O'Brien			S161.003	Grant O'Brien	Policy 47: Managing effects on indigenous ecosystems and habitats with significant indigenous biodiversity values - consideration	Oppose in part	As per above, until 'indigenous ecosystems' and 'habitats with significant indigenous biodiversity values' are mapped and understood and affected landowners advised, we can not support the inclusion of 'adequate buffering' as it is unclear who will be affected by this and what the implication of 'buffering' is. The term adequate is also qualitative and meaningless - actual distances need to be defined using appropriate data. Landowners would need compensation for losses of investment and livelihood on their land.	Remove the phrase 'adequate buffering', until such time as areas requiring buffering are mapped and landowners affected by buffering are engaged with.	reject
S162.015	Winstone Aggregates			S162.015	Winstone Aggregates	Policy 47: Managing effects on indigenous ecosystems and habitats with significant indigenous biodiversity values - consideration	Support in part	Generally supports the changes to clause (g) of this policy. Request removal of (i) for the reasons described in Policy 24 summary. Queries whether there are changes to how this policy operates due to insertion of proposed new definitions.	Reject changes to clause (i) [Note: Submission reference prior submission point S162.009]	reject

S42A Appendix 2 - HS6 Indigenous Ecosystems - Summary Recommendation Table

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
S162.015	Winstone Aggregates	FS11.020	Fulton Hogan Limited	FS11.020	Fulton Hogan Limited	Policy 47: Managing effects on indigenous ecosystems and habitats with significant indigenous biodiversity values - consideration	Support	Agree that point (i) relating to limits to offsetting and compensation in policy 24 should be removed for the reasons outlined in further submission point 11. Alignment of the terms used in the policy (e.g. maintaining connections) and the proposed new definitions (e.g. ecological connectivity) and any unintended consequences need to be investigated.	Allow	reject
S162.015	Winstone Aggregates	FS20.283	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	FS20.283	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	Policy 47: Managing effects on indigenous ecosystems and habitats with significant indigenous biodiversity values - consideration	Oppose	<p>Ātiawa oppose the submissions from Aggregate and Quarry Association and Winstone Aggregates to the extent that the relief sought is inconsistent with national direction, particularly the NPS-FM. Ātiawa are particularly sensitive to aggregate extraction from awa, it is mana whenua who are guaranteed tino rangatiratanga over the land, waterways and all other taonga (including aggregate) through Te Tiriti o Waitangi. Historically aggregate extraction industry has failed to uphold the articles and the principles of Te Tiriti. Additionally, aggregate extraction has adverse effects on te taiao and mana whenua values.</p> <p>On the matter of 'balancing' national policy statements', recent case law states that the NPS-FM 2020 and NPS-UD 2020 are to be read together and reconciled under the regional policy statement and the district plans. It goes on to say, development capacity does not outweigh (trump) Te Mana o te Wai. Te Mana o te Wai is the fundamental concept of freshwater management: any thinking to the converse would not give effect to either national policy statement. Therefore, to reconcile national direction, it is not a balancing act, or even a compromise, the NPS-FM must be given effect to while achieving the purpose of the NPS-UD for example. This can be applied to aggregate extraction, the activity must be consistent with Te Mana o te Wai and the NPS-FM. The need for housing capacity is not license to forgo the requirements of the NPS-FM.</p>	Disallow	Accept
S163.073	Wairarapa Federated Farmers			S163.073	Wairarapa Federated Farmers	Policy 47: Managing effects on indigenous	Oppose	The amendments to Policy 47 are principally to add clause i) referencing Policy 24 (offsets). Refer to submission on Policy 24 for reasons as to why this policy should be deleted.	That the amendments to Policy 47 be deleted. Delete the FW icon.	Accept in part

S42A Appendix 2 - HS6 Indigenous Ecosystems - Summary Recommendation Table

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
						ecosystems and habitats with significant indigenous biodiversity values - consideration				
S163.073	Wairarapa Federated Farmers	FS7.116	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society (Forest & Bird)	FS7.116	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society (Forest & Bird)	Policy 47: Managing effects on indigenous ecosystems and habitats with significant indigenous biodiversity values - consideration	Oppose	It is completely appropriate to include climate change, biodiversity and freshwater provisions in the plan change. This plan change creates efficiency by considering multiple policy directives from central government. The amendments sought by Federated Farmers fail to give effect to the NPSFM, the NPS for Indigenous Biodiversity, for which there is an exposure draft and the final version is due out this month, and do not achieve the purpose of the RMA or the Climate Change Response (Zero Carbon) Amendment Act 2019.	Disallow whole submission	Accept in part
S163.073	Wairarapa Federated Farmers	FS20.238	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	FS20.238	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	Policy 47: Managing effects on indigenous ecosystems and habitats with significant indigenous biodiversity values - consideration	Oppose	Ātiawa oppose the entire submission by Wairarapa Federated Farmers. The relief sought by Federated Farmers is to effectively delete the entire proposed plan change (except for submission points S163.083, S163.084). The basis for deleting the proposed plan change is to delay decision-making. Ātiawa do not accept that delaying responding to national direction is an appropriate course of action, and will further compound environmental and resource management issues.	Disallow the entire submission by Wairarapa Federated Farmers.	Accept in part
S163.073	Wairarapa Federated Farmers	FS29.089	Ngā Hapu o Otaki	FS29.089	Ngā Hapu o Otaki	Policy 47: Managing effects on indigenous ecosystems and habitats with significant indigenous biodiversity values - consideration	Oppose	Section 18, page 4: General Comments – OPPOSE Section 25, Page 5 Going Forward – OPPOSE It is disheartening to see that Wairarapa Federated Farmers aren't capable of recognizing the obligations GWRC must maintain with Treaty Partners. It must be understood that Manawhenua are not simply 'groups of people' but a representation of the signatories that signed the Treaty of Waitangi and the original kaitiaki and custodians of the taonga in question when considering how these plan changes are implemented. Wairarapa Federated Farmers indicate a lack of awareness to the value of manawhenua engagement. Their stated 'aspirations of delivering environmental improvements alongside a thriving bio-economy' aren't feasible without considering the	Not stated	Accept in part

S42A Appendix 2 - HS6 Indigenous Ecosystems - Summary Recommendation Table

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
								intergenerational insight and technical direction that only Mātauranga Māori can offer.		
S163.073	Wairarapa Federated Farmers	FS30.145	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Ltd	FS30.145	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Ltd	Policy 47: Managing effects on indigenous ecosystems and habitats with significant indigenous biodiversity values - consideration	Support	B+LNZ agree that the scope of RPS PC1 should be restricted to those changes necessary to give effect to the National Policy Statement for Urban Development and that any other matters should be subject to proper review in the Schedule full review of the RPS in 2024 and in the scheduled reviews of the Natural Resources Plan in 2023 and 2024. Where alternative relief is provided, B+LNZ generally support this relief.	Allow	reject
S165.074	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society (Forest & Bird)			S165.074	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society (Forest & Bird)	Policy 47: Managing effects on indigenous ecosystems and habitats with significant indigenous biodiversity values - consideration	Support in part	It is not appropriate to include new subclause (i), which refers to limits to offsetting and compensation, as a matter to be had particular regard to. A limit is something that has to be given effect to not had regard to. Require adherence to a full set of mandatory offsetting and compensation principles	Include (i) as a matter that has to be "given effect to", not "have regard to." Also include a requirement to give effect to a full set of mandatory offsetting and compensation principles, that are included in the RPS (as submitted above).	reject
S165.074	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society (Forest & Bird)		Wellington International Airport Ltd (WIAL)	FS17.022	Wellington International Airport Ltd (WIAL)	Policy 47: Managing effects on indigenous ecosystems and habitats with significant indigenous biodiversity values - consideration	Oppose	WIAL oppose the relief sought as it is inconsistent with WIAL's primary submission.	Disallow	Accept
S165.074	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society (Forest & Bird)		Winstone Aggregates	FS27.031	Winstone Aggregates	Policy 47: Managing effects on indigenous ecosystems and habitats with significant indigenous biodiversity	Oppose	Winstone opposes the inclusion of the new subclause (i) sought by Forest and Bird that requires offsetting and compensation to be given effect to (rather than have regard to) and adherence to an undefined set of offsetting and compensation principles, for the reasons generally set out in Winstones submission.	Disallow	Accept

S42A Appendix 2 - HS6 Indigenous Ecosystems - Summary Recommendation Table

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
						values - consideration				
S165.074	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society (Forest & Bird)		Meridian Energy Limited	FS26.060	Meridian Energy Limited	Policy 47: Managing effects on indigenous ecosystems and habitats with significant indigenous biodiversity values - consideration	Oppose	Forest & Bird considers it is not appropriate to include new subclause (i), which refers to limits to offsetting and compensation, as a matter to be had particular regard to. And requests that 'had regard to' is changed to 'give effect to'. Meridian considers 'have regard to' is the correct approach. The policy is a 'consideration' policy	Disallow	Accept
S165.074	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society (Forest & Bird)		Beef + Lamb New Zealand Ltd	FS30.319	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Ltd	Policy 47: Managing effects on indigenous ecosystems and habitats with significant indigenous biodiversity values - consideration	Oppose	B+LNZ generally oppose the submission on the grounds that's B+LNZ are seeking changes of the plan change are restricted to those necessary to give effect to the National Policy Statement for Urban Development and that any other matters should be subject to proper review in the Schedule full review of the RPS in 2024 and in the scheduled reviews of the Natural Resources Plan in 2023 and 2024. This is because the changes materially impact on communities, including rural communities and we do not consider that the necessary engagement has been undertaken to adequately inform these provisions or to meet the requirements of Part 3.2 of the NPS-FM. Furthermore, there is a risk that including matters relating to climate change and indigenous biodiversity before key national legislation is gazetted or implemented is premature and will lead to the inefficient implementation and confusion amongst those who it impacts materially.	Disallow	Accept
S168.077	Rangitāne O Wairarapa Inc			S168.077	Rangitāne O Wairarapa Inc	Policy 47: Managing effects on indigenous ecosystems and habitats with significant indigenous biodiversity values - consideration	Support	Rangitāne o Wairarapa support acknowledgement of the limits to offsetting, noting Rangitāne o Wairarapa's outstanding concerns with Policy 24.	Retain as notified	Accept in part

S42A Appendix 2 - HS6 Indigenous Ecosystems - Summary Recommendation Table

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
S168.077	Rangitāne O Wairarapa Inc	FS31.187	Sustainable Wairarapa Inc	FS31.187	Sustainable Wairarapa Inc	Policy 47: Managing effects on indigenous ecosystems and habitats with significant indigenous biodiversity values - consideration	Support	Kia ora koutou, My name is Ian Gunn, Secretary Sustainable Wairarapa inc. contact # 021567134, address 4B McKay Street, Paraparaumu Beach 5032. Firstly we'd like to state the time frame provided to peruse over 900 pages of submissions is in our opinion an abuse of process. The benefit of further submissions is for you the council to listen and hear the views of its ratepayers. The timeframe in our case does not allow a rigorous review of the original submissions to council. On top of this we are a week before Christmas- a very busy and chaotic time for most members of the community. It is highly likely that the majority of staff will take leave over the Christmas break so analysis of any further submissions will not occur until late January 2023-so why the short period to respond. While there is due process there is also good practise your management of the further submissions fails the good practise model. As a consequence we would like you to note Sustainable Wairarapa's strong support of the original submissions lodged with council by the two Wairarapa Iwi-Ngati Kahungunu and Rangitane. Its clear that there is a poor understanding of nature based solutions this term needs further explanation. Sustainable Wairarapa acknowledges that while nature based solutions offer a wide variety of options its not the only solution. We are heartened by the widespread support for the original document. Thanks for an opportunity to make a further submission. Nga mihi nui Ian Gun	Not stated	Accept in part
S30.0127	Porirua City Council			S30.0127	Porirua City Council	Policy 47: Managing effects on indigenous ecosystems and habitats with significant indigenous biodiversity values - consideration	Oppose	The legal weight that can be given to this statement is dubious considering that it is in an explanation: "This policy shall cease to have effect once policies 23 and 24 are in place in an operative district or regional plan." This policy should only apply to resource consents so it does not conflict and/or duplicate earlier regulatory policies that apply to the development of regional and district plans, as well as the NPS-IB.	Amend policy to include this statement, deeming provision, or advice note: This policy shall cease to have effect once policies 23 and 24 are in place in an operative district or regional plan. Amend policy to only apply to resource consents.	reject
S30.0127	Porirua City Council	FS25.045	Peka Peka Farm Limited	FS25.045	Peka Peka Farm Limited	Policy 47: Managing effects on indigenous ecosystems	Support	The submission provides a comprehensive analysis of the proposed change including in relation to matters of scope and jurisdiction. It is supported without prejudice to the specific relief sought in the primary	Allow	reject

S42A Appendix 2 - HS6 Indigenous Ecosystems - Summary Recommendation Table

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
						and habitats with significant indigenous biodiversity values - consideration		submission or this further submission by Peka Peka Farm Ltd.		
S30.0127	Porirua City Council	FS26.061	Meridian Energy Limited	FS26.061	Meridian Energy Limited	Policy 47: Managing effects on indigenous ecosystems and habitats with significant indigenous biodiversity values - consideration	Support in part	Porirua CC seeks amendment to include a statement, deeming provision, or advice note to the effect that the policy shall cease to have effect once policies 23 and 24 are in place in an operative district or regional plan. Meridian expects that this will be the natural consequence of the policy being given effect in operative plan provisions, but sees no harm in such an advice note.	Allow	reject
S30.0127	Porirua City Council	FS25.171	Peka Peka Farm Limited	FS25.171	Peka Peka Farm Limited	Policy 47: Managing effects on indigenous ecosystems and habitats with significant indigenous biodiversity values - consideration	Support	The submission provides a comprehensive analysis of the proposed change including in relation to matters of scope and jurisdiction. It is supported without prejudice to the specific relief sought in the primary submission or this further submission by Peka Peka Farm Ltd.	Allow	reject
S167.0113	Taranaki Whānui			S167.0113	Taranaki Whānui	Policy 47: Managing effects on indigenous ecosystems and habitats with significant indigenous biodiversity values - consideration	Support in part	Support with further promotion of mana whenua protections in consideration	Insert a new clause:(x) protecting the relationship between mana whenua / tangata whenua and their culture, land, water, wāhi tapu and other taonga	Accept in part
S16.063	Kāpiti Coast District Council			S16.063	Kāpiti Coast District Council	Policy IE.2: Maintaining, enhancing, and restoring indigenous ecosystem	Oppose	As this policy is not required by the RMA or a higher-level statutory planning document Council requests the methods and implementation of those methods should be the responsibility of GWRC only.	Delete Policy IE.2 or amend so it is only applicable to the regional council.	reject

S42A Appendix 2 - HS6 Indigenous Ecosystems - Summary Recommendation Table

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
						health - consideration				
S30.069	Porirua City Council			S30.069	Porirua City Council	Policy IE.2: Maintaining, enhancing, and restoring indigenous ecosystem health - consideration	Oppose	<p>Policy requires some specificity as to what the matter is being addressed through the policy, otherwise would apply as a consideration for any type of consent. Further, this policy would better be articulated as a transitional policy that falls away once Policy EI.1 is given effect to.</p> <p>This policy should only apply to resource consents so it does not conflict and/or duplicate earlier regulatory policies that apply to the development of regional and district plans, as well as the NPS-IB.</p>	<p>Amend policy so that it provides clear and appropriate direction to plan users in line with objectives and/or reword policy as follows:</p> <p>When considering an application for a resource consent, notice of requirement, or a plan change, variation or review of a district plan for subdivision, use or development that may impact on indigenous biodiversity, particular regard shall be given to enabling mana whenua / tangata whenua to exercise their role as kaitiaki, including, but not restricted to:</p> <p>(a) providing for mana whenua / tangata whenua values associated with indigenous biodiversity, including giving local effect to Te Rito o te Harakeke,</p> <p>(b) incorporating the use of mātauranga Māori in the management and monitoring of indigenous biodiversity; and</p> <p>(c) supporting mana whenua / tangata whenua to access and exercise sustainable customary use of indigenous biodiversity, including for mahinga kai and taonga, in accordance with tikanga.</p> <p>Amend policy to include this statement, deeming provision, or advice note: This policy shall cease to have effect once Policy EI.1 is in place in an operative district or regional plan.</p>	Accept in part

S42A Appendix 2 - HS6 Indigenous Ecosystems - Summary Recommendation Table

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
S30.069	Porirua City Council	FS25.102	Peka Peka Farm Limited	FS25.102	Peka Peka Farm Limited	Policy IE.2: Maintaining, enhancing, and restoring indigenous ecosystem health - consideration	Support	The submission provides a comprehensive analysis of the proposed change including in relation to matters of scope and jurisdiction. It is supported without prejudice to the specific relief sought in the primary submission or this further submission by Peka Peka Farm Ltd.	Allow	Accept in part
S34.084	Te Kaunihera o Te Awa Kairangi ki Uta, Upper Hutt City Council			S34.084	Te Kaunihera o Te Awa Kairangi ki Uta, Upper Hutt City Council	Policy IE.2: Maintaining, enhancing, and restoring indigenous ecosystem health - consideration	Oppose in part	Council supports the intent of the policy, but it cannot be implemented until the NPS-IB, given the uncertainty of provisions once finally gazetted.	Delete indigenous biodiversity provisions until the NPS-IB is gazetted.	reject
S115.072	Hutt City Council			S115.072	Hutt City Council	Policy IE.2: Maintaining, enhancing, and restoring indigenous ecosystem health - consideration	Oppose	While indigenous biodiversity is a key issue, we expect the government to soon gazette a National Policy Statement on Indigenous Biodiversity ("NPS-IB"). The proposed provisions may well conflict with the NPS-IB especially with regards to the process for identifying indigenous ecosystems. We request that all provisions relating to indigenous biodiversity be deleted and if regional direction is thought necessary after the NPS-IB is gazetted, that should occur through a variation or a separate policy statement change.	Delete all new provisions and amendments to existing provisions and retain existing Operative RPS provisions.	reject
S131.096	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust			S131.096	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	Policy IE.2: Maintaining, enhancing, and restoring indigenous ecosystem health - consideration	Support	Ātiawa supports Policy IE.2, the policy provides for mana whenua, including our values, mātauranga Māori, and our ability to exercise our cultural practices and ways of being in the natural world.	Retain as notified.	Accept
S131.096	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	FS29.366	Ngā Hapu o Otaki	FS29.366	Ngā Hapu o Otaki	Policy IE.2: Maintaining, enhancing, and restoring indigenous ecosystem health - consideration	Support	Co -design under a treaty house model is about shaping plans and resource management avenues alongside manawhenua that appropriately recognise the intergenerational prosperity of the uri of Ngā Hapu o Otaki and the wider community. There are ongoing concerns Ngā Hapu o Otaki maintain with GWRC in regard to the policies addressing Co-governance, Co-management, Co-leadership and Co-collabroative operational	Not stated	Accept

S42A Appendix 2 - HS6 Indigenous Ecosystems - Summary Recommendation Table

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
								<p>processes.</p> <p>This submission goes to great length to define where and how further considerations can be made recognising the interconnected nature of matauranga maori, the inequitable impact environmental decline will have on mana whenua/tangata whenua and offers insight to the intuitive and inherent awareness manawhenua need to maintain to ensure our intergenerational survival and prosperity.</p> <p>3.4 Freshwater including Public Access – Support in Principal</p> <p>3.6 Indigenous Ecosystems – Support in Principal</p> <p>3.9 Regional Form, Design and Function – Support in Principal</p> <p>Ātiawa views regarding Freshwater, indigenous ecosystems and Regional design and function resonate with insights Ngā Hapu o Otaki maintain. Ngā Hapu o Otaki would like opportunity to speak further to such views during the hearing process. We share Ātiawas concerns for Mātauranga Māori as a foundation for equitable interchange of decision making. Their concerns regarding intensification and the further degradation of taonga across our coastline rings true to the ongoing journey we are on as manawhenua facing intense growth for the coming generation. We seek to join the conversation and endorse provisions that will see our whanaunga and other manawhenua groups recognise their environmental resilience and the cultural agility our shared whakapapa offers.</p>		
S133.023	Muaūpoko Tribal Authority			S133.023	Muaūpoko Tribal Authority	Policy IE.2: Maintaining, enhancing, and restoring indigenous ecosystem health - consideration	Support in part	Supports the requirement to partner with mana whenua/tangata whenua, but request that Muaūpoko are also recognised.	Recognise Muaūpoko as also having connection to indigenous biodiversity in Te Whanganui-a-Tara. OR Alternative relief that may be necessary or appropriate to ensure Muaūpoko connection to Te Whanganui-a-Tara is recognised.	reject
S133.023	Muaūpoko Tribal Authority	FS6.053	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira on behalf of Ngāti Toa Rangatira	FS6.053	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira on behalf of Ngāti Toa Rangatira	Policy IE.2: Maintaining, enhancing, and restoring indigenous ecosystem	Oppose	We oppose this submission because as Muaūpoko claims are inappropriate. This not only causes confusion around which iwi are Tangata Whenua in Te Whanganui a Tara rohe and which iwi to engage with, but also portrays a false perception of who the mana whenua are, which is also inappropriate.	Disallow We seek that this part of the submission is disallowed.	Accept

S42A Appendix 2 - HS6 Indigenous Ecosystems - Summary Recommendation Table

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
						health - consideration				
S133.023	Muaūpoko Tribal Authority	FS20.370	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	FS20.370	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	Policy IE.2: Maintaining, enhancing, and restoring indigenous ecosystem health - consideration	Oppose	<p>Ātiawa vehemently oppose the submission and claims made by Muaūpoko Tribal Authority. The assertions made by Muāupoko Tribal Authority are categorically incorrect and highly offensive to Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai. While Muaūpoko may have historical associations with Te Whanganui-a-Tara and Kāpiti. These associations are recognised as historical only. Ātiawa refer to the evidence provided by Ngārongo Iwikatea Nicholson in support of Ngāti Toarangatira's claims which were upheld and settled by the Crown. Pages 26-34 sets out the extinguishment of Muaūpoko rights in our rohe. From both a tikanga Māori perspective and a Crown law perspective, Muaūpoko do not hold mana whenua (including for the purposes of the Resource Management Act). There is therefore no basis for Muaūpoko Tribal Authority to be recognised as being kaitiaki in the rohe; to do so would be incomprehensible and irreconcilable to Ātiawa, and more generally an affront to tikanga Māori. Muaūpoko Tribal Authority have cited Te Kāhui Māngai mapping as evidence of the spatial extent that they exercise kaitiakitanga. This in itself evidences the lack of basis to their claims, in that Te Kāhui Māngai map simply reflects claims made by Māori groups, and from our previous inquiry to Te Puni Kōkiri who are responsible for this map, we learned that Muaūpoko Tribal Authority included that spatial extent in their Agreement in Principle. Agreements in Principle provide claimants the opportunity to set out everything that a claimant wants from the Crown. They have no legal effect and are therefore not legally recognised. We strongly advise the Council to remain conscious that it is not appropriate for regional planning processes to be exploited in the manner suggested by the Muaūpoko Tribal Authority, that dealing with the false claims of groups like these must be left to the Crown, and that settlements must not pre-empted. Whilst Muaūpoko Tribal Authority may wish to seek out new territories through online maps, this is not of course how mana whenua is gained or held. We remain as ahi kā and mana whenua on the land, as we have undisturbed for over 198 years.</p>	Disallow the whole submission	Accept in part

S42A Appendix 2 - HS6 Indigenous Ecosystems - Summary Recommendation Table

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
S140.073	Wellington City Council (WCC)			S140.073	Wellington City Council (WCC)	Policy IE.2: Maintaining, enhancing, and restoring indigenous ecosystem health - consideration	Support	Support as proposed.	Retain as notified.	Accept
S147.036	Wellington Fish and Game Council			S147.036	Wellington Fish and Game Council	Policy IE.2: Maintaining, enhancing, and restoring indigenous ecosystem health - consideration	Support in part	Support the intention of this objective to ensure that mana whenua/tangata whenua values are properly recognised and provided for and their role as kaitiaki is supported. At the same time, in order to give full effect to the NPS-FM, those values must be considered alongside other recognised values and achieved in partnership with statutory managers of freshwater species and their habitats. The suggested amendment also aligns the language of this objective with the language of s 30(ga) RMA, which accords Regional Councils responsibility for "maintaining" rather than "managing" indigenous biodiversity.	Amend title: Policy IE.2: Giving effect to mana whenua/tangata whenua role and values when managing maintaining	reject
S147.036	Wellington Fish and Game Council	FS20.150	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	FS20.150	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	Policy IE.2: Maintaining, enhancing, and restoring indigenous ecosystem health - consideration	Oppose in part	Ātiawa oppose the relief sought, mana whenua have an important role as Treaty Partners in the management and maintenance of indigenous biodiversity. The relief sought seeks to minimise this role.	Disallow	Accept
S147.036	Wellington Fish and Game Council	FS19.100	Wellington Water Ltd ("Wellington Water")	FS19.100	Wellington Water Ltd ("Wellington Water")	Policy IE.2: Maintaining, enhancing, and restoring indigenous ecosystem health - consideration	Oppose	It is unnecessary and redundant to recreate NPSFM policies within the RPS. Most of the amendments sought do not in any event properly reflect the NPSFM. In particular, they do not accurately reflect the proviso to Policy 7, the requirements of clause 3.22, the limitation of Policy 10 to trout and salmon only, and the subservience of Policy 10 to Policy 9. Some of the amendments attempt to address matters that are already adequately covered by extant provisions or PC1 as notified. Some of the amendments undermine the more detailed content of PC1.	Disallow	Accept

S42A Appendix 2 - HS6 Indigenous Ecosystems - Summary Recommendation Table

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
S147.036	Wellington Fish and Game Council	FS30.205	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Ltd	FS30.205	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Ltd	Policy IE.2: Maintaining, enhancing, and restoring indigenous ecosystem health - consideration	Oppose	B+LNZ generally oppose the submission on the grounds that's B+LNZ are seeking changes of the plan change are restricted to those necessary to give effect to the National Policy Statement for Urban Development and that any other matters should be subject to proper review in the Schedule full review of the RPS in 2024 and in the scheduled reviews of the Natural Resources Plan in 2023 and 2024. This is because the changes materially impact on communities, including rural communities and we do not consider that the necessary engagement has been undertaken to adequately inform these provisions or to meet the requirements of Part 3.2 of the NPS-FM. Furthermore, there is a risk that including matters relating to climate change and indigenous biodiversity before key national legislation is gazetted is premature and will lead to the inefficient implementation and confusion amongst those who it impacts materially.	Disallow That the submission be disallowed with the exception of 147.007	Accept in part
S147.037	Wellington Fish and Game Council			S147.037	Wellington Fish and Game Council	Policy IE.2: Maintaining, enhancing, and restoring indigenous ecosystem health - consideration	Support in part	Support the intention of this objective to ensure that mana whenua/tangata whenua values are properly recognised and provided for and their role as kaitiaki is supported. At the same time, in order to give full effect to the NPS-FM, those values must be considered alongside other recognised values and achieved in partnership with statutory managers of freshwater species and their habitats. The suggested amendment also aligns the language of this objective with the language of s 30(ga) RMA, which accords Regional Councils responsibility for "maintaining" rather than "managing" indigenous biodiversity.	Amend subclause (a) providing for mana whenua / tangata whenua values associated with indigenous biodiversity, including giving local effect to Te Rito o te Harakeke, within a wider framework of equal weighting given to community values around indigenous and valued introduced biodiversity	reject
S147.037	Wellington Fish and Game Council	FS20.148	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	FS20.148	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	Policy IE.2: Maintaining, enhancing, and restoring indigenous ecosystem health - consideration	Oppose in part	As Treaty Partners, Ātiawa do not support the submission point which seeks to provide community values, and introduced biodiversity equal weighting to indigenous biodiversity. It is evident that indigenous ecosystems must be provided with the greatest protection. To accept the relief sought by the submitter would be contrary to Te Tiriti o Waitangi and national resource management direction.	Disallow in part Disallow the relief sought that references: "within a wider framework of equal weighting given to community values around indigenous and valued biodiversity".	Accept
S147.037	Wellington Fish and	FS19.101	Wellington Water Ltd	FS19.101	Wellington Water Ltd	Policy IE.2: Maintaining, enhancing, and restoring	Oppose	It is unnecessary and redundant to recreate NPSFM policies within the RPS. Most of the amendments sought do not in any event properly reflect the NPSFM. In particular, they do not	Disallow	Accept

S42A Appendix 2 - HS6 Indigenous Ecosystems - Summary Recommendation Table

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
	Game Council		("Wellington Water")		("Wellington Water")	indigenous ecosystem health - consideration		accurately reflect the proviso to Policy 7, the requirements of clause 3.22, the limitation of Policy 10 to trout and salmon only, and the subservience of Policy 10 to Policy 9. Some of the amendments attempt to address matters that are already adequately covered by extant provisions or PC1 as notified. Some of the amendments undermine the more detailed content of PC1.		
S147.037	Wellington Fish and Game Council	FS30.206	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Ltd	FS30.206	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Ltd	Policy IE.2: Maintaining, enhancing, and restoring indigenous ecosystem health - consideration	Oppose	B+LNZ generally oppose the submission on the grounds that's B+LNZ are seeking changes of the plan change are restricted to those necessary to give effect to the National Policy Statement for Urban Development and that any other matters should be subject to proper review in the Schedule full review of the RPS in 2024 and in the scheduled reviews of the Natural Resources Plan in 2023 and 2024. This is because the changes materially impact on communities, including rural communities and we do not consider that the necessary engagement has been undertaken to adequately inform these provisions or to meet the requirements of Part 3.2 of the NPS-FM. Furthermore, there is a risk that including matters relating to climate change and indigenous biodiversity before key national legislation is gazetted is premature and will lead to the inefficient implementation and confusion amongst those who it impacts materially.	Disallow That the submission be disallowed with the exception of 147.007	Accept in part
S163.074	Wairarapa Federated Farmers			S163.074	Wairarapa Federated Farmers	Policy IE.2: Maintaining, enhancing, and restoring indigenous ecosystem health - consideration	Oppose	Consider it is hugely inefficient to require that particular regard be given to exercise of mana whenua / tangata whenua role as kaitiaki for individual resource consent applications.	That Policy IE.2 be deleted. Delete the FW icon	Accept in part
S163.074	Wairarapa Federated Farmers	FS7.117	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society (Forest & Bird)	FS7.117	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society (Forest & Bird)	Policy IE.2: Maintaining, enhancing, and restoring indigenous ecosystem health - consideration	Oppose	It is completely appropriate to include climate change, biodiversity and freshwater provisions in the plan change. This plan change creates efficiency by considering multiple policy directives from central government. The amendments sought by Federated Farmers fail to give effect to the NPSFM, the NPS for Indigenous Biodiversity, for which there is an exposure draft and the final version is due out this month, and do not achieve the purpose of the RMA	Disallow whole submission	Accept in part

S42A Appendix 2 - HS6 Indigenous Ecosystems - Summary Recommendation Table

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
								or the Climate Change Response (Zero Carbon) Amendment Act 2019.		
S163.074	Wairarapa Federated Farmers	FS20.239	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	FS20.239	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	Policy IE.2: Maintaining, enhancing, and restoring indigenous ecosystem health - consideration	Oppose	Ātiawa oppose the entire submission by Wairarapa Federated Farmers. The relief sought by Federated Farmers is to effectively delete the entire proposed plan change (except for submission points S163.083, S163.084). The basis for deleting the proposed plan change is to delay decision-making. Ātiawa do not accept that delaying responding to national direction is an appropriate course of action, and will further compound environmental and resource management issues.	Disallow the entire submission by Wairarapa Federated Farmers.	Accept in part
S163.074	Wairarapa Federated Farmers	FS29.090	Ngā Hapu o Otaki	FS29.090	Ngā Hapu o Otaki	Policy IE.2: Maintaining, enhancing, and restoring indigenous ecosystem health - consideration	Oppose	Section 18, page 4: General Comments – OPPOSE Section 25, Page 5 Going Forward – OPPOSE It is disheartening to see that Wairarapa Federated Farmers aren't capable of recognizing the obligations GWRC must maintain with Treaty Partners. It must be understood that Manawhenua are not simply 'groups of people' but a representation of the signatories that signed the Treaty of Waitangi and the original kaitiaki and custodians of the taonga in question when considering how these plan changes are implemented. Wairarapa Federated Farmers indicate a lack of awareness to the value of manawhenua engagement. Their stated 'aspirations of delivering environmental improvements alongside a thriving bio-economy' aren't feasible without considering the intergenerational insight and technical direction that only Mātauranga Māori can offer.	Not stated	Accept in part
S163.074	Wairarapa Federated Farmers	FS30.146	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Ltd	FS30.146	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Ltd	Policy IE.2: Maintaining, enhancing, and restoring indigenous ecosystem health - consideration	Support	B+LNZ agree that the scope of RPS PC1 should be restricted to those changes necessary to give effect to the National Policy Statement for Urban Development and that any other matters should be subject to proper review in the Schedule full review of the RPS in 2024 and in the scheduled reviews of the Natural Resources Plan in 2023 and 2024. Where alternative relief is provided, B+LNZ generally support this relief.	Allow	reject
S168.079	Rangitāne O Wairarapa Inc			S168.079	Rangitāne O Wairarapa Inc	Policy IE.2: Maintaining, enhancing, and restoring indigenous ecosystem	Support	Rangitāne o Wairarapa support giving effect to mana whenua/tangata whenua roles in managing indigenous biodiversity.	Retain as notified	Accept

S42A Appendix 2 - HS6 Indigenous Ecosystems - Summary Recommendation Table

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
						health - consideration				
S168.079	Rangitāne O Wairarapa Inc	FS31.189	Sustainable Wairarapa Inc	FS31.189	Sustainable Wairarapa Inc	Policy IE.2: Maintaining, enhancing, and restoring indigenous ecosystem health - consideration	Support	Kia ora koutou, My name is Ian Gunn, Secretary Sustainable Wairarapa inc. contact # 021567134, address 4B McKay Street, Paraparaumu Beach 5032. Firstly we'd like to state the time frame provided to peruse over 900 pages of submissions is in our opinion an abuse of process. The benefit of further submissions is for you the council to listen and hear the views of its ratepayers. The timeframe in our case does not allow a rigorous review of the original submissions to council. On top of this we are a week before Christmas- a very busy and chaotic time for most members of the community. It is highly likely that the majority of staff will take leave over the Christmas break so analysis of any further submissions will not occur until late January 2023-so why the short period to respond. While there is due process there is also good practise your management of the further submissions fails the good practise model. As a consequence we would like you to note Sustainable Wairarapa's strong support of the original submissions lodged with council by the two Wairarapa Iwi-Ngati Kahungunu and Rangitane. Its clear that there is a poor understanding of nature based solutions this term needs further explanation. Sustainable Wairarapa acknowledges that while nature based solutions offer a wide variety of options its not the only solution. We are heartened by the widespread support for the original document. Thanks for an opportunity to make a further submission. Nga mihi nui Ian Gun	Not stated	Accept
S167.0114	Taranaki Whānui			S167.0114	Taranaki Whānui	Policy IE.2: Maintaining, enhancing, and restoring indigenous ecosystem health - consideration	Support in part	Support with further direction for partnership in decision making	Insert a new clause:(x) partnering with mana whenua / tangata whenua in resource management and decision making	reject
S167.0114	Taranaki Whānui	FS6.040	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira on behalf of Ngāti Toa Rangatira	FS6.040	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira on behalf of Ngāti Toa Rangatira	Policy IE.2: Maintaining, enhancing, and restoring indigenous ecosystem	Support	We support this submission because this will enable better partnership in relation to climate resilient urban areas. This will also mean that mana whenua/ tangata whenua aspirations are upheld.	Allow	reject

S42A Appendix 2 - HS6 Indigenous Ecosystems - Summary Recommendation Table

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
						health - consideration				
S30.078	Porirua City Council			S30.078	Porirua City Council	Policy 61: Allocation of responsibilities for land use controls for indigenous biodiversity	Support in part	Wetlands should be added to the exclusions in 61(c) to be consistent with 61(b), the NES-F, the NPS-FM, as well as FW.6(b).	Amend policy so that it provides clear and appropriate direction to plan users in line with national direction: Regional and district plans shall recognise and provide for the responsibilities below, when developing objectives, policies and methods, including rules, to maintain indigenous biodiversity: (a) Wellington Regional Council shall be responsible for developing objectives, policies, and methods in the regional policy statement for the control of the use of land to maintain indigenous biodiversity; (b) Wellington Regional Council shall be responsible for developing objectives, policies, rules and/or methods in regional plans for the control of the use of land to maintain and enhance ecosystems in water bodies and coastal water. This includes land within the coastal marine area, wetlands and the beds of lakes and rivers; and (c) city and district councils shall be responsible for developing objectives, policies, rules and/or methods in district plans for the control of the use of land for the maintenance of indigenous biodiversity. This excludes land within the coastal marine area, wetlands and the beds of lakes and rivers.	Accept

S42A Appendix 2 - HS6 Indigenous Ecosystems - Summary Recommendation Table

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
S30.078	Porirua City Council	FS25.111	Peka Peka Farm Limited	FS25.111	Peka Peka Farm Limited	Policy 61: Allocation of responsibilities for land use controls for indigenous biodiversity	Support	The submission provides a comprehensive analysis of the proposed change including in relation to matters of scope and jurisdiction. It is supported without prejudice to the specific relief sought in the primary submission or this further submission by Peka Peka Farm Ltd.	Allow	Accept
S34.099	Te Kaunihera o Te Awa Kairangi ki Uta, Upper Hutt City Council			S34.099	Te Kaunihera o Te Awa Kairangi ki Uta, Upper Hutt City Council	Policy 61: Allocation of responsibilities for land use controls for indigenous biodiversity	Support	Support changes to Policy 61 to refer to the correct term of 'biodiversity' not 'biological'	Retain policy as notified.	Accept in part
S115.081	Hutt City Council			S115.081	Hutt City Council	Policy 61: Allocation of responsibilities for land use controls for indigenous biodiversity	Oppose	While indigenous biodiversity is a key issue, we expect the government to soon gazette a National Policy Statement on Indigenous Biodiversity ("NPS-IB"). The proposed provisions may well conflict with the NPS-IB especially with regards to the process for identifying indigenous ecosystems. We request that all provisions relating to indigenous biodiversity be deleted and if regional direction is thought necessary after the NPS-IB is gazetted, that should occur through a variation or a separate policy statement change.	Delete all new provisions and amendments to existing provisions and retain existing Operative RPS provisions.	reject
S137.021	Greater Wellington Regional Council (GWRC)			S137.021	Greater Wellington Regional Council (GWRC)	Policy 61: Allocation of responsibilities for land use controls for indigenous biodiversity	Support in part	Amendments to Policy 61 are required to align with direction in Policy FW.6 on freshwater jurisdiction.	Amend Policy 61 as follows: ... (c) city and district councils shall be responsible for developing objectives, policies, rules and/or methods in district plans for the control of the use of land for the maintenance of indigenous biodiversity, including adverse effects on indigenous biodiversity in freshwater bodies . This excludes the management of land within the coastal marine area and the beds of lakes and rivers.	Accept
S140.082	Wellington City Council (WCC)			S140.082	Wellington City Council (WCC)	Policy 61: Allocation of responsibilities for land use	Support	Support as proposed.	Retain as notified.	Accept in part

S42A Appendix 2 - HS6 Indigenous Ecosystems - Summary Recommendation Table

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
						controls for indigenous biodiversity				
S147.074	Wellington Fish and Game Council			S147.074	Wellington Fish and Game Council	Policy 61: Allocation of responsibilities for land use controls for indigenous biodiversity	Support	Necessary to give effect to the NPS-FM.	Retain as notified.	Accept in part
S147.074	Wellington Fish and Game Council	FS19.138	Wellington Water Ltd ("Wellington Water")	FS19.138	Wellington Water Ltd ("Wellington Water")	Policy 61: Allocation of responsibilities for land use controls for indigenous biodiversity	Oppose	It is unnecessary and redundant to recreate NPSFM policies within the RPS. Most of the amendments sought do not in any event properly reflect the NPSFM. In particular, they do not accurately reflect the proviso to Policy 7, the requirements of clause 3.22, the limitation of Policy 10 to trout and salmon only, and the subservience of Policy 10 to Policy 9. Some of the amendments attempt to address matters that are already adequately covered by extant provisions or PC1 as notified. Some of the amendments undermine the more detailed content of PC1.	Disallow	reject
S147.074	Wellington Fish and Game Council	FS30.243	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Ltd	FS30.243	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Ltd	Policy 61: Allocation of responsibilities for land use controls for indigenous biodiversity	Oppose	B+LNZ generally oppose the submission on the grounds that's B+LNZ are seeking changes of the plan change are restricted to those necessary to give effect to the National Policy Statement for Urban Development and that any other matters should be subject to proper review in the Schedule full review of the RPS in 2024 and in the scheduled reviews of the Natural Resources Plan in 2023 and 2024. This is because the changes materially impact on communities, including rural communities and we do not consider that the necessary engagement has been undertaken to adequately inform these provisions or to meet the requirements of Part 3.2 of the NPS-FM. Furthermore, there is a risk that including matters relating to climate change and indigenous biodiversity before key national legislation is gazetted is premature and will lead to the inefficient implementation and confusion amongst those who it impacts materially.	Disallow That the submission be disallowed with the exception of 147.007	reject

S42A Appendix 2 - HS6 Indigenous Ecosystems - Summary Recommendation Table

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
S165.080	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society (Forest & Bird)			S165.080	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society (Forest & Bird)	Policy 61: Allocation of responsibilities for land use controls for indigenous biodiversity	Support		Retain	Accept in part
S165.080	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society (Forest & Bird)	FS30.319	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Ltd	FS30.319	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Ltd	Policy 61: Allocation of responsibilities for land use controls for indigenous biodiversity	Oppose	B+LNZ generally oppose the submission on the grounds that's B+LNZ are seeking changes of the plan change are restricted to those necessary to give effect to the National Policy Statement for Urban Development and that any other matters should be subject to proper review in the Schedule full review of the RPS in 2024 and in the scheduled reviews of the Natural Resources Plan in 2023 and 2024. This is because the changes materially impact on communities, including rural communities and we do not consider that the necessary engagement has been undertaken to adequately inform these provisions or to meet the requirements of Part 3.2 of the NPS-FM. Furthermore, there is a risk that including matters relating to climate change and indigenous biodiversity before key national legislation is gazetted or implemented is premature and will lead to the inefficient implementation and confusion amongst those who it impacts materially.	Disallow	Reject
S131.0105	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust			S131.0105	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	Policy 61: Allocation of responsibilities for land use controls for indigenous biodiversity	Support	Ātiawa supports the correction made to Policy 61.	Retain as notified.	Accept in part
S131.0105	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	FS29.220	Ngā Hapu o Otaki	FS29.220	Ngā Hapu o Otaki	Policy 61: Allocation of responsibilities for land use controls for indigenous biodiversity	Support	Co -design under a treaty house model is about shaping plans and resource management avenues alongside manawhenua that appropriately recognise the intergenerational prosperity of the uri of Ngā Hapu o Otaki and the wider community. There are ongoing concerns Ngā Hapu o Otaki maintain with GWRC in regard to the policies addressing Co-governance, Co-management, Co-leadership and Co-collabroative operational processes. This submission goes to great length to define where and how further considerations can be made recognising the interconnected nature of matauranga maori, the inequitable impact environmental decline	Not stated	Accept in part

S42A Appendix 2 - HS6 Indigenous Ecosystems - Summary Recommendation Table

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
								will have on mana whenua/tangata whenua and offers insight to the intuitive and inherent awareness manawhenua need to maintain to ensure our intergenerational survival and prosperity. 3.4 Freshwater including Public Access – Support in Principal 3.6 Indigenous Ecosystems – Support in Principal 3.9 Regional Form, Design and Function – Support in Principal Ātiawa views regarding Freshwater, indigenous ecosystems and Regional design and function resonate with insights Ngā Hapu o Otaki maintain. Ngā Hapu o Otaki would like opportunity to speak further to such views during the hearing process. We share Ātiawas concerns for Mātauranga Māori as a foundation for equitable interchange of decision making. Their concerns regarding intensification and the further degradation of taonga across our coastline rings true to the ongoing journey we are on as manawhenua facing intense growth for the coming generation. We seek to join the conversation and endorse provisions that will see our whanaunga and other manawhenua groups recognise their environmental resilience and the cultural agility our shared whakapapa offers.		
S167.0123	Taranaki Whānui			S167.0123	Taranaki Whānui	Policy 61: Allocation of responsibilities for land use controls for indigenous biodiversity	Support	Taranaki Whānui supports the amendments to Policy 61	Retain as notified.	reject
S11.022	Outdoor Bliss Heather Blissett			S11.022	Outdoor Bliss Heather Blissett	Policy IE.3: Maintaining, enhancing and restoring indigenous ecosystem health - non-regulatory	Support in part	Not stated.	Amend Policy IE.3(b) as such: "Where possible, priorities should will also deliver benefits for..."	reject
S16.064	Kāpiti Coast District Council			S16.064	Kāpiti Coast District Council	Policy IE.3: Maintaining, enhancing and restoring indigenous ecosystem	Support in part	Council notes city and district councils are responsible for the maintenance of indigenous biodiversity but have no role under the RMA or higher-legal statutory planning document for indigenous ecosystem restoration. Council requests these roles are clarified via the methods and implementation responsibilities	Clarify methods to deliver the policy and who will be responsible for the implementation of the methods in accordance with the functions specified under	Accept in part

S42A Appendix 2 - HS6 Indigenous Ecosystems - Summary Recommendation Table

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
						health - non-regulatory		in accordance with the functions specified under sections 30 and 31 of the RMA.	sections 30 and 31 of the RMA.	
S30.086	Porirua City Council			S30.086	Porirua City Council	Policy IE.3: Maintaining, enhancing and restoring indigenous ecosystem health - non-regulatory	Oppose	This policy does not make sense. It is a non-regulatory policy that requires a regulatory response. It is unclear why the Wellington Regional Council hasn't addressed this through Proposed Change 1, but rather is requiring itself to do this through another change.	Delete policy.	reject
S30.086	Porirua City Council	FS25.119	Peka Peka Farm Limited	FS25.119	Peka Peka Farm Limited	Policy IE.3: Maintaining, enhancing and restoring indigenous ecosystem health - non-regulatory	Support	The submission provides a comprehensive analysis of the proposed change including in relation to matters of scope and jurisdiction. It is supported without prejudice to the specific relief sought in the primary submission or this further submission by Peka Peka Farm Ltd.	Allow	reject
S34.081	Te Kaunihera o Te Awa Kairangi ki Uta, Upper Hutt City Council			S34.081	Te Kaunihera o Te Awa Kairangi ki Uta, Upper Hutt City Council	Policy IE.3: Maintaining, enhancing and restoring indigenous ecosystem health - non-regulatory	Oppose	Council is concerned that the proposed non-regulatory approach, appears to be setting targets. It is unclear how these targets are intended to be applied via a non-regulatory mechanism. Council also notes that any targets set under the RPS require consultation.	Delete policy in its entirety and review once NPS-IB is gazetted.	reject
S102.059	Te Tumu Paeroa Office of the Māori Trustee			S102.059	Te Tumu Paeroa Office of the Māori Trustee	Policy IE.3: Maintaining, enhancing and restoring indigenous ecosystem health - non-regulatory	Support	Generally supports the non-regulatory policies in the 'Indigenous ecosystems' chapter.	Retain as notified.	Accept
S115.088	Hutt City Council			S115.088	Hutt City Council	Policy IE.3: Maintaining, enhancing and restoring indigenous ecosystem health - non-regulatory	Oppose	While indigenous biodiversity is a key issue, we expect the government to soon gazette a National Policy Statement on Indigenous Biodiversity ("NPS-IB"). The proposed provisions may well conflict with the NPS-IB especially with regards to the process for identifying indigenous ecosystems. We request that all provisions relating to indigenous biodiversity be deleted and if regional direction is thought necessary after the NPS-IB is gazetted, that should occur through a variation or a separate policy statement change.	Delete Policy IE.3	reject

S42A Appendix 2 - HS6 Indigenous Ecosystems - Summary Recommendation Table

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
								It is also unclear what is achieved by a direction in the Regional Policy Statement that the Regional Policy Statement should be amended.		
S123.019	Peter Thompson			S123.019	Peter Thompson	Policy IE.3: Maintaining, enhancing and restoring indigenous ecosystem health - non-regulatory	Support	This is a key piece of work that needs to be completed to ensure that a difference is made	Retain as notified.	Accept
S140.089	Wellington City Council (WCC)			S140.089	Wellington City Council (WCC)	Policy IE.3: Maintaining, enhancing and restoring indigenous ecosystem health - non-regulatory	Support	Support as proposed	Retain as notified.	Accept
S144.024	Sustainable Wairarapa Inc			S144.024	Sustainable Wairarapa Inc	Policy IE.3: Maintaining, enhancing and restoring indigenous ecosystem health - non-regulatory	Support	This is a key piece of work that needs to be completed to ensure that a difference is being made - at present biodiversity is threatened by an ongoing decline in ecosystem and habitat health.	Retain as notified.	Accept
S147.038	Wellington Fish and Game Council			S147.038	Wellington Fish and Game Council	Policy IE.3: Maintaining, enhancing and restoring indigenous ecosystem health - non-regulatory	Support in part	The suggested amendment follows from the suggested amendment to Objective 16, above, and is intended to give better effect to the NPS-FM (including Policy 10). While the protections of indigenous ecosystems and habitats is vital, so too is the maintaining and enhancing of the whole environment, including those containing valued introduced species. An unduly narrow indigenous - centric focus could lead to lessening or removal of protections for non-indigenous dominant systems, habitats, and species. The loss of protections, enhancements, and restorations risks adverse environmental effects and weakened climate change resilience for the region.	amend title and text Policy IE.3: Maintaining and restoring indigenous ecosystem health the health of indigenous ecosystems and habitats with significant biodiversity or other values. To maintain, enhance and restore the ecosystem health, ecological integrity and ecological connectivity of the region's indigenous ecosystems, and habitats with significant biodiversity or other values , and the ecological processes that support them, giving effect to Te Rito o te Harakeke, the	Reject

S42A Appendix 2 - HS6 Indigenous Ecosystems - Summary Recommendation Table

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
									Regional Policy Statement shall, as soon as practicable:	
S147.038	Wellington Fish and Game Council	FS20.134	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	FS20.134	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	Policy IE.3: Maintaining, enhancing and restoring indigenous ecosystem health - non-regulatory	Oppose	Ātiawa do not support the rationale set out by Fish and Game, - indigenous ecosystems must be afforded the greatest protection above the protection of introduced ecosystems which already dominate te taiao, to the detriment of indigenous ecosystems. The relief sought by the submitter would like result in a status-quo outcome for indigenous ecosystems, Ātiawa are opposed to this outcome.	Disallow	Accept
S147.038	Wellington Fish and Game Council	FS19.102	Wellington Water Ltd ("Wellington Water")	FS19.102	Wellington Water Ltd ("Wellington Water")	Policy IE.3: Maintaining, enhancing and restoring indigenous ecosystem health - non-regulatory	Oppose	It is unnecessary and redundant to recreate NPSFM policies within the RPS. Most of the amendments sought do not in any event properly reflect the NPSFM. In particular, they do not accurately reflect the proviso to Policy 7, the requirements of clause 3.22, the limitation of Policy 10 to trout and salmon only, and the subservience of Policy 10 to Policy 9. Some of the amendments attempt to address matters that are already adequately covered by extant provisions or PC1 as notified. Some of the amendments undermine the more detailed content of PC1.	Disallow	Accept
S147.038	Wellington Fish and Game Council	FS30.207	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Ltd	FS30.207	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Ltd	Policy IE.3: Maintaining, enhancing and restoring indigenous ecosystem health - non-regulatory	Oppose	B+LNZ generally oppose the submission on the grounds that's B+LNZ are seeking changes of the plan change are restricted to those necessary to give effect to the National Policy Statement for Urban Development and that any other matters should be subject to proper review in the Schedule full review of the RPS in 2024 and in the scheduled reviews of the Natural Resources Plan in 2023 and 2024. This is because the changes materially impact on communities, including rural communities and we do not consider that the necessary engagement has been undertaken to adequately inform these provisions or to meet the requirements of Part 3.2 of the NPS-FM. Furthermore, there is a risk that including matters relating to climate change and indigenous biodiversity before key national legislation is gazetted is premature and will lead to the inefficient implementation and confusion amongst those who it impacts materially.	Disallow That the submission be disallowed with the exception of 147.007	Accept in part
S147.039	Wellington Fish and Game Council			S147.039	Wellington Fish and Game Council	Policy IE.3: Maintaining, enhancing and restoring indigenous	Support in part	The suggested amendment follows from the suggested amendment to Objective 16, above, and is intended to give better effect to the NPS-FM (including Policy 10). While the protections of indigenous ecosystems and habitats is vital, so too is the maintaining and	amend subclause: (a) identify the characteristics required for the region's indigenous ecosystems and habitats with significant	reject

S42A Appendix 2 - HS6 Indigenous Ecosystems - Summary Recommendation Table

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
						ecosystem health - non-regulatory		enhancing of the whole environment, including those containing valued introduced species. An unduly narrow indigenous - centric focus could lead to lessening or removal of protections for non-indigenous dominant systems, habitats, and species. The loss of protections, enhancements, and restorations risks adverse environmental effects and weakened climate change resilience for the region.	biodiversity or other values to be in a healthy functioning state, including the processes that enable them to persist over the long-term, and	
S147.039	Wellington Fish and Game Council	FS20.135	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	FS20.135	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	Policy IE.3: Maintaining, enhancing and restoring indigenous ecosystem health - non-regulatory	Oppose	Ātiawa do not support the rationale set out by Fish and Game, - indigenous ecosystems must be afforded the greatest protection above the protection of introduced ecosystems which already dominate te taiao, to the detriment of indigenous ecosystems. The relief sought by the submitter would like result in a status-quo outcome for indigenous ecosystems, Ātiawa are opposed to this outcome.	Disallow	Accept
S147.039	Wellington Fish and Game Council	FS19.103	Wellington Water Ltd ("Wellington Water")	FS19.103	Wellington Water Ltd ("Wellington Water")	Policy IE.3: Maintaining, enhancing and restoring indigenous ecosystem health - non-regulatory	Oppose	It is unnecessary and redundant to recreate NPSFM policies within the RPS. Most of the amendments sought do not in any event properly reflect the NPSFM. In particular, they do not accurately reflect the proviso to Policy 7, the requirements of clause 3.22, the limitation of Policy 10 to trout and salmon only, and the subservience of Policy 10 to Policy 9. Some of the amendments attempt to address matters that are already adequately covered by extant provisions or PC1 as notified. Some of the amendments undermine the more detailed content of PC1.	Disallow	Accept
S147.039	Wellington Fish and Game Council	FS30.208	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Ltd	FS30.208	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Ltd	Policy IE.3: Maintaining, enhancing and restoring indigenous ecosystem health - non-regulatory	Oppose	B+LNZ generally oppose the submission on the grounds that's B+LNZ are seeking changes of the plan change are restricted to those necessary to give effect to the National Policy Statement for Urban Development and that any other matters should be subject to proper review in the Schedule full review of the RPS in 2024 and in the scheduled reviews of the Natural Resources Plan in 2023 and 2024. This is because the changes materially impact on communities, including rural communities and we do not consider that the necessary engagement has been undertaken to adequately inform these provisions or to meet the requirements of Part 3.2 of the NPS-FM. Furthermore, there is a risk that including matters relating to climate change and indigenous biodiversity before key national legislation is gazetted is premature	Disallow That the submission be disallowed with the exception of 147.007	Accept in part

S42A Appendix 2 - HS6 Indigenous Ecosystems - Summary Recommendation Table

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
								and will lead to the inefficient implementation and confusion amongst those who it impacts materially.		
S147.040	Wellington Fish and Game Council			S147.040	Wellington Fish and Game Council	Policy IE.3: Maintaining, enhancing and restoring indigenous ecosystem health - non-regulatory	Support in part	The suggested amendment follows from the suggested amendment to Objective 16, above, and is intended to give better effect to the NPS-FM (including Policy 10). While the protections of indigenous ecosystems and habitats is vital, so too is the maintaining and enhancing of the whole environment, including those containing valued introduced species. An unduly narrow indigenous - centric focus could lead to lessening or removal of protections for non-indigenous dominant systems, habitats, and species. The loss of protections, enhancements, and restorations risks adverse environmental effects and weakened climate change resilience for the region.	amend subclause (b) identify strategic targets and priorities to ensure that management and restoration of indigenous ecosystems and habitats with significant biodiversity or other values (including pest management) are directed at areas [etc.]..."	Reject
S147.040	Wellington Fish and Game Council	FS20.136	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	FS20.136	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	Policy IE.3: Maintaining, enhancing and restoring indigenous ecosystem health - non-regulatory	Oppose	Ātiawa do not support the rationale set out by Fish and Game, - indigenous ecosystems must be afforded the greatest protection above the protection of introduced ecosystems which already dominate te taiao, to the detriment of indigenous ecosystems. The relief sought by the submitter would like result in a status-quo outcome for indigenous ecosystems, Ātiawa are opposed to this outcome.	Disallow	Accept
S147.040	Wellington Fish and Game Council	FS19.104	Wellington Water Ltd ("Wellington Water")	FS19.104	Wellington Water Ltd ("Wellington Water")	Policy IE.3: Maintaining, enhancing and restoring indigenous ecosystem health - non-regulatory	Oppose	It is unnecessary and redundant to recreate NPSFM policies within the RPS. Most of the amendments sought do not in any event properly reflect the NPSFM. In particular, they do not accurately reflect the proviso to Policy 7, the requirements of clause 3.22, the limitation of Policy 10 to trout and salmon only, and the subservience of Policy 10 to Policy 9. Some of the amendments attempt to address matters that are already adequately covered by extant provisions or PC1 as notified. Some of the amendments undermine the more detailed content of PC1.	Disallow	Accept
S147.040	Wellington Fish and Game Council	FS30.209	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Ltd	FS30.209	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Ltd	Policy IE.3: Maintaining, enhancing and restoring indigenous ecosystem health - non-regulatory	Oppose	B+LNZ generally oppose the submission on the grounds that's B+LNZ are seeking changes of the plan change are restricted to those necessary to give effect to the National Policy Statement for Urban Development and that any other matters should be subject to proper review in the Schedule full review of the RPS in 2024 and in the scheduled reviews of the Natural Resources Plan in 2023 and 2024. This is because the changes materially impact on communities, including rural communities and we do	Disallow That the submission be disallowed with the exception of 147.007	Accept in part

S42A Appendix 2 - HS6 Indigenous Ecosystems - Summary Recommendation Table

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
								not consider that the necessary engagement has been undertaken to adequately inform these provisions or to meet the requirements of Part 3.2 of the NPS-FM. Furthermore, there is a risk that including matters relating to climate change and indigenous biodiversity before key national legislation is gazetted is premature and will lead to the inefficient implementation and confusion amongst those who it impacts materially.		
S163.085	Wairarapa Federated Farmers			S163.085	Wairarapa Federated Farmers	Policy IE.3: Maintaining, enhancing and restoring indigenous ecosystem health - non-regulatory	Oppose	Defer to the 2024 RPS review. Clause a) would more efficiently be progressed at the national level. Generally support the intent of clause b) and c) but note that RPS Change One is not a pre-condition to action. Clause c) is broadly supported however question the extent to which proposals for imposing limitations to offsets is necessary and useful.	That Policy IE.3 be deleted. Delete the FW icon.	Accept in part
S163.085	Wairarapa Federated Farmers	FS7.128	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society (Forest & Bird)	FS7.128	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society (Forest & Bird)	Policy IE.3: Maintaining, enhancing and restoring indigenous ecosystem health - non-regulatory	Oppose	It is completely appropriate to include climate change, biodiversity and freshwater provisions in the plan change. This plan change creates efficiency by considering multiple policy directives from central government. The amendments sought by Federated Farmers fail to give effect to the NPSFM, the NPS for Indigenous Biodiversity, for which there is an exposure draft and the final version is due out this month, and do not achieve the purpose of the RMA or the Climate Change Response (Zero Carbon) Amendment Act 2019.	Disallow whole submission	Accept in part
S163.085	Wairarapa Federated Farmers	FS20.250	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	FS20.250	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	Policy IE.3: Maintaining, enhancing and restoring indigenous ecosystem health - non-regulatory	Oppose	Ātiawa oppose the entire submission by Wairarapa Federated Farmers. The relief sought by Federated Farmers is to effectively delete the entire proposed plan change (except for submission points S163.083, S163.084). The basis for deleting the proposed plan change is to delay decision-making. Ātiawa do not accept that delaying responding to national direction is an appropriate course of action, and will further compound environmental and resource management issues.	Disallow the entire submission by Wairarapa Federated Farmers.	Accept in part
S163.085	Wairarapa Federated Farmers	FS29.101	Ngā Hapu o Otaki	FS29.101	Ngā Hapu o Otaki	Policy IE.3: Maintaining, enhancing and restoring indigenous ecosystem health - non-regulatory	Oppose	Section 18, page 4: General Comments – OPPOSE Section 25, Page 5 Going Forward – OPPOSE It is disheartening to see that Wairarapa Federated Farmers aren't capable of recognizing the obligations GWRC must maintain with Treaty Partners. It must be understood that Manawhenua are not simply 'groups of people' but a representation of the signatories that signed the Treaty of Waitangi and the original kaitiaki and custodians of the taonga in question when considering how these plan changes are implemented.	Not stated	Accept in part

S42A Appendix 2 - HS6 Indigenous Ecosystems - Summary Recommendation Table

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
								Wairarapa Federated Farmers indicate a lack of awareness to the value of manawhenua engagement. Their stated 'aspirations of delivering environmental improvements alongside a thriving bio-economy' aren't feasible without considering the intergenerational insight and technical direction that only Mātauranga Māori can offer.		
S163.085	Wairarapa Federated Farmers	FS30.157	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Ltd	FS30.157	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Ltd	Policy IE.3: Maintaining, enhancing and restoring indigenous ecosystem health - non-regulatory	Support	B+LNZ agree that the scope of RPS PC1 should be restricted to those changes necessary to give effect to the National Policy Statement for Urban Development and that any other matters should be subject to proper review in the Schedule full review of the RPS in 2024 and in the scheduled reviews of the Natural Resources Plan in 2023 and 2024. Where alternative relief is provided, B+LNZ generally support this relief.	Allow	reject
S165.089	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society (Forest & Bird)			S165.089	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society (Forest & Bird)	Policy IE.3: Maintaining, enhancing and restoring indigenous ecosystem health - non-regulatory	Support in part		This policy should be a regulatory policy, and have regulatory method(s) giving effect to it.	reject
S165.089	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society (Forest & Bird)	FS30.319	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Ltd	FS30.319	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Ltd	Policy IE.3: Maintaining, enhancing and restoring indigenous ecosystem health - non-regulatory	Oppose	B+LNZ generally oppose the submission on the grounds that's B+LNZ are seeking changes of the plan change are restricted to those necessary to give effect to the National Policy Statement for Urban Development and that any other matters should be subject to proper review in the Schedule full review of the RPS in 2024 and in the scheduled reviews of the Natural Resources Plan in 2023 and 2024. This is because the changes materially impact on communities, including rural communities and we do not consider that the necessary engagement has been undertaken to adequately inform these provisions or to meet the requirements of Part 3.2 of the NPS-FM. Furthermore, there is a risk that including matters relating to climate change and indigenous biodiversity before key national legislation is gazetted or implemented is premature and will lead to the inefficient implementation and confusion amongst those who it impacts materially.	Disallow	Accept
S168.080	Rangitāne O Wairarapa Inc			S168.080	Rangitāne O Wairarapa Inc	Policy IE.3: Maintaining, enhancing and restoring	Support in part	Rangitāne o Wairarapa support the intention of this policy, however, further amendments are sought in relation to the following: The timeframe to ensure identification and	Amend the policy to provide for partnering with iwi in the prioritisation of indigenous ecosystems and habitats	Accept

S42A Appendix 2 - HS6 Indigenous Ecosystems - Summary Recommendation Table

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
						indigenous ecosystem health - non-regulatory		prioritisation is completed in a timely manner, rather than 'as soon as practicable'; The process surrounding prioritisation of ecosystems and habitats in subclause (b) should include partnership with iwi to ensure matauranga and taonga species are included and considered in the prioritisation process.	process. Alternatively, include an additional policy that recognises and provides for the role of mana whenua/tangata whenua in the identification of priority ecosystems, habitats and species for management and restoration. Include a timeframe (no later than 2024) in the policy to ensure identification and prioritisation is completed in a timely manner, rather than 'as soon as practicable'.	
S168.080	Rangitāne O Wairarapa Inc	FS31.190	Sustainable Wairarapa Inc	FS31.190	Sustainable Wairarapa Inc	Policy IE.3: Maintaining, enhancing and restoring indigenous ecosystem health - non-regulatory	Support	Kia ora koutou, My name is Ian Gunn, Secretary Sustainable Wairarapa inc. contact # 021567134, address 4B McKay Street, Paraparaumu Beach 5032. Firstly we'd like to state the time frame provided to peruse over 900 pages of submissions is in our opinion an abuse of process. The benefit of further submissions is for you the council to listen and hear the views of its ratepayers. The timeframe in our case does not allow a rigorous review of the original submissions to council. On top of this we are a week before Christmas- a very busy and chaotic time for most members of the community. It is highly likely that the majority of staff will take leave over the Christmas break so analysis of any further submissions will not occur until late January 2023-so why the short period to respond. While there is due process there is also good practise your management of the further submissions fails the good practise model. As a consequence we would like you to note Sustainable Wairarapa's strong support of the original submissions lodged with council by the two Wairarapa Iwi-Ngati Kahungunu and Rangitane. Its clear that there is a poor understanding of nature based solutions this term needs further explanation. Sustainable Wairarapa acknowledges that while nature based solutions offer a wide variety of options its not the only solution. We are heartened by the widespread support for the original document. Thanks for an opportunity to make a further submission. Nga mihi nui Ian Gun	Not stated	Accept

S42A Appendix 2 - HS6 Indigenous Ecosystems - Summary Recommendation Table

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
S170.055	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira			S170.055	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	Policy IE.2: Maintaining, enhancing, and restoring indigenous ecosystem health - consideration	Not Stated / Neutral	Policy IE.3 Giving effect to mana whenua roles and values when managing indigenous biodiversity - consideration It is confusing mana whenua roles and values are recognised in this particular policy and given consideration for a resource consent, however in other parts of the RPS we do not see them. Policy 49 has connections to Policy IE.3 and all taonga will need to be linked to a kaitiaki monitoring framework; it is confusing why the plan picks out a regime of giving effect to mana whenua values and roles particularly managing indigenous biodiversity but not other parts of the Plan.	Require mana whenua roles and values to be given consideration in consent applications. All taonga need to be linked to a kaitiaki monitoring framework	Accept
S170.055	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	FS29.169	Ngā Hapu o Otaki	FS29.169	Ngā Hapu o Otaki	Policy IE.2: Maintaining, enhancing, and restoring indigenous ecosystem health - consideration	Support	Co -design under a treaty house model is about shaping plans and resource management avenues alongside manawhenua that appropriately recognise the intergenerational prosperity of the uri of Ngā Hapu o Otaki and the wider community. There are ongoing concerns Ngā Hapu o Otaki maintain with GWRC in regard to the policies addressing Co-governance, Co-management, Co-leadership and Co-collabroative operational processes. This submission goes to great length to define where and how further considerations can be made recognising the interconnected nature of matauranga maori, the inequitable impact environmental decline will have on mana whenua/tangata whenua and offers insight to the intuitive and inherent awareness manawhenua need to maintain to ensure our intergenerational survival and prosperity. Objective 3: Lack of mana whenua / tangata whenua involvement in decision making – Support in principal FW Kaitiakitanga O1, O2, O3 – Support in principal Wai Mate O1,O2,O3 - Support in principal Climate Change and Freshwater objectives, CCFW-01, CCFW-02, CCFW-03, CCFW-04, CCFW-05, CCFW-06 This submission appropriately articulates Kaitiakitanga, FW objectives regarding Climate Change, Wai mate, Wai ora and the lack of provisions to see balanced decision making between Treaty Partners. Ngā Hapu o Otaki support Te Runanga o Toa Rangatira expression and wish to speak further to such views during the hearing process. We have serious concerns for the degradation of our taonga, in particular our wai. This combined with the projected growth the next generation will see means manawhenua resilience and agility to climate grief and environmental decline is	Not stated	Accept

S42A Appendix 2 - HS6 Indigenous Ecosystems - Summary Recommendation Table

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
								paramount. Ngā Hapu o Otaki seek to support our whanaunga and other Manawhenua groups to build the provisions we will need to solidify our Tino Rangatiratanga and ensure our intergenerational prosperity.		
S131.0114	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust			S131.0114	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	Policy IE.3: Maintaining, enhancing and restoring indigenous ecosystem health - non-regulatory	Support in part	Ātiawa supports the overall intent of Policy IE.3. Ātiawa seeks that mana whenua partner with Regional Council in this policy. Mana whenua can provide mātauranga Māori that is essential to understanding and identifying measures of ecosystem health. In addition, mana whenua are often acutely aware of areas that would benefit from restoration efforts. Further, partnering with mana whenua upholds Te Tiriti and the responsibility of Regional Council to work with mana whenua to protect and provide for mana whenua values at all levels of resource management (governance, decisionmaking, through to practical actions/operational level).	Amend introductory text to Policy IE.3 as follows: To maintain, enhance and restore the ecosystem health, ecological integrity and ecological connectivity of the region's indigenous ecosystems, and the ecological processes that supports them, giving effect to Te Rito o te Harakeke, the Regional Policy Statement in partnership with mana whenua shall, as soon as practicable:	Accept in part
S131.0114	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	FS29.230	Ngā Hapu o Otaki	FS29.230	Ngā Hapu o Otaki	Policy IE.3: Maintaining, enhancing and restoring indigenous ecosystem health - non-regulatory	Support	Co -design under a treaty house model is about shaping plans and resource management avenues alongside manawhenua that appropriately recognise the intergenerational prosperity of the uri of Ngā Hapu o Otaki and the wider community. There are ongoing concerns Ngā Hapu o Otaki maintain with GWRC in regard to the policies addressing Co-governance, Co-management, Co-leadership and Co-collabroative operational processes. This submission goes to great length to define where and how further considerations can be made recognising the interconnected nature of matauranga maori, the inequitable impact environmental decline will have on mana whenua/tangata whenua and offers insight to the intuitive and inherent awareness manawhenua need to maintain to ensure our intergenerational survival and prosperity. 3.4 Freshwater including Public Access – Support in Principal 3.6 Indigenous Ecosystems – Support in Principal 3.9 Regional Form, Design and Function – Support in Principal Ātiawa views regarding Freshwater, indigenous ecosystems and Regional design and function resonate with insights Ngā Hapu o Otaki maintain. Ngā Hapu o Otaki would like opportunity to speak further to such views during the hearing process. We share Ātiawas	Not stated	Accept in part

S42A Appendix 2 - HS6 Indigenous Ecosystems - Summary Recommendation Table

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
								concerns for Mātauranga Māori as a foundation for equitable interchange of decision making. Their concerns regarding intensification and the further degradation of taonga across our coastline rings true to the ongoing journey we are on as manawhenua facing intense growth for the coming generation. We seek to join the conversation and endorse provisions that will see our whanaunga and other manawhenua groups recognise their environmental resilience and the cultural agility our shared whakapapa offers.		
S167.0132				S167.0132	Taranaki Whānui	Policy IE.3: Maintaining, enhancing and restoring indigenous ecosystem health - non-regulatory	Support in part	Taranaki Whānui supports the principle of Policy IE.3 but wants to see clearer reference to partnership with and the resourcing of mana whenua.	Retain as notified.	Accept
S16.065	Kāpiti Coast District Council			S16.065	Kāpiti Coast District Council	Policy IE.4: Recognising the roles and values of landowners and communities in the management of indigenous biodiversity - non-regulatory	Support	Council supports the recognition of the significant role landowners and communities play in the management of indigenous biodiversity.	Retain	Accept
S30.087	Porirua City Council			S30.087	Porirua City Council	Policy IE.4: Recognising the roles and values of landowners and communities in the management of indigenous biodiversity - non-regulatory	Oppose	This policy does not make sense. It is a non-regulatory policy that requires a regulatory response.	Delete policy, or amend policy so that it provides clear and appropriate direction to plan users in line with objectives.	reject
S30.087	Porirua City Council	FS25.120	Peka Peka Farm Limited	FS25.120	Peka Peka Farm Limited	Policy IE.4: Recognising the roles and values of	Support	The submission provides a comprehensive analysis of the proposed change including in relation to matters of scope and jurisdiction. It is supported without prejudice to the specific relief sought in the primary	Allow	reject

S42A Appendix 2 - HS6 Indigenous Ecosystems - Summary Recommendation Table

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
						landowners and communities in the management of indigenous biodiversity - non-regulatory		submission or this further submission by Peka Peka Farm Ltd.		
S102.060	Te Tumu Paeroa Office of the Māori Trustee			S102.060	Te Tumu Paeroa Office of the Māori Trustee	Policy IE.4: Recognising the roles and values of landowners and communities in the management of indigenous biodiversity - non-regulatory	Support	Generally supports the non-regulatory policies in the 'Indigenous ecosystems' chapter.	Retain as notified.	Accept
S115.089	Hutt City Council			S115.089	Hutt City Council	Policy IE.4: Recognising the roles and values of landowners and communities in the management of indigenous biodiversity - non-regulatory	Oppose	While indigenous biodiversity is a key issue, we expect the government to soon gazette a National Policy Statement on Indigenous Biodiversity ("NPS-IB"). The proposed provisions may well conflict with the NPS-IB especially with regards to the process for identifying indigenous ecosystems. We request that all provisions relating to indigenous biodiversity be deleted and if regional direction is thought necessary after the NPS-IB is gazetted, that should occur through a variation or a separate policy statement change. We also oppose the inclusion of non-regulatory policies and methods that apply to territorial authorities.	Delete Policy IE.4	reject
S133.025	Muaūpoko Tribal Authority			S133.025	Muaūpoko Tribal Authority	Policy IE.4: Recognising the roles and values of landowners and communities in the management of indigenous biodiversity - non-regulatory	Support in part	Supports the requirement to partner with mana whenua/tangata whenua, but request that Muaūpoko are also recognised.	Recognise Muaūpoko as also having connection to indigenous biodiversity in Te Whanganui-a-Tara. OR Alternative relief that may be necessary or appropriate to ensure Muaūpoko connection to Te Whanganui-a-Tara is recognised.	reject

S42A Appendix 2 - HS6 Indigenous Ecosystems - Summary Recommendation Table

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
S133.025	Muaūpoko Tribal Authority	FS6.055	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira on behalf of Ngāti Toa Rangatira	FS6.055	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira on behalf of Ngāti Toa Rangatira	Policy IE.4: Recognising the roles and values of landowners and communities in the management of indigenous biodiversity - non-regulatory	Oppose	We oppose this submission because as Muaūpoko claims are inappropriate. This not only causes confusion around which iwi are Tangata Whenua in Te Whanganui a Tara rohe and which iwi to engage with, but also portrays a false perception of who the mana whenua are, which is also inappropriate.	Disallow We seek that this part of the submission is disallowed.	Accept
S133.025	Muaūpoko Tribal Authority	FS20.372	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	FS20.372	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	Policy IE.4: Recognising the roles and values of landowners and communities in the management of indigenous biodiversity - non-regulatory	Oppose	Ātiawa vehemently oppose the submission and claims made by Muaūpoko Tribal Authority. The assertions made by Muāupoko Tribal Authority are categorically incorrect and highly offensive to Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai. While Muaūpoko may have historical associations with Te Whanganui-a-Tara and Kāpiti. These associations are recognised as historical only. Ātiawa refer to the evidence provided by Ngārongo Iwikatea Nicholson in support of Ngāti Toarangatira's claims which were upheld and settled by the Crown. Pages 26-34 sets out the extinguishment of Muaūpoko rights in our rohe. From both a tikanga Māori perspective and a Crown law perspective, Muaūpoko do not hold mana whenua (including for the purposes of the Resource Management Act). There is therefore no basis for Muaūpoko Tribal Authority to be recognised as being kaitiaki in the rohe; to do so would be incomprehensible and irreconcilable to Ātiawa, and more generally an affront to tikanga Māori. Muaūpoko Tribal Authority have cited Te Kāhui Māngai mapping as evidence of the spatial extent that they exercise kaitiakitanga. This in itself evidences the lack of basis to their claims, in that Te Kāhui Māngai map simply reflects claims made by Māori groups, and from our previous inquiry to Te Puni Kōkiri who are responsible for this map, we learned that Muaūpoko Tribal Authority included that spatial extent in their Agreement in Principle. Agreements in Principle provide claimants the opportunity to set out everything that a claimant wants from the Crown. They have no legal effect and are therefore not legally recognised. We strongly advise the Council to remain conscious that it is not appropriate for regional planning processes to be exploited in the manner suggested by the Muaūpoko Tribal Authority, that	Disallow the whole submission	Accept in part

S42A Appendix 2 - HS6 Indigenous Ecosystems - Summary Recommendation Table

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
								dealing with the false claims of groups like these must be left to the Crown, and that settlements must not pre-empted. Whilst Muaūpoko Tribal Authority may wish to seek out new territories through online maps, this is not of course how mana whenua is gained or held. We remain as ahi kā and mana whenua on the land, as we have undisturbed for over 198 years.		
S140.090	Wellington City Council (WCC)			S140.090	Wellington City Council (WCC)	Policy IE.4: Recognising the roles and values of landowners and communities in the management of indigenous biodiversity - non-regulatory	Support	Support as proposed.	Retain as notified	Accept
S147.041	Wellington Fish and Game Council			S147.041	Wellington Fish and Game Council	Policy IE.4: Recognising the roles and values of landowners and communities in the management of indigenous biodiversity - non-regulatory	Support in part	The suggested amendment follows from the suggested amendment to Objective 16, above, and is intended to give better effect to the NPS-FM (including Policy 10). While the protections of indigenous ecosystems and habitats is vital, so too is the maintaining and enhancing of the whole environment, including those containing valued introduced species. An unduly narrow indigenous - centric focus could lead to lessening or removal of protections for non-indigenous dominant systems, habitats, and species. The loss of protections, enhancements, and restorations risks adverse environmental effects and weakened climate change resilience for the region.	Policy IE.4: Recognising the roles and values of landowners and communities in the management maintenance and restoration of indigenous biodiversity and habitats with significant biodiversity or other values - non-regulatory	reject
S147.041	Wellington Fish and Game Council	FS20.137	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	FS20.137	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	Policy IE.4: Recognising the roles and values of landowners and communities in the management of indigenous biodiversity - non-regulatory	Oppose	Ātiawa do not support the rationale set out by Fish and Game, - indigenous ecosystems must be afforded the greatest protection above the protection of introduced ecosystems which already dominate te taiao, to the detriment of indigenous ecosystems. The relief sought by the submitter would like result in a status-quo outcome for indigenous ecosystems, Ātiawa are opposed to this outcome.	Disallow	Accept
S147.041	Wellington Fish and	FS19.105	Wellington Water Ltd	FS19.105	Wellington Water Ltd	Policy IE.4: Recognising	Oppose	It is unnecessary and redundant to recreate NPSFM policies within the RPS.	Disallow	Accept

S42A Appendix 2 - HS6 Indigenous Ecosystems - Summary Recommendation Table

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
	Game Council		("Wellington Water")		("Wellington Water")	the roles and values of landowners and communities in the management of indigenous biodiversity - non-regulatory		Most of the amendments sought do not in any event properly reflect the NPSFM. In particular, they do not accurately reflect the proviso to Policy 7, the requirements of clause 3.22, the limitation of Policy 10 to trout and salmon only, and the subservience of Policy 10 to Policy 9. Some of the amendments attempt to address matters that are already adequately covered by extant provisions or PC1 as notified. Some of the amendments undermine the more detailed content of PC1.		
S147.041	Wellington Fish and Game Council	FS30.210	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Ltd	FS30.210	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Ltd	Policy IE.4: Recognising the roles and values of landowners and communities in the management of indigenous biodiversity - non-regulatory	Oppose	B+LNZ generally oppose the submission on the grounds that's B+LNZ are seeking changes of the plan change are restricted to those necessary to give effect to the National Policy Statement for Urban Development and that any other matters should be subject to proper review in the Schedule full review of the RPS in 2024 and in the scheduled reviews of the Natural Resources Plan in 2023 and 2024. This is because the changes materially impact on communities, including rural communities and we do not consider that the necessary engagement has been undertaken to adequately inform these provisions or to meet the requirements of Part 3.2 of the NPS-FM. Furthermore, there is a risk that including matters relating to climate change and indigenous biodiversity before key national legislation is gazetted is premature and will lead to the inefficient implementation and confusion amongst those who it impacts materially.	Disallow That the submission be disallowed with the exception of 147.007	Accept in part
S147.042	Wellington Fish and Game Council			S147.042	Wellington Fish and Game Council	Policy IE.4: Recognising the roles and values of landowners and communities in the management of indigenous biodiversity - non-regulatory	Support in part	The suggested amendment follows from the suggested amendment to Objective 16, above, and is intended to give better effect to the NPS-FM (including Policy 10). While the protections of indigenous ecosystems and habitats is vital, so too is the maintaining and enhancing of the whole environment, including those containing valued introduced species. An unduly narrow indigenous - centric focus could lead to lessening or removal of protections for non-indigenous dominant systems, habitats, and species. The loss of protections, enhancements, and restorations risks adverse environmental effects and weakened climate change resilience for the region.	Recognise and provide for the values of landowners and communities as stewards of the indigenous biodiversity of the Wellington Region, by:"	reject
S147.042	Wellington Fish and Game Council	FS20.138	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	FS20.138	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	Policy IE.4: Recognising the roles and values of	Oppose	Ātiawa do not support the rationale set out by Fish and Game, - indigenous ecosystems must be afforded the greatest protection above the protection of introduced ecosystems which already dominate te	Disallow	Accept

S42A Appendix 2 - HS6 Indigenous Ecosystems - Summary Recommendation Table

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
						landowners and communities in the management of indigenous biodiversity - non-regulatory		taiao, to the detriment of indigenous ecosystems. The relief sought by the submitter would like result in a status-quo outcome for indigenous ecosystems, Ātiawa are opposed to this outcome.		
S147.042	Wellington Fish and Game Council	FS19.106	Wellington Water Ltd ("Wellington Water")	FS19.106	Wellington Water Ltd ("Wellington Water")	Policy IE.4: Recognising the roles and values of landowners and communities in the management of indigenous biodiversity - non-regulatory	Oppose	It is unnecessary and redundant to recreate NPSFM policies within the RPS. Most of the amendments sought do not in any event properly reflect the NPSFM. In particular, they do not accurately reflect the proviso to Policy 7, the requirements of clause 3.22, the limitation of Policy 10 to trout and salmon only, and the subservience of Policy 10 to Policy 9. Some of the amendments attempt to address matters that are already adequately covered by extant provisions or PC1 as notified. Some of the amendments undermine the more detailed content of PC1.	Disallow	Accept
S147.042	Wellington Fish and Game Council	FS30.211	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Ltd	FS30.211	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Ltd	Policy IE.4: Recognising the roles and values of landowners and communities in the management of indigenous biodiversity - non-regulatory	Oppose	B+LNZ generally oppose the submission on the grounds that's B+LNZ are seeking changes of the plan change are restricted to those necessary to give effect to the National Policy Statement for Urban Development and that any other matters should be subject to proper review in the Schedule full review of the RPS in 2024 and in the scheduled reviews of the Natural Resources Plan in 2023 and 2024. This is because the changes materially impact on communities, including rural communities and we do not consider that the necessary engagement has been undertaken to adequately inform these provisions or to meet the requirements of Part 3.2 of the NPS-FM. Furthermore, there is a risk that including matters relating to climate change and indigenous biodiversity before key national legislation is gazetted is premature and will lead to the inefficient implementation and confusion amongst those who it impacts materially.	Disallow That the submission be disallowed with the exception of 147.007	Accept in part
S147.043	Wellington Fish and Game Council			S147.043	Wellington Fish and Game Council	Policy IE.4: Recognising the roles and values of landowners and communities	Support in part	The suggested amendment follows from the suggested amendment to Objective 16, above, and is intended to give better effect to the NPS-FM (including Policy 10). While the protections of indigenous ecosystems and habitats is vital, so too is the maintaining and enhancing of the whole environment, including those containing valued introduced species.	amend subclauses: a)involving communities in the identification of targets and priorities for protecting, enhancing and restoring indigenous biodiversity and habitats with significant	reject

S42A Appendix 2 - HS6 Indigenous Ecosystems - Summary Recommendation Table

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
						in the management of indigenous biodiversity - non-regulatory		An unduly narrow indigenous - centric focus could lead to lessening or removal of protections for non-indigenous dominant systems, habitats, and species. The loss of protections, enhancements, and restorations risks adverse environmental effects and weakened climate change resilience for the region.	biodiversity or other values; and (b) supporting landowner and community restoration of indigenous ecosystems and habitats with significant biodiversity or other values."	
S147.043	Wellington Fish and Game Council	FS20.139	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	FS20.139	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	Policy IE.4: Recognising the roles and values of landowners and communities in the management of indigenous biodiversity - non-regulatory	Oppose	Ātiawa do not support the rationale set out by Fish and Game, - indigenous ecosystems must be afforded the greatest protection above the protection of introduced ecosystems which already dominate te taiao, to the detriment of indigenous ecosystems. The relief sought by the submitter would like result in a status-quo outcome for indigenous ecosystems, Ātiawa are opposed to this outcome.	Disallow	Accept
S147.043	Wellington Fish and Game Council	FS19.107	Wellington Water Ltd ("Wellington Water")	FS19.107	Wellington Water Ltd ("Wellington Water")	Policy IE.4: Recognising the roles and values of landowners and communities in the management of indigenous biodiversity - non-regulatory	Oppose	It is unnecessary and redundant to recreate NPSFM policies within the RPS. Most of the amendments sought do not in any event properly reflect the NPSFM. In particular, they do not accurately reflect the proviso to Policy 7, the requirements of clause 3.22, the limitation of Policy 10 to trout and salmon only, and the subservience of Policy 10 to Policy 9. Some of the amendments attempt to address matters that are already adequately covered by extant provisions or PC1 as notified. Some of the amendments undermine the more detailed content of PC1.	Disallow	Accept
S147.043	Wellington Fish and Game Council	FS30.212	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Ltd	FS30.212	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Ltd	Policy IE.4: Recognising the roles and values of landowners and communities in the management of indigenous biodiversity - non-regulatory	Oppose	B+LNZ generally oppose the submission on the grounds that's B+LNZ are seeking changes of the plan change are restricted to those necessary to give effect to the National Policy Statement for Urban Development and that any other matters should be subject to proper review in the Schedule full review of the RPS in 2024 and in the scheduled reviews of the Natural Resources Plan in 2023 and 2024. This is because the changes materially impact on communities, including rural communities and we do not consider that the necessary engagement has been undertaken to adequately inform these provisions or to meet the requirements of Part 3.2 of the NPS-FM. Furthermore, there is a risk that including matters	Disallow That the submission be disallowed with the exception of 147.007	Accept in part

S42A Appendix 2 - HS6 Indigenous Ecosystems - Summary Recommendation Table

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
								relating to climate change and indigenous biodiversity before key national legislation is gazetted is premature and will lead to the inefficient implementation and confusion amongst those who it impacts materially.		
S163.086	Wairarapa Federated Farmers			S163.086	Wairarapa Federated Farmers	Policy IE.4: Recognising the roles and values of landowners and communities in the management of indigenous biodiversity - non-regulatory	Oppose	Support the intent of this policy, however the proposed over-arching Objective A is intended to recognise the importance of this matter, and to provide a concrete pathway towards achieving it.	That Policy IE.4 be deleted. Delete the FW icon.	Accept in part
S163.086	Wairarapa Federated Farmers	FS7.129	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society (Forest & Bird)	FS7.129	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society (Forest & Bird)	Policy IE.4: Recognising the roles and values of landowners and communities in the management of indigenous biodiversity - non-regulatory	Oppose	It is completely appropriate to include climate change, biodiversity and freshwater provisions in the plan change. This plan change creates efficiency by considering multiple policy directives from central government. The amendments sought by Federated Farmers fail to give effect to the NPSFM, the NPS for Indigenous Biodiversity, for which there is an exposure draft and the final version is due out this month, and do not achieve the purpose of the RMA or the Climate Change Response (Zero Carbon) Amendment Act 2019.	Disallow whole submission	Accept in part
S163.086	Wairarapa Federated Farmers	FS20.251	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	FS20.251	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	Policy IE.4: Recognising the roles and values of landowners and communities in the management of indigenous biodiversity - non-regulatory	Oppose	Ātiawa oppose the entire submission by Wairarapa Federated Farmers. The relief sought by Federated Farmers is to effectively delete the entire proposed plan change (except for submission points S163.083, S163.084). The basis for deleting the proposed plan change is to delay decision-making. Ātiawa do not accept that delaying responding to national direction is an appropriate course of action, and will further compound environmental and resource management issues.	Disallow the entire submission by Wairarapa Federated Farmers.	Accept in part
S163.086	Wairarapa Federated Farmers	FS29.102	Ngā Hapu o Otaki	FS29.102	Ngā Hapu o Otaki	Policy IE.4: Recognising the roles and values of landowners and	Oppose	Section 18, page 4: General Comments – OPPOSE Section 25, Page 5 Going Forward – OPPOSE It is disheartening to see that Wairarapa Federated Farmers aren't capable of recognizing the obligations GWRC must maintain with Treaty Partners. It must be understood that Manawhenua are not simply 'groups	Not stated	Awaiting recommendation

S42A Appendix 2 - HS6 Indigenous Ecosystems - Summary Recommendation Table

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
						communities in the management of indigenous biodiversity - non-regulatory		of people' but a representation of the signatories that signed the Treaty of Waitangi and the original kaitiaki and custodians of the taonga in question when considering how these plan changes are implemented. Wairarapa Federated Farmers indicate a lack of awareness to the value of manawhenua engagement. Their stated 'aspirations of delivering environmental improvements alongside a thriving bio-economy' aren't feasible without considering the intergenerational insight and technical direction that only Mātauranga Māori can offer.		
S163.086	Wairarapa Federated Farmers	FS30.158	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Ltd	FS30.158	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Ltd	Policy IE.4: Recognising the roles and values of landowners and communities in the management of indigenous biodiversity - non-regulatory	Support	B+LNZ agree that the scope of RPS PC1 should be restricted to those changes necessary to give effect to the National Policy Statement for Urban Development and that any other matters should be subject to proper review in the Schedule full review of the RPS in 2024 and in the scheduled reviews of the Natural Resources Plan in 2023 and 2024. Where alternative relief is provided, B+LNZ generally support this relief.	Allow	reject
S165.090	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society (Forest & Bird)			S165.090	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society (Forest & Bird)	Policy IE.4: Recognising the roles and values of landowners and communities in the management of indigenous biodiversity - non-regulatory	Support		Retain	Accept
S165.090	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society (Forest & Bird)	FS30.319	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Ltd	FS30.319	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Ltd	Policy IE.4: Recognising the roles and values of landowners and communities in the management of indigenous	Oppose	B+LNZ generally oppose the submission on the grounds that's B+LNZ are seeking changes of the plan change are restricted to those necessary to give effect to the National Policy Statement for Urban Development and that any other matters should be subject to proper review in the Schedule full review of the RPS in 2024 and in the scheduled reviews of the Natural Resources Plan in 2023 and 2024. This is because the changes materially impact on communities, including rural communities and we do not consider that the necessary engagement has been	Disallow	reject

S42A Appendix 2 - HS6 Indigenous Ecosystems - Summary Recommendation Table

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
						biodiversity - non-regulatory		undertaken to adequately inform these provisions or to meet the requirements of Part 3.2 of the NPS-FM. Furthermore, there is a risk that including matters relating to climate change and indigenous biodiversity before key national legislation is gazetted or implemented is premature and will lead to the inefficient implementation and confusion amongst those who it impacts materially.		
S168.081	Rangitāne O Wairarapa Inc			S168.081	Rangitāne O Wairarapa Inc	Policy IE.4: Recognising the roles and values of landowners and communities in the management of indigenous biodiversity - non-regulatory	Support in part	Rangitāne o Wairarapa acknowledge the role of landowners in the protection, enhancement and restoration of indigenous biodiversity, however the special relationship tangata whenua have with indigenous biodiversity must also be recognised and acknowledged in the identification and prioritisation process.	Amend policy IE.3 to include partnership with iwi in the prioritisation process and include a reference in the explanatory text to policy IE.4 which explains the special relationship of tangata whenua in this process. Alternatively , include an additional policy that recognises and provides for the role of tangata whenua in the identification of priority ecosystems, habitats and species for management and restoration.	reject
S168.081	Rangitāne O Wairarapa Inc	FS31.191	Sustainable Wairarapa Inc	FS31.191	Sustainable Wairarapa Inc	Policy IE.4: Recognising the roles and values of landowners and communities in the management of indigenous biodiversity - non-regulatory	Support	Kia ora koutou, My name is Ian Gunn, Secretary Sustainable Wairarapa inc. contact # 021567134, address 4B McKay Street, Paraparaumu Beach 5032. Firstly we'd like to state the time frame provided to peruse over 900 pages of submissions is in our opinion an abuse of process. The benefit of further submissions is for you the council to listen and hear the views of its ratepayers. The timeframe in our case does not allow a rigorous review of the original submissions to council. On top of this we are a week before Christmas- a very busy and chaotic time for most members of the community. It is highly likely that the majority of staff will take leave over the Christmas break so analysis of any further submissions will not occur until late January 2023-so why the short period to respond. While there is due process there is also good practise your management of the further submissions fails the good practise model. As a consequence we would like you to note Sustainable Wairarapa's strong support of the original submissions lodged with council by the two Wairarapa Iwi-Ngati Kahungunu and Rangitane. Its clear that there is a poor understanding of nature based solutions this term	Not stated	Awaiting recommendation

S42A Appendix 2 - HS6 Indigenous Ecosystems - Summary Recommendation Table

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
								needs further explanation. Sustainable Wairarapa acknowledges that while nature based solutions offer a wide variety of options its not the only solution. We are heartened by the widespread support for the original document. Thanks for an opportunity to make a further submission. Nga mihi nui Ian Gun		
S131.0115	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust			S131.0115	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	Policy IE.4: Recognising the roles and values of landowners and communities in the management of indigenous biodiversity - non-regulatory	Support	Ātiawa supports the role and contribution of landowners and communities in the management of indigenous biodiversity. Ātiawa are supportive of Ātiawa acknowledge the collective efforts required to create meaningful improvements to te taiao.	Retain as notified.	Accept
S131.0115	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	FS29.231	Ngā Hapu o Otaki	FS29.231	Ngā Hapu o Otaki	Method IE.1: Partnering with mana whenua / tangata whenua to give local effect to Te Rito o te Harakeke	Support	Co -design under a treaty house model is about shaping plans and resource management avenues alongside manawhenua that appropriately recognise the intergenerational prosperity of the uri of Ngā Hapu o Otaki and the wider community. There are ongoing concerns Ngā Hapu o Otaki maintain with GWRC in regard to the policies addressing Co-governance, Co-management, Co-leadership and Co-collabroative operational processes. This submission goes to great length to define where and how further considerations can be made recognising the interconnected nature of matauranga maori, the inequitable impact environmental decline will have on mana whenua/tangata whenua and offers insight to the intuitive and inherent awareness manawhenua need to maintain to ensure our intergenerational survival and prosperity. 3.4 Freshwater including Public Access – Support in Principal 3.6 Indigenous Ecosystems – Support in Principal 3.9 Regional Form, Design and Function – Support in Principal Ātiawa views regarding Freshwater, indigenous ecosystems and Regional design and function resonate with insights Ngā Hapu o Otaki maintain. Ngā Hapu o Otaki would like opportunity to speak further to such views during the hearing process. We share Ātiawas concerns for Mātauranga Māori as a foundation for equitable interchange of decision making. Their	Not stated	Accept in part

S42A Appendix 2 - HS6 Indigenous Ecosystems - Summary Recommendation Table

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
								concerns regarding intensification and the further degradation of taonga across our coastline rings true to the ongoing journey we are on as manawhenua facing intense growth for the coming generation. We seek to join the conversation and endorse provisions that will see our whanaunga and other manawhenua groups recognise their environmental resilience and the cultural agility our shared whakapapa offers.		
S167.0133	Taranaki Whānui			S167.0133	Taranaki Whānui	Policy IE.4: Recognising the roles and values of landowners and communities in the management of indigenous biodiversity - non-regulatory	Support in part	Taranaki Whānui supports the principle of Policy IE.4 and feel mana whenua as Treaty partners also have role in this policy and this should be referred to and enabled.	Retain as notified.	Accept
S102.062	Te Tumu Paeroa Office of the Māori Trustee			S102.062	Te Tumu Paeroa Office of the Māori Trustee	Method IE.1: Partnering with mana whenua / tangata whenua to give local effect to Te Rito o te Harakeke	Support in part	Considers Method IE.1 be changed to "regulatory" to guarantee partnership with mana whenua/tangata whenua is established to give effect to Te Rito o te Harakeke by the Regional Council.	Amend Method IE.1 to a 'regulatory' method.	Reject
S147.089	Wellington Fish and Game Council			S147.089	Wellington Fish and Game Council	Method IE.1: Partnering with mana whenua / tangata whenua to give local effect to Te Rito o te Harakeke	Support in part	Support the intention to ensure that mana whenua/tangata whenua values are properly recognised and provided for and their role as kaitiaki is supported. At the same time, however, in order to give full effect to the NPS-FM, those values must be considered alongside other recognised values and achieved in partnership with statutory managers of freshwater species and their habitats.	amend. Partner with mana whenua / tangata whenua and stakeholders, and engage with landowners and community , to identify the local approach to give effect to Te Rito o te Harakeke and develop guidance on how to implement this.	Reject
S147.089	Wellington Fish and Game Council	FS20.151	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	FS20.151	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	Method IE.1: Partnering with mana whenua / tangata whenua to	Oppose in part	While Ātiawa recognise the role of stakeholders, landowners and community and the collective effort that must occur to result in meaningful outcomes for te taiao, first the Council must honour their partnership with mana whenua under Te Tiriti.	Disallow	Accept

S42A Appendix 2 - HS6 Indigenous Ecosystems - Summary Recommendation Table

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
						give local effect to Te Rito o te Harakeke				
S147.089	Wellington Fish and Game Council	FS19.153	Wellington Water Ltd ("Wellington Water")	FS19.153	Wellington Water Ltd ("Wellington Water")	Method IE.1: Partnering with mana whenua / tangata whenua to give local effect to Te Rito o te Harakeke	Oppose	It is unnecessary and redundant to recreate NPSFM policies within the RPS. Most of the amendments sought do not in any event properly reflect the proviso to Policy 7, the requirements of clause 3.22, the limitation of Policy 10 to trout and salmon only, and the subservience of Policy 10 to Policy 9. Some of the amendments attempt to address matters that are already adequately covered by extant provisions or PC1 as notified. Some of the amendments undermine the more detailed content of PC1.	Disallow	Accept
S147.089	Wellington Fish and Game Council	FS30.258	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Ltd	FS30.258	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Ltd	Method IE.1: Partnering with mana whenua / tangata whenua to give local effect to Te Rito o te Harakeke	Oppose	B+LNZ generally oppose the submission on the grounds that's B+LNZ are seeking changes of the plan change are restricted to those necessary to give effect to the National Policy Statement for Urban Development and that any other matters should be subject to proper review in the Schedule full review of the RPS in 2024 and in the scheduled reviews of the Natural Resources Plan in 2023 and 2024. This is because the changes materially impact on communities, including rural communities and we do not consider that the necessary engagement has been undertaken to adequately inform these provisions or to meet the requirements of Part 3.2 of the NPS-FM. Furthermore, there is a risk that including matters relating to climate change and indigenous biodiversity before key national legislation is gazetted is premature and will lead to the inefficient implementation and confusion amongst those who it impacts materially.	Disallow That the submission be disallowed with the exception of 147.007	Accept
S163.091	Wairarapa Federated Farmers			S163.091	Wairarapa Federated Farmers	Method IE.1: Partnering with mana whenua / tangata whenua to give local effect to Te Rito o te Harakeke	Oppose	Defer to the 2024 RPS review We anticipate that national guidance will be developed in this area.	That Method IE.1 be deleted Delete the FW icon	reject

S42A Appendix 2 - HS6 Indigenous Ecosystems - Summary Recommendation Table

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
S163.091	Wairarapa Federated Farmers	FS7.134	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society (Forest & Bird)	FS7.134	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society (Forest & Bird)	Method IE.1: Partnering with mana whenua / tangata whenua to give local effect to Te Rito o te Harakeke	Oppose	It is completely appropriate to include climate change, biodiversity and freshwater provisions in the plan change. This plan change creates efficiency by considering multiple policy directives from central government. The amendments sought by Federated Farmers fail to give effect to the NPSFM, the NPS for Indigenous Biodiversity, for which there is an exposure draft and the final version is due out this month, and do not achieve the purpose of the RMA or the Climate Change Response (Zero Carbon) Amendment Act 2019.	Disallow whole submission	Accept in part
S163.091	Wairarapa Federated Farmers	FS20.256	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	FS20.256	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	Method IE.1: Partnering with mana whenua / tangata whenua to give local effect to Te Rito o te Harakeke	Oppose	Ātiawa oppose the entire submission by Wairarapa Federated Farmers. The relief sought by Federated Farmers is to effectively delete the entire proposed plan change (except for submission points S163.083, S163.084). The basis for deleting the proposed plan change is to delay decision-making. Ātiawa do not accept that delaying responding to national direction is an appropriate course of action, and will further compound environmental and resource management issues.	Disallow the entire submission by Wairarapa Federated Farmers.	Accept in part
S163.091	Wairarapa Federated Farmers	FS29.107	Ngā Hapu o Otaki	FS29.107	Ngā Hapu o Otaki	Method IE.1: Partnering with mana whenua / tangata whenua to give local effect to Te Rito o te Harakeke	Oppose	Section 18, page 4: General Comments – OPPOSE Section 25, Page 5 Going Forward – OPPOSE It is disheartening to see that Wairarapa Federated Farmers aren't capable of recognizing the obligations GWRC must maintain with Treaty Partners. It must be understood that Manawhenua are not simply 'groups of people' but a representation of the signatories that signed the Treaty of Waitangi and the original kaitiaki and custodians of the taonga in question when considering how these plan changes are implemented. Wairarapa Federated Farmers indicate a lack of awareness to the value of manawhenua engagement. Their stated 'aspirations of delivering environmental improvements alongside a thriving bio-economy' aren't feasible without considering the intergenerational insight and technical direction that only Mātauranga Māori can offer.	Not stated	Accept
S163.091	Wairarapa Federated Farmers	FS30.163	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Ltd	FS30.163	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Ltd	Method IE.1: Partnering with mana whenua / tangata whenua to give local effect to Te	Support	B+LNZ agree that the scope of RPS PC1 should be restricted to those changes necessary to give effect to the National Policy Statement for Urban Development and that any other matters should be subject to proper review in the Schedule full review of the RPS in 2024 and in the scheduled reviews of the Natural Resources Plan in 2023 and 2024. Where alternative relief is provided, B+LNZ generally support this relief.	Allow	reject

S42A Appendix 2 - HS6 Indigenous Ecosystems - Summary Recommendation Table

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
						Rito o te Harakeke				
S131.0120	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust			S131.0120	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	Method IE.1: Partnering with mana whenua / tangata whenua to give local effect to Te Rito o te Harakeke	Support	Ātiawa support Method IE.1. Ātiawa seek that this partnership model is enabled through funding/resourcing.	Insert the following sentence: Mana whenua are enabled to partner with the Regional Council through adequate funding and resourcing.	Accept in part
S131.0120	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	FS29.237	Ngā Hapu o Otaki	FS29.237	Ngā Hapu o Otaki	Method IE.1: Partnering with mana whenua / tangata whenua to give local effect to Te Rito o te Harakeke	Support	Co -design under a treaty house model is about shaping plans and resource management avenues alongside manawhenua that appropriately recognise the intergenerational prosperity of the uri of Ngā Hapu o Otaki and the wider community. There are ongoing concerns Ngā Hapu o Otaki maintain with GWRC in regard to the policies addressing Co-governance, Co-management, Co-leadership and Co-collabroative operational processes. This submission goes to great length to define where and how further considerations can be made recognising the interconnected nature of matauranga maori, the inequitable impact environmental decline will have on mana whenua/tangata whenua and offers insight to the intuitive and inherent awareness manawhenua need to maintain to ensure our intergenerational survival and prosperity. 3.4 Freshwater including Public Access – Support in Principal 3.6 Indigenous Ecosystems – Support in Principal 3.9 Regional Form, Design and Function – Support in Principal Ātiawa views regarding Freshwater, indigenous ecosystems and Regional design and function resonate with insights Ngā Hapu o Otaki maintain. Ngā Hapu o Otaki would like opportunity to speak further to such views during the hearing process. We share Ātiawas concerns for Mātauranga Māori as a foundation for equitable interchange of decision making. Their concerns regarding intensification and the further degradation of taonga across our coastline rings true to the ongoing journey we are on as manawhenua facing intense growth for the coming generation. We seek to join the conversation and endorse provisions that will see our whanaunga and other manawhenua	Not stated	Accept in part

S42A Appendix 2 - HS6 Indigenous Ecosystems - Summary Recommendation Table

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
								groups recognise their environmental resilience and the cultural agility our shared whakapapa offers.		
S165.0101	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society (Forest & Bird)			S165.0101	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society (Forest & Bird)	Method IE.1: Partnering with mana whenua / tangata whenua to give local effect to Te Rito o te Harakeke	Support		Retain	Accept
S165.0101	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society (Forest & Bird)	FS30.319	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Ltd	FS30.319	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Ltd	Method IE.1: Partnering with mana whenua / tangata whenua to give local effect to Te Rito o te Harakeke	Oppose	B+LNZ generally oppose the submission on the grounds that's B+LNZ are seeking changes of the plan change are restricted to those necessary to give effect to the National Policy Statement for Urban Development and that any other matters should be subject to proper review in the Schedule full review of the RPS in 2024 and in the scheduled reviews of the Natural Resources Plan in 2023 and 2024. This is because the changes materially impact on communities, including rural communities and we do not consider that the necessary engagement has been undertaken to adequately inform these provisions or to meet the requirements of Part 3.2 of the NPS-FM. Furthermore, there is a risk that including matters relating to climate change and indigenous biodiversity before key national legislation is gazetted or implemented is premature and will lead to the inefficient implementation and confusion amongst those who it impacts materially.	Disallow	reject
S167.0145	Taranaki Whānui			S167.0145	Taranaki Whānui	Method IE.1: Partnering with mana whenua / tangata whenua to give local effect to Te Rito o te Harakeke	Support in part	Taranaki Whānui support the inclusion of this method. In particular we note and support the requirement to work in partnership with mana whenua. Taranaki Whānui would like to see clear statements on the resourcing/funding and capability building of mana whenua partners included in the description.	Retain as notified.	Accept
S30.095	Porirua City Council			S30.095	Porirua City Council	Method 32: Partnering with mana whenua / tangata	Support in part	The method as drafted omits the step before managed. Add 'identify' for consistency with Policy 27 of the RPS.	Amend Method 32 (b) to include the 'identify' step for Special Amenity Landscapes as follows: (...)	Accept

S42A Appendix 2 - HS6 Indigenous Ecosystems - Summary Recommendation Table

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
						whenua, and engaging with stakeholders, landowners and the community in the identification and protection of significant values			(b) identify and protect outstanding natural features and landscapes, and identify and manage the values of special amenity landscapes, including those with significant cultural values; (...)	
S30.095	Porirua City Council	FS25.128	Peka Peka Farm Limited	FS25.128	Peka Peka Farm Limited	Method 32: Partnering with mana whenua / tangata whenua, and engaging with stakeholders, landowners and the community in the identification and protection of significant values	Support	The submission provides a comprehensive analysis of the proposed change including in relation to matters of scope and jurisdiction. It is supported without prejudice to the specific relief sought in the primary submission or this further submission by Peka Peka Farm Ltd.	Allow	Accept
S102.050	Te Tumu Paeroa Office of the Māori Trustee			S102.050	Te Tumu Paeroa Office of the Māori Trustee	Method 32: Partnering with mana whenua / tangata whenua, and engaging with stakeholders, landowners and the community in the identification and protection of significant values	Support in part	Generally supports the methods to implement in the 'Freshwater' Chapter. However, Method 32 should be a regulatory method to ensure the protection of significant values.	Amend Policy 32 to a 'regulatory' method.	reject
S102.086	Te Tumu Paeroa Office of the			S102.086	Te Tumu Paeroa Office	Method 32: Partnering with mana	Support	Generally supports the methods to implement for the 'Coastal Environment' chapter.	Retain as notified.	Accept in part

S42A Appendix 2 - HS6 Indigenous Ecosystems - Summary Recommendation Table

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
	Māori Trustee				of the Māori Trustee	whenua / tangata whenua, and engaging with stakeholders, landowners and the community in the identification and protection of significant values				
S123.011	Peter Thompson			S123.011	Peter Thompson	Method 32: Partnering with mana whenua / tangata whenua, and engaging with stakeholders, landowners and the community in the identification and protection of significant values	Support	Partnering is very important in this space	Retain as notified.	Accept in part
S128.056	Horticulture New Zealand			S128.056	Horticulture New Zealand	Method 32: Partnering with mana whenua / tangata whenua, and engaging with stakeholders, landowners and the community in the identification and protection of significant values	Support	Consider highly productive land to be of significant value. The NPSHPL 2022 will require a mapping exercise.	Add new subclause: (f) identify areas of highly productive land	Accept

S42A Appendix 2 - HS6 Indigenous Ecosystems - Summary Recommendation Table

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
S144.016	Sustainable Wairarapa Inc			S144.016	Sustainable Wairarapa Inc	Method 32: Partnering with mana whenua / tangata whenua, and engaging with stakeholders, landowners and the community in the identification and protection of significant values	Support	Partnering is very important in this space	Retain as notified.	Accept in part
S147.024	Wellington Fish and Game Council			S147.024	Wellington Fish and Game Council	Method 32: Partnering with mana whenua / tangata whenua, and engaging with stakeholders, landowners and the community in the identification and protection of significant values	Support in part	Supports the special role of mana whenua as Treaty partners and kaitiaki. At the same time, GWRC has a responsibility to work alongside recognised stakeholders - such as WFGC as the statutory manager of freshwater species and habitats. The amendments to the title and chapeau of Method 32 reflect this responsibility.	Amend policy title and text: Policy 32: Partnering with mana whenua/tangata whenua and engaging with stakeholders, and engaging with landowners and the community in the identification and protection of significant values. Partner with iwi, hapū, marae and/or whānau, and engage with stakeholders, and engage with landowners and the community to:	Accept
S147.024	Wellington Fish and Game Council	FS20.144	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	FS20.144	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	Method 32: Partnering with mana whenua / tangata whenua, and engaging with stakeholders, landowners and the community in the identification and protection	Oppose	Ātiawa do not recognise Fish and Game as partners under Te Tiriti o Waitangi which is the basis for which the Council must partner with mana whenua.	Disallow	reject

S42A Appendix 2 - HS6 Indigenous Ecosystems - Summary Recommendation Table

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
						of significant values				
S147.024	Wellington Fish and Game Council	FS19.088	Wellington Water Ltd ("Wellington Water")	FS19.088	Wellington Water Ltd ("Wellington Water")	Method 32: Partnering with mana whenua / tangata whenua, and engaging with stakeholders, landowners and the community in the identification and protection of significant values	Oppose	It is unnecessary and redundant to recreate NPSFM policies within the RPS. Most of the amendments sought do not in any event properly reflect the NPSFM. In particular, they do not accurately reflect the proviso to Policy 7, the requirements of clause 3.22, the limitation of Policy 10 to trout and salmon only, and the subservience of Policy 10 to Policy 9. Some of the amendments attempt to address matters that are already adequately covered by extant provisions or PC1 as notified. Some of the amendments undermine the more detailed content of PC1.	Disallow	reject
S147.024	Wellington Fish and Game Council	FS30.193	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Ltd	FS30.193	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Ltd	Method 32: Partnering with mana whenua / tangata whenua, and engaging with stakeholders, landowners and the community in the identification and protection of significant values	Oppose	B+LNZ generally oppose the submission on the grounds that's B+LNZ are seeking changes of the plan change are restricted to those necessary to give effect to the National Policy Statement for Urban Development and that any other matters should be subject to proper review in the Schedule full review of the RPS in 2024 and in the scheduled reviews of the Natural Resources Plan in 2023 and 2024. This is because the changes materially impact on communities, including rural communities and we do not consider that the necessary engagement has been undertaken to adequately inform these provisions or to meet the requirements of Part 3.2 of the NPS-FM. Furthermore, there is a risk that including matters relating to climate change and indigenous biodiversity before key national legislation is gazetted is premature and will lead to the inefficient implementation and confusion amongst those who it impacts materially.	Disallow That the submission be disallowed with the exception of 147.007	reject
S147.025	Wellington Fish and Game Council			S147.025	Wellington Fish and Game Council	Method 32: Partnering with mana whenua / tangata whenua, and engaging with stakeholders, landowners and the	Support in part	The suggested amendments to paragraph (c) and the suggested new paragraph (f) give effect to Policies 9 and 10 of the NPS-FM, which are not properly implemented in Proposed Change 1 as drafted.	Amend subclause: (c) identification and protection of indigenous ecosystems and habitats with significant biodiversity or other values, including those of significance to mana whenua / tangata whenua;	reject

S42A Appendix 2 - HS6 Indigenous Ecosystems - Summary Recommendation Table

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
						community in the identification and protection of significant values				
S147.025	Wellington Fish and Game Council	FS20.128	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	FS20.128	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	Method 32: Partnering with mana whenua / tangata whenua, and engaging with stakeholders, landowners and the community in the identification and protection of significant values	Oppose	Ātiawa do not support the rationale set out by Fish and Game, - indigenous ecosystems must be afforded the greatest protection above the protection of introduced ecosystems which already dominate te taiao, to the detriment of indigenous ecosystems. The relief sought by the submitter would like result in a status-quo outcome for indigenous ecosystems, Ātiawa are opposed to this outcome.	Disallow	Accept
S147.025	Wellington Fish and Game Council	FS19.089	Wellington Water Ltd ("Wellington Water")	FS19.089	Wellington Water Ltd ("Wellington Water")	Method 32: Partnering with mana whenua / tangata whenua, and engaging with stakeholders, landowners and the community in the identification and protection of significant values	Oppose	It is unnecessary and redundant to recreate NPSFM policies within the RPS. Most of the amendments sought do not in any event properly reflect the NPSFM. In particular, they do not accurately reflect the proviso to Policy 7, the requirements of clause 3.22, the limitation of Policy 10 to trout and salmon only, and the subservience of Policy 10 to Policy 9. Some of the amendments attempt to address matters that are already adequately covered by extant provisions or PC1 as notified. Some of the amendments undermine the more detailed content of PC1.	Disallow	Accept
S147.025	Wellington Fish and Game Council	FS30.194	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Ltd	FS30.194	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Ltd	Method 32: Partnering with mana whenua / tangata whenua, and engaging with stakeholders,	Oppose	B+LNZ generally oppose the submission on the grounds that's B+LNZ are seeking changes of the plan change are restricted to those necessary to give effect to the National Policy Statement for Urban Development and that any other matters should be subject to proper review in the Schedule full review of the RPS in 2024 and in the scheduled reviews of the Natural Resources Plan in 2023 and 2024. This is	Disallow That the submission be disallowed with the exception of 147.007	Accept

S42A Appendix 2 - HS6 Indigenous Ecosystems - Summary Recommendation Table

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
						landowners and the community in the identification and protection of significant values		because the changes materially impact on communities, including rural communities and we do not consider that the necessary engagement has been undertaken to adequately inform these provisions or to meet the requirements of Part 3.2 of the NPS-FM. Furthermore, there is a risk that including matters relating to climate change and indigenous biodiversity before key national legislation is gazetted is premature and will lead to the inefficient implementation and confusion amongst those who it impacts materially.		
S147.026	Wellington Fish and Game Council			S147.026	Wellington Fish and Game Council	Method 32: Partnering with mana whenua / tangata whenua, and engaging with stakeholders, landowners and the community in the identification and protection of significant values	Support in part	The suggested amendments to paragraph (c) and the suggested new paragraph (f) give effect to Policies 9 and 10 of the NPS-FM, which are not properly implemented in Proposed Change 1 as drafted.	New subclause: (f) identifying and protecting the habitats of indigenous freshwater species, trout and salmon	Reject
S147.026	Wellington Fish and Game Council	FS20.116	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	FS20.116	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	Method 32: Partnering with mana whenua / tangata whenua, and engaging with stakeholders, landowners and the community in the identification and protection of significant values	Oppose	Ātiawa do not support the relief sought where it relates to protecting habitats of trout and salmon without any provision. Ātiawa refer to Policy 9 and Policy 10 of the NPS-FM to support this statement, which affords indigenous freshwater species greater protection than trout and salmon. Additionally, Ātiawa do not support the protection of trout and salmon which have adverse impacts on indigenous ecosystems. Generally the management and decision making in regards to trout and salmon species has not been undertaken within a Treaty Partnership with mana whenua. To accept the relief sought by the submitter would be contrary to Te Tiriti o Waitangi and the national resource management direction.	Disallow the relief sought in so far as it relates to the protection of trout and salmon.	Accept
S147.026	Wellington Fish and Game Council	FS19.090	Wellington Water Ltd ("Wellington Water")	FS19.090	Wellington Water Ltd ("Wellington Water")	Method 32: Partnering with mana whenua /	Oppose	It is unnecessary and redundant to recreate NPSFM policies within the RPS. Most of the amendments sought do not in any event properly reflect the NPSFM. In particular, they do not	Disallow	Accept

S42A Appendix 2 - HS6 Indigenous Ecosystems - Summary Recommendation Table

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
						tangata whenua, and engaging with stakeholders, landowners and the community in the identification and protection of significant values		accurately reflect the proviso to Policy 7, the requirements of clause 3.22, the limitation of Policy 10 to trout and salmon only, and the subservience of Policy 10 to Policy 9. Some of the amendments attempt to address matters that are already adequately covered by extant provisions or PC1 as notified. Some of the amendments undermine the more detailed content of PC1.		
S147.026	Wellington Fish and Game Council	FS30.195	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Ltd	FS30.195	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Ltd	Method 32: Partnering with mana whenua / tangata whenua, and engaging with stakeholders, landowners and the community in the identification and protection of significant values	Oppose	B+LNZ generally oppose the submission on the grounds that's B+LNZ are seeking changes of the plan change are restricted to those necessary to give effect to the National Policy Statement for Urban Development and that any other matters should be subject to proper review in the Schedule full review of the RPS in 2024 and in the scheduled reviews of the Natural Resources Plan in 2023 and 2024. This is because the changes materially impact on communities, including rural communities and we do not consider that the necessary engagement has been undertaken to adequately inform these provisions or to meet the requirements of Part 3.2 of the NPS-FM. Furthermore, there is a risk that including matters relating to climate change and indigenous biodiversity before key national legislation is gazetted is premature and will lead to the inefficient implementation and confusion amongst those who it impacts materially.	Disallow That the submission be disallowed with the exception of 147.007	Accept in part
S163.093	Wairarapa Federated Farmers			S163.093	Wairarapa Federated Farmers	Method 32: Partnering with mana whenua / tangata whenua, and engaging with stakeholders, landowners and the community in the identification and protection of significant values	Oppose	Defer to the 2024 RPS review	That the amendments to Method 32 be deleted. Delete the FW icon	reject

S42A Appendix 2 - HS6 Indigenous Ecosystems - Summary Recommendation Table

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
S163.093	Wairarapa Federated Farmers	FS7.136	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society (Forest & Bird)	FS7.136	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society (Forest & Bird)	Method 32: Partnering with mana whenua / tangata whenua, and engaging with stakeholders, landowners and the community in the identification and protection of significant values	Oppose	It is completely appropriate to include climate change, biodiversity and freshwater provisions in the plan change. This plan change creates efficiency by considering multiple policy directives from central government. The amendments sought by Federated Farmers fail to give effect to the NPSFM, the NPS for Indigenous Biodiversity, for which there is an exposure draft and the final version is due out this month, and do not achieve the purpose of the RMA or the Climate Change Response (Zero Carbon) Amendment Act 2019.	Disallow whole submission	Accept in part
S163.093	Wairarapa Federated Farmers	FS20.258	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	FS20.258	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	Method 32: Partnering with mana whenua / tangata whenua, and engaging with stakeholders, landowners and the community in the identification and protection of significant values	Oppose	Ātiawa oppose the entire submission by Wairarapa Federated Farmers. The relief sought by Federated Farmers is to effectively delete the entire proposed plan change (except for submission points S163.083, S163.084). The basis for deleting the proposed plan change is to delay decision-making. Ātiawa do not accept that delaying responding to national direction is an appropriate course of action, and will further compound environmental and resource management issues.	Disallow the entire submission by Wairarapa Federated Farmers.	Accept in part
S163.093	Wairarapa Federated Farmers	FS29.109	Ngā Hapu o Otaki	FS29.109	Ngā Hapu o Otaki	Method 32: Partnering with mana whenua / tangata whenua, and engaging with stakeholders, landowners and the community in the identification and protection	Oppose	Section 18, page 4: General Comments – OPPOSE Section 25, Page 5 Going Forward – OPPOSE It is disheartening to see that Wairarapa Federated Farmers aren't capable of recognizing the obligations GWRC must maintain with Treaty Partners. It must be understood that Manawhenua are not simply 'groups of people' but a representation of the signatories that signed the Treaty of Waitangi and the original kaitiaki and custodians of the taonga in question when considering how these plan changes are implemented. Wairarapa Federated Farmers indicate a lack of awareness to the value of manawhenua engagement. Their stated 'aspirations of delivering environmental improvements alongside a thriving bio-economy'	Not stated	Accept in part

S42A Appendix 2 - HS6 Indigenous Ecosystems - Summary Recommendation Table

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
						of significant values		aren't feasible without considering the intergenerational insight and technical direction that only Mātauranga Māori can offer.		
S163.093	Wairarapa Federated Farmers	FS30.165	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Ltd	FS30.165	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Ltd	Method 32: Partnering with mana whenua / tangata whenua, and engaging with stakeholders, landowners and the community in the identification and protection of significant values	Support	B+LNZ agree that the scope of RPS PC1 should be restricted to those changes necessary to give effect to the National Policy Statement for Urban Development and that any other matters should be subject to proper review in the Schedule full review of the RPS in 2024 and in the scheduled reviews of the Natural Resources Plan in 2023 and 2024. Where alternative relief is provided, B+LNZ generally support this relief.	Allow	reject
S168.061	Rangitāne O Wairarapa Inc			S168.061	Rangitāne O Wairarapa Inc	Method 32: Partnering with mana whenua / tangata whenua, and engaging with stakeholders, landowners and the community in the identification and protection of significant values	Support	Rangitāne o Wairarapa support this method.	Retain as notified.	Accept in part
S168.061	Rangitāne O Wairarapa Inc	FS31.171	Sustainable Wairarapa Inc	FS31.171	Sustainable Wairarapa Inc	Method 32: Partnering with mana whenua / tangata whenua, and engaging with stakeholders, landowners and the community in	Support	Kia ora koutou, My name is Ian Gunn, Secretary Sustainable Wairarapa inc. contact # 021567134, address 4B McKay Street, Paraparaumu Beach 5032. Firstly we'd like to state the time frame provided to peruse over 900 pages of submissions is in our opinion an abuse of process. The benefit of further submissions is for you the council to listen and hear the views of its ratepayers. The timeframe in our case does not allow a rigorous review of the original submissions to council. On top of this we are a week before Christmas- a very busy and chaotic time for	Not stated	Accept in part

S42A Appendix 2 - HS6 Indigenous Ecosystems - Summary Recommendation Table

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
						the identification and protection of significant values		most members of the community. It is highly likely that the majority of staff will take leave over the Christmas break so analysis of any further submissions will not occur until late January 2023-so why the short period to respond. While there is due process there is also good practise your management of the further submissions fails the good practise model. As a consequence we would like you to note Sustainable Wairarapa's strong support of the original submissions lodged with council by the two Wairarapa Iwi-Ngati Kahungunu and Rangitane. Its clear that there is a poor understanding of nature based solutions this term needs further explanation. Sustainable Wairarapa acknowledges that while nature based solutions offer a wide variety of options its not the only solution. We are heartened by the widespread support for the original document. Thanks for an opportunity to make a further submission. Nga mihi nui Ian Gun		
S168.099	Rangitāne O Wairarapa Inc			S168.099	Rangitāne O Wairarapa Inc	Method 32: Partnering with mana whenua / tangata whenua, and engaging with stakeholders, landowners and the community in the identification and protection of significant values	Support	Rangitāne o Wairarapa support this method, particularly the partnership directive.	Retain as notified.	Accept in part
S168.099	Rangitāne O Wairarapa Inc	FS31.209	Sustainable Wairarapa Inc	FS31.209	Sustainable Wairarapa Inc	Method 32: Partnering with mana whenua / tangata whenua, and engaging with stakeholders, landowners and the community in the identification	Support	Kia ora koutou, My name is Ian Gunn, Secretary Sustainable Wairarapa inc. contact # 021567134, address 4B McKay Street, Paraparaumu Beach 5032. Firstly we'd like to state the time frame provided to peruse over 900 pages of submissions is in our opinion an abuse of process. The benefit of further submissions is for you the council to listen and hear the views of its ratepayers. The timeframe in our case does not allow a rigorous review of the original submissions to council. On top of this we are a week before Christmas- a very busy and chaotic time for most members of the community. It is highly likely that the majority of staff will take leave over the	Not stated	Awaiting recommendation

S42A Appendix 2 - HS6 Indigenous Ecosystems - Summary Recommendation Table

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
						and protection of significant values		Christmas break so analysis of any further submissions will not occur until late January 2023-so why the short period to respond. While there is due process there is also good practise your management of the further submissions fails the good practise model. As a consequence we would like you to note Sustainable Wairarapa's strong support of the original submissions lodged with council by the two Wairarapa Iwi-Ngati Kahungunu and Rangitane. Its clear that there is a poor understanding of nature based solutions this term needs further explanation. Sustainable Wairarapa acknowledges that while nature based solutions offer a wide variety of options its not the only solution. We are heartened by the widespread support for the original document. Thanks for an opportunity to make a further submission. Nga mihi nui Ian Gun		
S170.072	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangitira			S170.072	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangitira	Method 32: Partnering with mana whenua / tangata whenua, and engaging with stakeholders, landowners and the community in the identification and protection of significant values	Support in part	The content covered in the Method 32 is supported, however it is not clear the intention of the drafting in some places, such as, 'engaging with stakeholders, landowners and community'. This method could emphasize 'co-design of actions, policies and implementation' -it is not an exercise just regarding sites of significance to iwi and Māori.	Retain as notified.	Accept in part
S170.072	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangitira	FS29.186	Ngā Hapu o Otaki	FS29.186	Ngā Hapu o Otaki	Method 32: Partnering with mana whenua / tangata whenua, and engaging with stakeholders, landowners and the community in the identification and protection	Support	Co -design under a treaty house model is about shaping plans and resource management avenues alongside manawhenua that appropriately recognise the intergenerational prosperity of the uri of Ngā Hapu o Otaki and the wider community. There are ongoing concerns Ngā Hapu o Otaki maintain with GWRC in regard to the policies addressing Co-governance, Co-management, Co-leadership and Co-collabroative operational processes. This submission goes to great length to define where and how further considerations can be made recognising the interconnected nature of matauranga maori, the inequitable impact environmental decline will have on mana whenua/tangata whenua and offers insight to the intuitive and inherent awareness	Not stated	Accept in part

S42A Appendix 2 - HS6 Indigenous Ecosystems - Summary Recommendation Table

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
						of significant values		manawhenua need to maintain to ensure our intergenerational survival and prosperity. Objective 3: Lack of mana whenua / tangata whenua involvement in decision making – Support in principal FW Kaitiakitanga O1, O2, O3 – Support in principal Wai Mate O1,O2,O3 - Support in principal Climate Change and Freshwater objectives, CCFW-01, CCFW-02, CCFW-03, CCFW-04, CCFW-05, CCFW-06 This submission appropriately articulates Kaitiakitanga, FW objectives regarding Climate Change, Wai mate, Wai ora and the lack of provisions to see balanced decision making between Treaty Partners. Ngā Hapu o Otaki support Te Runanga o Toa Rangatira expression and wish to speak further to such views during the hearing process. We have serious concerns for the degradation of our taonga, in particular our wai. This combined with the projected growth the next generation will see means manawhenua resilience and agility to climate grief and environmental decline is paramount. Ngā Hapu o Otaki seek to support our whanaunga and other Manawhenua groups to build the provisions we will need to solidify our Tino Rangatiratanga and ensure our intergenerational prosperity.		
S115.0103	Hutt City Council			S115.0103	Hutt City Council	Method 32: Partnering with mana whenua / tangata whenua, and engaging with stakeholders, landowners and the community in the identification and protection of significant values	Oppose in part	Oppose the inclusion of non-regulatory policies and methods that apply to territorial authorities.	Amend Method 32 so that it does not apply to city and district councils.	reject
S131.0129	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust			S131.0129	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	Method 32: Partnering with mana whenua / tangata whenua, and engaging with	Support in part	While Ātiawa support the intent of Method 31, Ātiawa position is that partnering with mana whenua for the purposes of identifying and protecting significant values should be provided for separately to the stakeholders, landowners and the general public and community. Te Tiriti provides for the relationship and partnership	Method 32: Partnering with mana whenua / tangata whenua, and engaging with stakeholders, landowners and the community in the identification and protection of significant values	Accept

S42A Appendix 2 - HS6 Indigenous Ecosystems - Summary Recommendation Table

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
						stakeholders, landowners and the community in the identification and protection of significant values		between the crown, including local government and mana whenua. In order to uphold Te Tiriti, Regional Council must actively work in partnership with mana whenua to protect and provide for the relationship of mana whenua, their culture and traditions with their ancestral lands, water, sites, wāhi tapu and other taonga (as provided for as a matter of national importance in Part 2 of the RMA). It is not appropriate that stakeholders, landowners (unless Māori landowners) and the community identify places, sites and areas with significant cultural heritage values, or outstanding natural features and landscapes with significant cultural values, or identify indigenous ecosystems and habitats with significance to mana whenua, or mana whenua values associated with rivers and lakes. It is only mana whenua who can identify these sets of values. Ātiawa recognise that stakeholders, landowners and the community also have their own values associated with te taiao, and the collective action is required to protect and enhance te taiao.	Partner with iwi, hapū, marae and/or whānau, and engage with stakeholders, landowners and the community in the to:	
S131.0129	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	FS29.246	Ngā Hapu o Otaki	FS29.246	Ngā Hapu o Otaki	Method 32: Partnering with mana whenua / tangata whenua, and engaging with stakeholders, landowners and the community in the identification and protection of significant values	Support	Co -design under a treaty house model is about shaping plans and resource management avenues alongside manawhenua that appropriately recognise the intergenerational prosperity of the uri of Ngā Hapu o Otaki and the wider community. There are ongoing concerns Ngā Hapu o Otaki maintain with GWRC in regard to the policies addressing Co-governance, Co-management, Co-leadership and Co-collabroative operational processes. This submission goes to great length to define where and how further considerations can be made recognising the interconnected nature of matauranga maori, the inequitable impact environmental decline will have on mana whenua/tangata whenua and offers insight to the intuitive and inherent awareness manawhenua need to maintain to ensure our intergenerational survival and prosperity. 3.4 Freshwater including Public Access – Support in Principal 3.6 Indigenous Ecosystems – Support in Principal 3.9 Regional Form, Design and Function – Support in Principal Ātiawa views regarding Freshwater, indigenous ecosystems and Regional design and function resonate with insights Ngā Hapu o Otaki maintain. Ngā Hapu o Otaki would like opportunity to speak further to such	Not stated	Accept

S42A Appendix 2 - HS6 Indigenous Ecosystems - Summary Recommendation Table

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
								views during the hearing process. We share Ātiawas concerns for Mātauranga Māori as a foundation for equitable interchange of decision making. Their concerns regarding intensification and the further degradation of taonga across our coastline rings true to the ongoing journey we are on as manawhenua facing intense growth for the coming generation. We seek to join the conversation and endorse provisions that will see our whanaunga and other manawhenua groups recognise their environmental resilience and the cultural agility our shared whakapapa offers.		
S140.0106	Wellington City Council (WCC)			S140.0106	Wellington City Council (WCC)	Method 32: Partnering with mana whenua / tangata whenua, and engaging with stakeholders, landowners and the community in the identification and protection of significant values	Support	Support as proposed.	Retain as notified.	Accept in part
S165.0108	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society (Forest & Bird)			S165.0108	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society (Forest & Bird)	Method 32: Partnering with mana whenua / tangata whenua, and engaging with stakeholders, landowners and the community in the identification and protection of significant values	Support		Retain	Accept in part
S165.0108	Royal Forest and Bird Protection	FS30.319	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Ltd	FS30.319	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Ltd	Method 32: Partnering with mana	Oppose	B+LNZ generally oppose the submission on the grounds that's B+LNZ are seeking changes of the plan change are restricted to those necessary to give effect	Disallow	reject

S42A Appendix 2 - HS6 Indigenous Ecosystems - Summary Recommendation Table

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
	Society (Forest & Bird)					whenua / tangata whenua, and engaging with stakeholders, landowners and the community in the identification and protection of significant values		to the National Policy Statement for Urban Development and that any other matters should be subject to proper review in the Schedule full review of the RPS in 2024 and in the scheduled reviews of the Natural Resources Plan in 2023 and 2024. This is because the changes materially impact on communities, including rural communities and we do not consider that the necessary engagement has been undertaken to adequately inform these provisions or to meet the requirements of Part 3.2 of the NPS-FM. Furthermore, there is a risk that including matters relating to climate change and indigenous biodiversity before key national legislation is gazetted or implemented is premature and will lead to the inefficient implementation and confusion amongst those who it impacts materially.		
S167.0156	Taranaki Whānui			S167.0156	Taranaki Whānui	Method 32: Partnering with mana whenua / tangata whenua, and engaging with stakeholders, landowners and the community in the identification and protection of significant values	Support	Taranaki Whānui support the inclusion of this method and in particular note the requirement to partner with mana whenua. Taranaki Whānui want to indicate our intention to partner with council in these processes. We are keen to see assurances regarding the resourcing/funding and capability building of mana whenua in this work.	Retain as notified.	Accept in part
S34.077	Te Kaunihera o Te Awa Kairangi ki Uta, Upper Hutt City Council			S34.077	Te Kaunihera o Te Awa Kairangi ki Uta, Upper Hutt City Council	Method IE.2: Inventory of biodiversity offsetting and biodiversity compensation opportunities	Support	Council supports the targets being removed from proposed provision seen in the draft RPS.	Retain method as notified. Check text	Accept
S102.063	Te Tumu Paeroa Office of the Māori Trustee			S102.063	Te Tumu Paeroa Office of the Māori Trustee	Method IE.2: Inventory of biodiversity offsetting and biodiversity compensation opportunities	Support	Supports Method IE.2.	Retain as notified.	Accept

S42A Appendix 2 - HS6 Indigenous Ecosystems - Summary Recommendation Table

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
S147.099	Wellington Fish and Game Council			S147.099	Wellington Fish and Game Council	Method IE.2: Inventory of biodiversity offsetting and biodiversity compensation opportunities	Support in part	The suggested amendment follows from the suggested amendment to Objective 16, above, and is intended to give better effect to the NPS-FM (including Policy 10). While the protections of indigenous ecosystems and habitats is vital, so too is the maintaining and enhancing of the whole environment, including those containing valued introduced species. An unduly narrow indigenous - centric focus could lead to lessening or removal of protections for non-indigenous dominant systems, habitats, and species. The loss of protections, enhancements, and restorations risks adverse environmental effects and weakened climate change resilience for the region.	Amend. Partner with mana whenua / tangata whenua and stakeholders , and engage with interested parties to develop a regional inventory of opportunities for offsetting or compensating for any residual adverse effects on ecosystems and habitats with significant indigenous or valued introduced biodiversity values	reject
S147.099	Wellington Fish and Game Council	FS20.145	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	FS20.145	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	Method IE.2: Inventory of biodiversity offsetting and biodiversity compensation opportunities	Oppose	Ātiawa do not recognise Fish and Game as partners under Te Tiriti o Waitangi which is the basis for which the Council must partner with mana whenua.	Disallow	Accept in part
S147.099	Wellington Fish and Game Council	FS19.163	Wellington Water Ltd ("Wellington Water")	FS19.163	Wellington Water Ltd ("Wellington Water")	Method IE.2: Inventory of biodiversity offsetting and biodiversity compensation opportunities	Oppose	It is unnecessary and redundant to recreate NPSFM policies within the RPS. Most of the amendments sought do not in any event properly reflect the NPSFM. In particular, they do not accurately reflect the proviso to Policy 7, the requirements of clause 3.22, the limitation of Policy 10 to trout and salmon only, and the subservience of Policy 10 to Policy 9. Some of the amendments attempt to address matters that are already adequately covered by extant provisions or PC1 as notified. Some of the amendments undermine the more detailed content of PC1.	Disallow	Accept in part
S147.099	Wellington Fish and Game Council	FS30.268	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Ltd	FS30.268	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Ltd	Method IE.2: Inventory of biodiversity offsetting and biodiversity compensation opportunities	Oppose	B+LNZ generally oppose the submission on the grounds that's B+LNZ are seeking changes of the plan change are restricted to those necessary to give effect to the National Policy Statement for Urban Development and that any other matters should be subject to proper review in the Schedule full review of the RPS in 2024 and in the scheduled reviews of the Natural Resources Plan in 2023 and 2024. This is because the changes materially impact on communities, including rural communities and we do not consider that the necessary engagement has been undertaken to adequately inform these provisions or to meet the requirements of Part 3.2 of the NPS-FM.	Disallow That the submission be disallowed with the exception of 147.007	Accept in part

S42A Appendix 2 - HS6 Indigenous Ecosystems - Summary Recommendation Table

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
								Furthermore, there is a risk that including matters relating to climate change and indigenous biodiversity before key national legislation is gazetted is premature and will lead to the inefficient implementation and confusion amongst those who it impacts materially.		
S163.099	Wairarapa Federated Farmers			S163.099	Wairarapa Federated Farmers	Method IE.2: Inventory of biodiversity offsetting and biodiversity compensation opportunities	Oppose	Support the intent, however this can be progressed outside the RPS framework, ie, Method IE.2 is not a pre-condition for action.	That Method IE.2 be deleted. Delete the FW icon	Accept in part
S163.099	Wairarapa Federated Farmers	FS7.142	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society (Forest & Bird)	FS7.142	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society (Forest & Bird)	Method IE.2: Inventory of biodiversity offsetting and biodiversity compensation opportunities	Oppose	It is completely appropriate to include climate change, biodiversity and freshwater provisions in the plan change. This plan change creates efficiency by considering multiple policy directives from central government. The amendments sought by Federated Farmers fail to give effect to the NPSFM, the NPS for Indigenous Biodiversity, for which there is an exposure draft and the final version is due out this month, and do not achieve the purpose of the RMA or the Climate Change Response (Zero Carbon) Amendment Act 2019.	Disallow whole submission	Accept in part
S163.099	Wairarapa Federated Farmers	FS20.264	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	FS20.264	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	Method IE.2: Inventory of biodiversity offsetting and biodiversity compensation opportunities	Oppose	Ātiawa oppose the entire submission by Wairarapa Federated Farmers. The relief sought by Federated Farmers is to effectively delete the entire proposed plan change (except for submission points S163.083, S163.084). The basis for deleting the proposed plan change is to delay decision-making. Ātiawa do not accept that delaying responding to national direction is an appropriate course of action, and will further compound environmental and resource management issues.	Disallow the entire submission by Wairarapa Federated Farmers.	Accept in part
S163.099	Wairarapa Federated Farmers	FS29.115	Ngā Hapu o Otaki	FS29.115	Ngā Hapu o Otaki	Method IE.2: Inventory of biodiversity offsetting and biodiversity compensation opportunities	Oppose	Section 18, page 4: General Comments – OPPOSE Section 25, Page 5 Going Forward – OPPOSE It is disheartening to see that Wairarapa Federated Farmers aren't capable of recognizing the obligations GWRC must maintain with Treaty Partners. It must be understood that Manawhenua are not simply 'groups of people' but a representation of the signatories that signed the Treaty of Waitangi and the original kaitiaki and custodians of the taonga in question when considering how these plan changes are implemented. Wairarapa Federated Farmers indicate a lack of awareness to the value of manawhenua engagement. Their stated 'aspirations of delivering environmental improvements alongside a thriving bio-economy'	Not stated	Accept in part

S42A Appendix 2 - HS6 Indigenous Ecosystems - Summary Recommendation Table

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
								aren't feasible without considering the intergenerational insight and technical direction that only Mātauranga Māori can offer.		
S163.099	Wairarapa Federated Farmers	FS30.171	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Ltd	FS30.171	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Ltd	Method IE.2: Inventory of biodiversity offsetting and biodiversity compensation opportunities	Support	B+LNZ agree that the scope of RPS PC1 should be restricted to those changes necessary to give effect to the National Policy Statement for Urban Development and that any other matters should be subject to proper review in the Schedule full review of the RPS in 2024 and in the scheduled reviews of the Natural Resources Plan in 2023 and 2024. Where alternative relief is provided, B+LNZ generally support this relief.	Allow	reject
S115.0111	Hutt City Council			S115.0111	Hutt City Council	Method IE.2: Inventory of biodiversity offsetting and biodiversity compensation opportunities	Oppose	While indigenous biodiversity is a key issue, we expect the government to soon gazette a National Policy.	Delete Method IE.2	reject
S131.0139	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust			S131.0139	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	Method IE.2: Inventory of biodiversity offsetting and biodiversity compensation opportunities	Support in part	Ātiawa support partnering with mana whenua to develop an inventory of opportunities for biodiversity offsetting or biodiversity compensation. Ātiawa's position is that priority should be given to protecting, maintaining or enhancing biodiversity. Ātiawa seek that this partnership approach shall be enabled through funding and resourcing	Insert the following sentence to Method IE.2. Mana whenua are enabled to partner with the Regional Council through adequate funding and resourcing.	reject
S131.0139	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	FS29.257	Ngā Hapu o Otaki	FS29.257	Ngā Hapu o Otaki	Method IE.2: Inventory of biodiversity offsetting and biodiversity compensation opportunities	Support	Co-design under a treaty house model is about shaping plans and resource management avenues alongside manawhenua that appropriately recognise the intergenerational prosperity of the uri of Ngā Hapu o Otaki and the wider community. There are ongoing concerns Ngā Hapu o Otaki maintain with GWRC in regard to the policies addressing Co-governance, Co-management, Co-leadership and Co-collabroative operational processes. This submission goes to great length to define where and how further considerations can be made recognising the interconnected nature of matauranga maori, the inequitable impact environmental decline will have on mana whenua/tangata whenua and offers insight to the intuitive and inherent awareness manawhenua need to maintain to ensure our intergenerational survival and prosperity. 3.4 Freshwater including Public Access – Support in Principal 3.6 Indigenous Ecosystems – Support in Principal 3.9 Regional Form, Design and Function – Support in	Not stated	reject

S42A Appendix 2 - HS6 Indigenous Ecosystems - Summary Recommendation Table

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
								Principal Ātiawa views regarding Freshwater, indigenous ecosystems and Regional design and function resonate with insights Ngā Hapu o Otaki maintain. Ngā Hapu o Otaki would like opportunity to speak further to such views during the hearing process. We share Ātiawas concerns for Mātauranga Māori as a foundation for equitable interchange of decision making. Their concerns regarding intensification and the further degradation of taonga across our coastline rings true to the ongoing journey we are on as manawhenua facing intense growth for the coming generation. We seek to join the conversation and endorse provisions that will see our whanaunga and other manawhenua groups recognise their environmental resilience and the cultural agility our shared whakapapa offers.		
S140.0113	Wellington City Council (WCC)			S140.0113	Wellington City Council (WCC)	Method IE.2: Inventory of biodiversity offsetting and biodiversity compensation opportunities	Support in part	As City and District Councils are likely to be implementing the Indigenous Biodiversity effects management hierarchy, the inventory should be worked on collaboratively.	Amend to include City and District Councils.	Accept
S165.0147	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society (Forest & Bird)			S165.0147	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society (Forest & Bird)	Method IE.2: Inventory of biodiversity offsetting and biodiversity compensation opportunities	Oppose	An inventory of offsetting and compensation opportunities is not supported at the current time. Policy documents and institutional arrangements do not support such an inventory at the current time.	Delete Method IE.2 Consider replacing with a method that focusses on ecosystems that are restoration priorities for the Council, but that is not linked to offsetting and compensation, although it appears that this function is already fulfilled by the regional biodiversity strategy.	reject
S165.0147	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society (Forest & Bird)	FS20.099	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	FS20.099	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	Method IE.2: Inventory of biodiversity offsetting and biodiversity compensation opportunities	Oppose	As in our original submission, Ātiawa support partnering with mana whenua to develop an inventory of opportunities for biodiversity offsetting or biodiversity compensation. Ātiawa's position is that priority should be given to protecting, maintaining or enhancing biodiversity. Ātiawa seek that this partnership approach shall be enabled through funding and resourcing.	Disallow	Accept
S165.0147	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	FS30.319	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Ltd	FS30.319	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Ltd	Method IE.2: Inventory of biodiversity offsetting and	Oppose	B+LNZ generally oppose the submission on the grounds that's B+LNZ are seeking changes of the plan change are restricted to those necessary to give effect to the National Policy Statement for Urban	Disallow	Accept

S42A Appendix 2 - HS6 Indigenous Ecosystems - Summary Recommendation Table

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
	(Forest & Bird)					biodiversity compensation opportunities		Development and that any other matters should be subject to proper review in the Schedule full review of the RPS in 2024 and in the scheduled reviews of the Natural Resources Plan in 2023 and 2024. This is because the changes materially impact on communities, including rural communities and we do not consider that the necessary engagement has been undertaken to adequately inform these provisions or to meet the requirements of Part 3.2 of the NPS-FM. Furthermore, there is a risk that including matters relating to climate change and indigenous biodiversity before key national legislation is gazetted or implemented is premature and will lead to the inefficient implementation and confusion amongst those who it impacts materially.		
S167.0172	Taranaki Whānui			S167.0172	Taranaki Whānui	Method IE.2: Inventory of biodiversity offsetting and biodiversity compensation opportunities	Support in part	Taranaki Whānui support the inclusion of this method. In particular we note and support the requirement to work in partnership with mana whenua. We would like to see clear statements on the resourcing/funding and capability building of mana whenua partners included in the description. Taranaki Whānui want to indicate their intention to work in partnership with councils in the implementation of this method.	Retain as notified.	Accept
S168.0101	Rangitāne O Wairarapa Inc			S168.0101	Rangitāne O Wairarapa Inc	Method IE.2: Inventory of biodiversity offsetting and biodiversity compensation opportunities	Support	Rangitāne o Wairarapa support the inclusion of this method and the integration of partnership.	Retain as notified.	Accept
S168.0101	Rangitāne O Wairarapa Inc	FS31.026	Sustainable Wairarapa Inc	FS31.026	Sustainable Wairarapa Inc	Method IE.2: Inventory of biodiversity offsetting and biodiversity compensation opportunities	Support	Kia ora koutou, My name is Ian Gunn, Secretary Sustainable Wairarapa inc. contact # 021567134, address 4B McKay Street, Paraparaumu Beach 5032. Firstly we'd like to state the time frame provided to peruse over 900 pages of submissions is in our opinion an abuse of process. The benefit of further submissions is for you the council to listen and hear the views of its ratepayers. The timeframe in our case does not allow a rigorous review of the original submissions to council. On top of this we are a week before Christmas- a very busy and chaotic time for most members of the community. It is highly likely that the majority of staff will take leave over the Christmas break so analysis of any further submissions will not occur until late January 2023-so why the short	Not stated	Accept

S42A Appendix 2 - HS6 Indigenous Ecosystems - Summary Recommendation Table

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
								period to respond. While there is due process there is also good practise your management of the further submissions fails the good practise model. As a consequence we would like you to note Sustainable Wairarapa's strong support of the original submissions lodged with council by the two Wairarapa Iwi-Ngati Kahungunu and Rangitane. Its clear that there is a poor understanding of nature based solutions this term needs further explanation. Sustainable Wairarapa acknowledges that while nature based solutions offer a wide variety of options its not the only solution. We are heartened by the widespread support for the original document. Thanks for an opportunity to make a further submission. Nga mihi nui Ian Gun		
S34.076	Te Kaunihera o Te Awa Kairangi ki Uta, Upper Hutt City Council			S34.076	Te Kaunihera o Te Awa Kairangi ki Uta, Upper Hutt City Council	Method IE.3: Regional biodiversity strategy	Oppose in part	Council supports the intent to work in partnership with mana whenua regarding indigenous biodiversity, however it is inappropriate to do so prior to the NPS-IB being gazetted. Council is also concerned that the proposed non-regulatory method, appears to rely on a future regulatory process.	Delete method in its entirety and review once NPS-IB is gazetted.	reject
S129.044	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency			S129.044	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	Method IE.3: Regional biodiversity strategy	Support	Supports Method IE.3 and seek to be involved as a key stakeholder to ensure that the maintenance and operation of infrastructure is enabled.	Retain as notified.	Accept
S131.0140	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust			S131.0140	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	Method IE.3: Regional biodiversity strategy	Support in part	Ātiawa support intent of Method IE.3. Ātiawa seek that protection should also be included in the regional biodiversity strategy - protection of indigenous biodiversity from the impacts of development, use and subdivision should be considered as part of the framework for regional biodiversity strategy.	Develop and implement, in partnership with mana whenua / tangata whenua and in collaboration with territorial authorities, communities and other key stakeholders, a regional biodiversity strategy to protect , maintain and restore indigenous biodiversity at a Proposed Change 1 to the Regional Policy Statement for the Wellington Region August 2022 Page 190 of 228 landscape scale, incorporating both Mātauranga Māori and systematic conservation planning. Mana whenua are enabled to partner with the Regional Council through	Accept in part

S42A Appendix 2 - HS6 Indigenous Ecosystems - Summary Recommendation Table

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
									adequate funding and resourcing.	

S42A Appendix 2 - HS6 Indigenous Ecosystems - Summary Recommendation Table

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
S131.0141	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust			S131.0141	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	Method IE.3: Regional biodiversity strategy	Support in part	Ātiawa support intent of Method IE.3. Ātiawa seek that protection should also be included in the regional biodiversity strategy - protection of indigenous biodiversity from the impacts of development, use and subdivision should be considered as part of the framework for regional biodiversity strategy.	Develop and implement, in partnership with mana whenua / tangata whenua and in collaboration with territorial authorities, communities and other key stakeholders, a regional biodiversity strategy to protect , maintain and restore indigenous biodiversity at a Proposed Change 1 to the Regional Policy Statement for the Wellington Region August 2022 Page 190 of 228 landscape scale, incorporating both Mātauranga Māori and systematic conservation planning. Mana whenua are enabled to partner with the Regional Council through adequate funding and resourcing	Accept in part
S131.0141	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	FS29.260	Ngā Hapu o Otaki	FS29.260	Ngā Hapu o Otaki	Method IE.3: Regional biodiversity strategy	Support	Co -design under a treaty house model is about shaping plans and resource management avenues alongside manawhenua that appropriately recognise the intergenerational prosperity of the uri of Ngā Hapu o Otaki and the wider community. There are ongoing concerns Ngā Hapu o Otaki maintain with GWRC in regard to the policies addressing Co-governance, Co-management, Co-leadership and Co-collabroative operational processes. This submission goes to great length to define where and how further considerations can be made recognising the interconnected nature of matauranga maori, the inequitable impact environmental decline will have on mana whenua/tangata whenua and offers insight to the intuitive and inherent awareness manawhenua need to maintain to ensure our intergenerational survival and prosperity. 3.4 Freshwater including Public Access – Support in Principal 3.6 Indigenous Ecosystems – Support in Principal 3.9 Regional Form, Design and Function – Support in Principal Ātiawa views regarding Freshwater, indigenous ecosystems and Regional design and function resonate	Not stated	Accept in part

S42A Appendix 2 - HS6 Indigenous Ecosystems - Summary Recommendation Table

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
								with insights Ngā Hapu o Otaki maintain. Ngā Hapu o Otaki would like opportunity to speak further to such views during the hearing process. We share Ātiawas concerns for Mātauranga Māori as a foundation for equitable interchange of decision making. Their concerns regarding intensification and the further degradation of taonga across our coastline rings true to the ongoing journey we are on as manawhenua facing intense growth for the coming generation. We seek to join the conversation and endorse provisions that will see our whanaunga and other manawhenua groups recognise their environmental resilience and the cultural agility our shared whakapapa offers.		
S147.0100	Wellington Fish and Game Council			S147.0100	Wellington Fish and Game Council	Method IE.3: Regional biodiversity strategy	Support in part	The suggested amendment follows from the suggested amendment to Objective 16, above, and is intended to give better effect to the NPS-FM (including Policy 10). While the protections of indigenous ecosystems and habitats is vital, so too is the maintaining and enhancing of the whole environment, including those containing valued introduced species. An unduly narrow indigenous - centric focus could lead to lessening or removal of protections for non-indigenous dominant systems, habitats, and species. The loss of protections, enhancements, and restorations risks adverse environmental effects and weakened climate change resilience for the region.	Amend. Develop and implement, in partnership with mana whenua / tangata whenua and in collaboration with territorial authorities, communities and other key stakeholders, a regional biodiversity strategy to maintain and restore indigenous and valued introduced biodiversity at a landscape scale, incorporating both Mātauranga Māori and systematic conservation planning."	Reject
S147.0100	Wellington Fish and Game Council	FS20.143	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	FS20.143	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	Method IE.3: Regional biodiversity strategy	Oppose	Ātiawa do not support the rationale set out by Fish and Game, - indigenous ecosystems must be afforded the greatest protection above the protection of introduced ecosystems which already dominate te taiao, to the detriment of indigenous ecosystems. The relief sought by the submitter would like result in a status-quo outcome for indigenous ecosystems, Ātiawa are opposed to this outcome.	Disallow	Accept
S147.0100	Wellington Fish and Game Council	FS19.164	Wellington Water Ltd ("Wellington Water")	FS19.164	Wellington Water Ltd ("Wellington Water")	Method IE.3: Regional biodiversity strategy	Oppose	It is unnecessary and redundant to recreate NPSFM policies within the RPS. Most of the amendments sought do not in any event properly reflect the NPSFM. In particular, they do not accurately reflect the proviso to Policy 7, the requirements of clause 3.22, the limitation of Policy 10 to trout and salmon only, and the subservience of Policy 10 to Policy 9. Some of the amendments attempt to address matters	Disallow	Accept

S42A Appendix 2 - HS6 Indigenous Ecosystems - Summary Recommendation Table

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
								that are already adequately covered by extant provisions or PC1 as notified. Some of the amendments undermine the more detailed content of PC1.		
S147.0100	Wellington Fish and Game Council	FS30.269	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Ltd	FS30.269	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Ltd	Method IE.3: Regional biodiversity strategy	Oppose	B+LNZ generally oppose the submission on the grounds that's B+LNZ are seeking changes of the plan change are restricted to those necessary to give effect to the National Policy Statement for Urban Development and that any other matters should be subject to proper review in the Schedule full review of the RPS in 2024 and in the scheduled reviews of the Natural Resources Plan in 2023 and 2024. This is because the changes materially impact on communities, including rural communities and we do not consider that the necessary engagement has been undertaken to adequately inform these provisions or to meet the requirements of Part 3.2 of the NPS-FM. Furthermore, there is a risk that including matters relating to climate change and indigenous biodiversity before key national legislation is gazetted is premature and will lead to the inefficient implementation and confusion amongst those who it impacts materially.	Disallow That the submission be disallowed with the exception of 147.007	Accept in part
S163.0100	Wairarapa Federated Farmers			S163.0100	Wairarapa Federated Farmers	Method IE.3: Regional biodiversity strategy	Oppose	Defer biodiversity matters to the 2024 RPS review.	That Method IE.3 be deleted. Delete the FW icon	Accept in part
S163.0100	Wairarapa Federated Farmers	FS7.040	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society (Forest & Bird)	FS7.040	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society (Forest & Bird)	Method IE.3: Regional biodiversity strategy	Oppose	It is completely appropriate to include climate change, biodiversity and freshwater provisions in the plan change. This plan change creates efficiency by considering multiple policy directives from central government. The amendments sought by Federated Farmers fail to give effect to the NPSFM, the NPS for Indigenous Biodiversity, for which there is an exposure draft and the final version is due out this month, and do not achieve the purpose of the RMA or the Climate Change Response (Zero Carbon) Amendment Act 2019.	Disallow whole submission	Accept in part
S163.0100	Wairarapa Federated Farmers	FS20.162	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	FS20.162	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	Method IE.3: Regional biodiversity strategy	Oppose	Ātiawa oppose the entire submission by Wairarapa Federated Farmers. The relief sought by Federated Farmers is to effectively delete the entire proposed plan change (except for submission points S163.083, S163.084). The basis for deleting the proposed plan change is to delay decision-making. Ātiawa do not accept that delaying responding to national direction is an appropriate course of action, and will further compound environmental and resource management issues.	Disallow the entire submission by Wairarapa Federated Farmers.	Accept in part

S42A Appendix 2 - HS6 Indigenous Ecosystems - Summary Recommendation Table

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
S163.0100	Wairarapa Federated Farmers	FS29.013	Ngā Hapu o Otaki	FS29.013	Ngā Hapu o Otaki	Method IE.3: Regional biodiversity strategy	Oppose	Section 18, page 4: General Comments – OPPOSE Section 25, Page 5 Going Forward – OPPOSE It is disheartening to see that Wairarapa Federated Farmers aren't capable of recognizing the obligations GWRC must maintain with Treaty Partners. It must be understood that Manawhenua are not simply 'groups of people' but a representation of the signatories that signed the Treaty of Waitangi and the original kaitiaki and custodians of the taonga in question when considering how these plan changes are implemented. Wairarapa Federated Farmers indicate a lack of awareness to the value of manawhenua engagement. Their stated 'aspirations of delivering environmental improvements alongside a thriving bio-economy' aren't feasible without considering the intergenerational insight and technical direction that only Mātauranga Māori can offer.	Not stated	Accept in part
S163.0100	Wairarapa Federated Farmers	FS30.069	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Ltd	FS30.069	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Ltd	Method IE.3: Regional biodiversity strategy	Support	B+LNZ agree that the scope of RPS PC1 should be restricted to those changes necessary to give effect to the National Policy Statement for Urban Development and that any other matters should be subject to proper review in the Schedule full review of the RPS in 2024 and in the scheduled reviews of the Natural Resources Plan in 2023 and 2024. Where alternative relief is provided, B+LNZ generally support this relief.	Allow	reject
S165.0115	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society (Forest & Bird)			S165.0115	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society (Forest & Bird)	Method IE.3: Regional biodiversity strategy	Support in part	A regional biodiversity strategy should also refer to the requirement to protect indigenous biodiversity	Add the word "protect" before the word "maintain". Amend to make this a regulatory method.	reject
S165.0115	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society (Forest & Bird)	FS30.319	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Ltd	FS30.319	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Ltd	Method IE.3: Regional biodiversity strategy	Oppose	B+LNZ generally oppose the submission on the grounds that's B+LNZ are seeking changes of the plan change are restricted to those necessary to give effect to the National Policy Statement for Urban Development and that any other matters should be subject to proper review in the Schedule full review of the RPS in 2024 and in the scheduled reviews of the Natural Resources Plan in 2023 and 2024. This is because the changes materially impact on communities, including rural communities and we do not consider that the necessary engagement has been undertaken to adequately inform these provisions or to meet the requirements of Part 3.2 of the NPS-FM. Furthermore, there is a risk that including matters relating to climate change and indigenous biodiversity before key national legislation is gazetted or	Disallow	Accept

S42A Appendix 2 - HS6 Indigenous Ecosystems - Summary Recommendation Table

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
								implemented is premature and will lead to the inefficient implementation and confusion amongst those who it impacts materially.		
S167.0173	Taranaki Whānui			S167.0173	Taranaki Whānui	Method IE.3: Regional biodiversity strategy	Support	Taranaki Whānui support the inclusion of this method. In particular we note and support the requirement to work in partnership with mana whenua. We would like to see clear statements on the resourcing/funding and capability building of mana whenua partners included in the description. Taranaki Whānui want to indicate their intention to work in partnership with the regional council in the development and implementation of the regional biodiversity strategy.	Retain as notified.	Accept
S168.0102	Rangitāne O Wairarapa Inc			S168.0102	Rangitāne O Wairarapa Inc	Method IE.3: Regional biodiversity strategy	Support	Rangitāne o Wairarapa supports this method.	Retain as notified.	Accept
S168.0102	Rangitāne O Wairarapa Inc	FS31.027	Sustainable Wairarapa Inc	FS31.027	Sustainable Wairarapa Inc	Method IE.3: Regional biodiversity strategy	Support	Kia ora koutou, My name is Ian Gunn, Secretary Sustainable Wairarapa inc. contact # 021567134, address 4B McKay Street, Paraparaumu Beach 5032. Firstly we'd like to state the time frame provided to peruse over 900 pages of submissions is in our opinion an abuse of process. The benefit of further submissions is for you the council to listen and hear the views of its ratepayers. The timeframe in our case does not allow a rigorous review of the original submissions to council. On top of this we are a week before Christmas- a very busy and chaotic time for most members of the community. It is highly likely that the majority of staff will take leave over the Christmas break so analysis of any further submissions will not occur until late January 2023-so why the short period to respond. While there is due process there is also good practise your management of the further submissions fails the good practise model. As a consequence we would like you to note Sustainable Wairarapa's strong support of the original submissions lodged with council by the two Wairarapa Iwi-Ngati Kahungunu and Rangitane. Its clear that there is a poor understanding of nature based solutions this term needs further explanation. Sustainable Wairarapa acknowledges that while nature based solutions offer a wide variety of options its not the only solution. We are heartened by the widespread support for the original document. Thanks for an opportunity to make a further submission. Nga mihi nui Ian Gun	Not stated	Accept

S42A Appendix 2 - HS6 Indigenous Ecosystems - Summary Recommendation Table

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
S11.012	Outdoor Bliss Heather Blissett			S11.012	Outdoor Bliss Heather Blissett	Method 21: Identification and protection of indigenous ecosystems and habitats with significant indigenous biodiversity values	Support in part	Let community be part of the solution	Include community as part of the solutions	Accept in part
S30.094	Porirua City Council			S30.094	Porirua City Council	Method 21: Identification and protection of indigenous ecosystems and habitats with significant indigenous biodiversity values	Oppose	<p>Council supports this policy being timebound in principle. It has already been given effect to through our Proposed District Plan (PDP). However, Policy EI.1 requires a first principles approach to SNA identification and protection which would make it challenging for any council to meet this. The government has released an exposure draft of the NPS-IB which sets out additional requirements and a longer implementation timeframe. The RPS should align with these if/when the NPS-IB is gazetted. Wording change would increase clarity of method.</p>	<p>Amend method to either:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • remove 2025 time frame; or • align with NPS-IB timeframes once gazetted; or • provide for councils that have mapped and protected all SNA in their plan to give effect to this policy through their next full district plan review. <p>And /or reword policy as follows:</p> <p>The regional council will liaise with the region's territorial authorities to ensure that all district plans include, by 30 June 2025 at the latest, a schedule of indigenous ecosystems and habitats with significant indigenous biodiversity values and plan provisions to protect them from inappropriate subdivision, use and development</p> <p>Where a territorial authority has not initiated a district-wide indigenous biodiversity assessment has not been initiated by 30 June 2024, the regional council will liaise with the territorial authority to agree on a programme of works and an understanding</p>	Accept

S42A Appendix 2 - HS6 Indigenous Ecosystems - Summary Recommendation Table

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
									as to whether: (a) the territorial authority shall continue to have sole responsibility; or (b) the regional council shall take full responsibility; or (c) the territorial authority and the regional council shall share responsibilities	
S30.094	Porirua City Council	FS25.127	Peka Peka Farm Limited	FS25.127	Peka Peka Farm Limited	Method 21: Identification and protection of indigenous ecosystems and habitats with significant indigenous biodiversity values	Support	The submission provides a comprehensive analysis of the proposed change including in relation to matters of scope and jurisdiction. It is supported without prejudice to the specific relief sought in the primary submission or this further submission by Peka Peka Farm Ltd.	Allow	Accept
S34.074	Te Kaunihera o Te Awa Kairangi ki Uta, Upper Hutt City Council			S34.074	Te Kaunihera o Te Awa Kairangi ki Uta, Upper Hutt City Council	Method 21: Identification and protection of indigenous ecosystems and habitats with significant indigenous biodiversity values	Oppose	Council fundamentally disagrees with going ahead in advance of NPS-IB being gazetted but notes that Council may be interested in working with regional council if the provision remains.	Retain as operationally written and review once NPS-IB has been gazetted.	Accept
S79.051	South Wairarapa District Council			S79.051	South Wairarapa District Council	Method 21: Identification and protection of indigenous ecosystems and habitats with significant indigenous biodiversity values	Support	The Wairarapa Combined District Plan already identifies and protects SNA's. However, further review and ground truthing is estimated to cost approximately \$600,000. As noted in our submission above, this equates to an approximate 3% rates increase above the already significant increases SWDC has already set. As above, the timeframe means that this work is current unfunded and would need to go through the LTP cycle. The work would have to be completed in a very short timetable assuming it could be funded. Council wishes to discuss passing this responsibility to GWRC.	Retain as notified	Accept in part
S115.0112	Hutt City Council			S115.0112	Hutt City Council	Method 21: Identification	Oppose	Statement on Indigenous Biodiversity ("NPS-IB"). The proposed provisions may well conflict with the NPS-IB	Retain existing Operative Method 21.	Accept in part

S42A Appendix 2 - HS6 Indigenous Ecosystems - Summary Recommendation Table

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
						and protection of indigenous ecosystems and habitats with significant indigenous biodiversity values		especially with regards to the process for identifying indigenous ecosystems. We request that all provisions relating to indigenous biodiversity be deleted and if regional direction is thought necessary after the NPS-IB is gazetted, that should occur through a variation or a separate policy statement change.	Failing that, amend the deadline from 30 June 2025 to 5 years after RPS Change1 becomes operative.	
S131.0142	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust			S131.0142	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	Method 21: Identification and protection of indigenous ecosystems and habitats with significant indigenous biodiversity values	Support	While Ātiawa supports the intent of Method 21, Ātiawa seek to partner with Regional Council in the development of a schedule of indigenous ecosystems and habitats with significant indigenous biodiversity values. This will ensure that mana whenua are included in the decision making process in regards to land with indigenous ecosystems and habitats that is held under Te Ture Whenua Māori Act 1993 and general title held by Māori. It also ensures mana whenua values are provided for in the development of the schedule.	The Regional Council will liaise with the region's territorial authorities and partner with mana whenua to ensure that all district plans include, by 30 June 2025 at the latest, a schedule of indigenous ecosystems and habitats with significant indigenous biodiversity values and plan provisions to protect them from inappropriate subdivision, use and development. Where a district-wide indigenous biodiversity assessment has not been initiated by 30 June 2024, the Regional Council will liaise with the territorial authority to agree on a programme of works and an understanding as to whether: (a) the territorial authority shall continue to have sole responsibility; or (b) the Regional Council shall take full responsibility; or (c) the territorial authority and the Regional Council shall share responsibilities. Mana whenua are enabled to partner with the Regional Council through adequate funding and resourcing.	Accept in part
S131.0142	Ātiawa ki Whakarongot	FS29.261	Ngā Hapu o Otaki	FS29.261	Ngā Hapu o Otaki	Method 21: Identification	Support	Co-design under a treaty house model is about shaping plans and resource management avenues	Not stated	Accept in part

S42A Appendix 2 - HS6 Indigenous Ecosystems - Summary Recommendation Table

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
	ai Charitable Trust					and protection of indigenous ecosystems and habitats with significant indigenous biodiversity values		<p>alongside manawhenua that appropriately recognise the intergenerational prosperity of the uri of Ngā Hapu o Otaki and the wider community.</p> <p>There are ongoing concerns Ngā Hapu o Otaki maintain with GWRC in regard to the policies addressing Co-governance, Co-management, Co-leadership and Co-collabroative operational processes. This submission goes to great length to define where and how further considerations can be made recognising the interconnected nature of matauranga maori, the inequitable impact environmental decline will have on mana whenua/tangata whenua and offers insight to the intuitive and inherent awareness manawhenua need to maintain to ensure our intergenerational survival and prosperity.</p> <p>3.4 Freshwater including Public Access – Support in Principal</p> <p>3.6 Indigenous Ecosystems – Support in Principal</p> <p>3.9 Regional Form, Design and Function – Support in Principal</p> <p>Ātiawa views regarding Freshwater, indigenous ecosystems and Regional design and function resonate with insights Ngā Hapu o Otaki maintain. Ngā Hapu o Otaki would like opportunity to speak further to such views during the hearing process. We share Ātiawas concerns for Mātauranga Māori as a foundation for equitable interchange of decision making. Their concerns regarding intensification and the further degradation of taonga across our coastline rings true to the ongoing journey we are on as manawhenua facing intense growth for the coming generation. We seek to join the conversation and endorse provisions that will see our whanaunga and other manawhenua groups recognise their environmental resilience and the cultural agility our shared whakapapa offers.</p>		
S140.0114	Wellington City Council (WCC)			S140.0114	Wellington City Council (WCC)	Method 21: Identification and protection of indigenous ecosystems and habitats with significant indigenous biodiversity values	Support	Support as proposed.	Retain as notified.	Accept in part

S42A Appendix 2 - HS6 Indigenous Ecosystems - Summary Recommendation Table

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
S147.0101	Wellington Fish and Game Council			S147.0101	Wellington Fish and Game Council	Method 21: Identification and protection of indigenous ecosystems and habitats with significant indigenous biodiversity values	Support	Necessary to implement the NPS-FM.	Retain as notified.	Accept in part
S147.0101	Wellington Fish and Game Council	FS19.165	Wellington Water Ltd ("Wellington Water")	FS19.165	Wellington Water Ltd ("Wellington Water")	Method 21: Identification and protection of indigenous ecosystems and habitats with significant indigenous biodiversity values	Oppose	It is unnecessary and redundant to recreate NPSFM policies within the RPS. Most of the amendments sought do not in any event properly reflect the NPSFM. In particular, they do not accurately reflect the proviso to Policy 7, the requirements of clause 3.22, the limitation of Policy 10 to trout and salmon only, and the subservience of Policy 10 to Policy 9. Some of the amendments attempt to address matters that are already adequately covered by extant provisions or PC1 as notified. Some of the amendments undermine the more detailed content of PC1.	Disallow	reject
S147.0101	Wellington Fish and Game Council	FS30.270	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Ltd	FS30.270	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Ltd	Method 21: Identification and protection of indigenous ecosystems and habitats with significant indigenous biodiversity values	Oppose	B+LNZ generally oppose the submission on the grounds that's B+LNZ are seeking changes of the plan change are restricted to those necessary to give effect to the National Policy Statement for Urban Development and that any other matters should be subject to proper review in the Schedule full review of the RPS in 2024 and in the scheduled reviews of the Natural Resources Plan in 2023 and 2024. This is because the changes materially impact on communities, including rural communities and we do not consider that the necessary engagement has been undertaken to adequately inform these provisions or to meet the requirements of Part 3.2 of the NPS-FM. Furthermore, there is a risk that including matters relating to climate change and indigenous biodiversity before key national legislation is gazetted is premature and will lead to the inefficient implementation and confusion amongst those who it impacts materially.	Disallow That the submission be disallowed with the exception of 147.007	reject
S165.0116	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society			S165.0116	Royal Forest and Bird Protection	Method 21: Identification and protection of	Support in part		Amend as follows: The regional council will liaise with the region's territorial authorities to ensure that all	reject

S42A Appendix 2 - HS6 Indigenous Ecosystems - Summary Recommendation Table

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
	(Forest & Bird)				Society (Forest & Bird)	indigenous ecosystems and habitats with significant indigenous biodiversity values			district plans include, as soon as possible, and in any event no later than 30 June 2025 at the latest, a schedule of indigenous ecosystems and habitats with significant indigenous biodiversity values and plan provisions to protect them from inappropriate subdivision, use and development. Add the words "as soon as possible, and in any event no later than" before the words "30 June 2025" Amend to make this a regulatory method.	
S165.0116	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society (Forest & Bird)	FS30.319	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Ltd	FS30.319	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Ltd	Method 21: Identification and protection of indigenous ecosystems and habitats with significant indigenous biodiversity values	Oppose	B+LNZ generally oppose the submission on the grounds that's B+LNZ are seeking changes of the plan change are restricted to those necessary to give effect to the National Policy Statement for Urban Development and that any other matters should be subject to proper review in the Schedule full review of the RPS in 2024 and in the scheduled reviews of the Natural Resources Plan in 2023 and 2024. This is because the changes materially impact on communities, including rural communities and we do not consider that the necessary engagement has been undertaken to adequately inform these provisions or to meet the requirements of Part 3.2 of the NPS-FM. Furthermore, there is a risk that including matters relating to climate change and indigenous biodiversity before key national legislation is gazetted or implemented is premature and will lead to the inefficient implementation and confusion amongst those who it impacts materially.	Disallow	Accept
S167.0174	Taranaki Whānui			S167.0174	Taranaki Whānui	Method 21: Identification and protection of indigenous ecosystems and habitats with significant indigenous	Support	Taranaki Whānui supports this method as part of the implementation of Policy 23. Taranaki Whānui seek to partner with the regional council in the development of this schedule of indigenous ecosystems and habitats.	Retain as notified.	Accept

S42A Appendix 2 - HS6 Indigenous Ecosystems - Summary Recommendation Table

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
						biodiversity values				
S163.0103	Wairarapa Federated Farmers	FS30.072	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Ltd	FS30.072	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Ltd	Method CC.9: Support and funding for protecting, enhancing, and restoring indigenous ecosystems and nature-based solutions	Support	B+LNZ agree that the scope of RPS PC1 should be restricted to those changes necessary to give effect to the National Policy Statement for Urban Development and that any other matters should be subject to proper review in the Schedule full review of the RPS in 2024 and in the scheduled reviews of the Natural Resources Plan in 2023 and 2024. Where alternative relief is provided, B+LNZ generally support this relief.	Allow	reject
S147.083	Wellington Fish and Game Council			S147.083	Wellington Fish and Game Council	Method IE.4: Kaitiaki indigenous biodiversity monitoring	Support	Look forward to working in partnership with tangata whenua and support resourcing of kaitiaki programmes to assist in achieving positive environmental outcomes for our valued freshwater species.	Retain as notified.	Accept
S147.083	Wellington Fish and Game Council	FS19.147	Wellington Water Ltd ("Wellington Water")	FS19.147	Wellington Water Ltd ("Wellington Water")	Method IE.4: Kaitiaki indigenous biodiversity monitoring	Oppose	It is unnecessary and redundant to recreate NPSFM policies within the RPS. Most of the amendments sought do not in any event properly reflect the NPSFM. In particular, they do not accurately reflect the proviso to Policy 7, the requirements of clause 3.22, the limitation of Policy 10 to trout and salmon only, and the subservience of Policy 10 to Policy 9. Some of the amendments attempt to address matters that are already adequately covered by extant provisions or PC1 as notified. Some of the amendments undermine the more detailed content of PC1.	Disallow	reject
S147.083	Wellington Fish and Game Council	FS30.252	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Ltd	FS30.252	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Ltd	Method IE.4: Kaitiaki indigenous biodiversity monitoring	Oppose	B+LNZ generally oppose the submission on the grounds that's B+LNZ are seeking changes of the plan change are restricted to those necessary to give effect to the National Policy Statement for Urban Development and that any other matters should be subject to proper review in the Schedule full review of the RPS in 2024 and in the scheduled reviews of the Natural Resources Plan in 2023 and 2024. This is because the changes materially impact on communities, including rural communities and we do not consider that the necessary engagement has been undertaken to adequately inform these provisions or to meet the requirements of Part 3.2 of the NPS-FM. Furthermore, there is a risk that including matters relating to climate change and indigenous biodiversity before key national legislation is gazetted is premature	Disallow That the submission be disallowed with the exception of 147.007	reject

S42A Appendix 2 - HS6 Indigenous Ecosystems - Summary Recommendation Table

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
								and will lead to the inefficient implementation and confusion amongst those who it impacts materially.		
S170.076	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira			S170.076	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	Method IE.4: Kaitiaki indigenous biodiversity monitoring	Not Stated / Neutral	Method IE3 Kaitiaki indigenous biodiversity monitoring programme This is connected throughout the plan; kaitiaki monitoring is not intended just for biodiversity; the theme needs to spread throughout all areas of taiao. It has not been consistently applied the same language provided here in this method as it needs to be coming across all the RPS. The word 'support' mana whenua can be redrafted to say, 'ensure Mana Whenua has sufficient resources to establish a mana whenua kaitiaki monitoring programme to monitor the health of the region's indigenous biodiversity.' Note that comments made above, the kaitiaki monitoring does not just apply to indigenous biodiversity and the method should speak to how this is incorporated to the GWRC monitoring frameworks.	Amend the word 'support' to say, 'ensure Mana Whenua has sufficient resources to establish a mana whenua kaitiaki monitoring programme to monitor the health of the region's indigenous biodiversity.' Kaitiaki monitoring shouldn't just be in relation to biodiversity.	reject
S170.076	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	FS29.190	Ngā Hapu o Otaki	FS29.190	Ngā Hapu o Otaki	Method IE.4: Kaitiaki indigenous biodiversity monitoring	Support	Co -design under a treaty house model is about shaping plans and resource management avenues alongside manawhenua that appropriately recognise the intergenerational prosperity of the uri of Ngā Hapu o Otaki and the wider community. There are ongoing concerns Ngā Hapu o Otaki maintain with GWRC in regard to the policies addressing Co-governance, Co-management, Co-leadership and Co-collabroative operational processes. This submission goes to great length to define where and how further considerations can be made recognising the interconnected nature of matauranga maori, the inequitable impact environmental decline will have on mana whenua/tangata whenua and offers insight to the intuitive and inherent awareness manawhenua need to maintain to ensure our intergenerational survival and prosperity. Objective 3: Lack of mana whenua / tangata whenua involvement in decision making – Support in principal FW Kaitiakitanga O1, O2, O3 – Support in principal Wai Mate O1,O2,O3 - Support in principal Climate Change and Freshwater objectives, CCFW-01, CCFW-02, CCFW-03, CCFW-04, CCFW-05, CCFW-06 This submission appropriately articulates Kaitiakitanga, FW objectives regarding Climate Change, Wai mate, Wai ora and the lack of provisions to see balanced decision making between Treaty Partners. Ngā Hapu o Otaki support Te Runanga o Toa Rangatira expression and wish to speak further to such views during the	Not stated	reject

S42A Appendix 2 - HS6 Indigenous Ecosystems - Summary Recommendation Table

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
								hearing process. We have serious concerns for the degradation of our taonga, in particular our wai. This combined with the projected growth the next generation will see means manawhenua resilience and agility to climate grief and environmental decline is paramount. Ngā Hapu o Otaki seek to support our whanaunga and other Manawhenua groups to build the provisions we will need to solidify our Tino Rangatiratanga and ensure our intergenerational prosperity.		
S131.0147	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust			S131.0147	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	Method IE.4: Kaitiaki indigenous biodiversity monitoring	Support	Ātiawa support Method IE.4. Ātiawa seek that Regional Council provide for this partnership through adequate funding and resourcing.	Insert the following sentence to Method IE.4: Mana whenua are enabled to partner with the Regional Council through adequate funding and resourcing.	reject
S131.0147	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	FS29.266	Ngā Hapu o Otaki	FS29.266	Ngā Hapu o Otaki	Method IE.4: Kaitiaki indigenous biodiversity monitoring	Support	Co -design under a treaty house model is about shaping plans and resource management avenues alongside manawhenua that appropriately recognise the intergenerational prosperity of the uri of Ngā Hapu o Otaki and the wider community. There are ongoing concerns Ngā Hapu o Otaki maintain with GWRC in regard to the policies addressing Co-governance, Co-management, Co-leadership and Co-collabroative operational processes. This submission goes to great length to define where and how further considerations can be made recognising the interconnected nature of matauranga maori, the inequitable impact environmental decline will have on mana whenua/tangata whenua and offers insight to the intuitive and inherent awareness manawhenua need to maintain to ensure our intergenerational survival and prosperity. 3.4 Freshwater including Public Access – Support in Principal 3.6 Indigenous Ecosystems – Support in Principal 3.9 Regional Form, Design and Function – Support in Principal Ātiawa views regarding Freshwater, indigenous ecosystems and Regional design and function resonate with insights Ngā Hapu o Otaki maintain. Ngā Hapu o Otaki would like opportunity to speak further to such views during the hearing process. We share Ātiawas concerns for Mātauranga Māori as a foundation for equitable interchange of decision making. Their concerns regarding intensification and the further degradation of taonga across our coastline rings true	Not stated	Reject

S42A Appendix 2 - HS6 Indigenous Ecosystems - Summary Recommendation Table

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
								to the ongoing journey we are on as manawhenua facing intense growth for the coming generation. We seek to join the conversation and endorse provisions that will see our whanaunga and other manawhenua groups recognise their environmental resilience and the cultural agility our shared whakapapa offers.		
S165.0121	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society (Forest & Bird)			S165.0121	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society (Forest & Bird)	Method IE.4: Kaitiaki indigenous biodiversity monitoring	Support		Retain	Accept
S165.0121	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society (Forest & Bird)	FS20.080	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	FS20.080	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	Method IE.4: Kaitiaki indigenous biodiversity monitoring	Support	Ātiawa support this submission point.	Allow	Accept
S165.0121	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society (Forest & Bird)	FS30.319	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Ltd	FS30.319	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Ltd	Method IE.4: Kaitiaki indigenous biodiversity monitoring	Oppose	B+LNZ generally oppose the submission on the grounds that's B+LNZ are seeking changes of the plan change are restricted to those necessary to give effect to the National Policy Statement for Urban Development and that any other matters should be subject to proper review in the Schedule full review of the RPS in 2024 and in the scheduled reviews of the Natural Resources Plan in 2023 and 2024. This is because the changes materially impact on communities, including rural communities and we do not consider that the necessary engagement has been undertaken to adequately inform these provisions or to meet the requirements of Part 3.2 of the NPS-FM. Furthermore, there is a risk that including matters relating to climate change and indigenous biodiversity before key national legislation is gazetted or implemented is premature and will lead to the inefficient implementation and confusion amongst those who it impacts materially.	Disallow	reject
S167.0179	Taranaki Whānui			S167.0179	Taranaki Whānui	Method IE.4: Kaitiaki indigenous biodiversity monitoring	Support	Taranaki Whānui support this new method. Taranaki Whānui note the clear mention of partnership and resourcing. Taranaki Whānui are keen to work with the regional council and to develop our kaitiaki monitoring programme.	Retain as notified.	Accept
S168.0103	Rangitāne O Wairarapa Inc			S168.0103	Rangitāne O Wairarapa Inc	Method IE.4: Kaitiaki indigenous	Support	Rangitāne o Wairarapa supports this method, particularly the partnership directive.	Retain as notified.	Accept

S42A Appendix 2 - HS6 Indigenous Ecosystems - Summary Recommendation Table

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
						biodiversity monitoring				
S168.0103	Rangitāne O Wairarapa Inc	FS31.028	Sustainable Wairarapa Inc	FS31.028	Sustainable Wairarapa Inc	Method IE.4: Kaitiaki indigenous biodiversity monitoring	Support	Kia ora koutou, My name is Ian Gunn, Secretary Sustainable Wairarapa inc. contact # 021567134, address 4B McKay Street, Paraparaumu Beach 5032. Firstly we'd like to state the time frame provided to peruse over 900 pages of submissions is in our opinion an abuse of process. The benefit of further submissions is for you the council to listen and hear the views of its ratepayers. The timeframe in our case does not allow a rigorous review of the original submissions to council. On top of this we are a week before Christmas- a very busy and chaotic time for most members of the community. It is highly likely that the majority of staff will take leave over the Christmas break so analysis of any further submissions will not occur until late January 2023-so why the short period to respond. While there is due process there is also good practise your management of the further submissions fails the good practise model. As a consequence we would like you to note Sustainable Wairarapa's strong support of the original submissions lodged with council by the two Wairarapa Iwi-Ngati Kahungunu and Rangitane. Its clear that there is a poor understanding of nature based solutions this term needs further explanation. Sustainable Wairarapa acknowledges that while nature based solutions offer a wide variety of options its not the only solution. We are heartened by the widespread support for the original document. Thanks for an opportunity to make a further submission. Nga mihi nui Ian Gun	Not stated	Accept
S102.087	Te Tumu Paeroa Office of the Māori Trustee			S102.087	Te Tumu Paeroa Office of the Māori Trustee	Method 53: Support mana whenua / tangata whenua and community restoration initiatives for indigenous ecosystems	Support	Generally supports the methods to implement for the 'Coastal Environment' chapter.	Retain as notified.	Accept
S123.012	Peter Thompson			S123.012	Peter Thompson	Method 53: Support mana whenua / tangata whenua and	Support	Partnering is very important in this space	Retain as notified.	Accept

S42A Appendix 2 - HS6 Indigenous Ecosystems - Summary Recommendation Table

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
						community restoration initiatives for indigenous ecosystems				
S144.017	Sustainable Wairarapa Inc			S144.017	Sustainable Wairarapa Inc	Method 53: Support mana whenua / tangata whenua and community restoration initiatives for indigenous ecosystems	Support	Partnering is very important in this space	Retain as notified.	Accept
S147.014	Wellington Fish and Game Council			S147.014	Wellington Fish and Game Council	Method 53: Support mana whenua / tangata whenua and community restoration initiatives for indigenous ecosystems	Oppose	Proposed Change 1 to replace "coastal environment, rivers, lakes and wetlands" with "indigenous ecosystems" in Method 53 is unclear and inappropriately narrow. It is also unnecessary to give effect to the NPS-FM. Restricting Method 53 to "indigenous ecosystems" excludes the habitats of valued introduced species such as trout, salmon, and gamebirds. Narrowing the focus of Method 53 as proposed: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • will introduce potential adverse environmental effects (such as trophic cascades); • adopts a values-based approach to policies and management rather than science based; and • does not give effect to Policy 10 of the NPS-FM 	Retain original drafting without changes in Proposed Change 1. OR Amend to read: "Support mana whenua/tangata whenua and community restoration initiatives for indigenous coastal and freshwater ecosystems."	Accept
S147.014	Wellington Fish and Game Council	FS19.078	Wellington Water Ltd ("Wellington Water")	FS19.078	Wellington Water Ltd ("Wellington Water")	Method 53: Support mana whenua / tangata whenua and community restoration initiatives for indigenous ecosystems	Oppose	It is unnecessary and redundant to recreate NPSFM policies within the RPS. Most of the amendments sought do not in any event properly reflect the NPSFM. In particular, they do not accurately reflect the proviso to Policy 7, the requirements of clause 3.22, the limitation of Policy 10 to trout and salmon only, and the subservience of Policy 10 to Policy 9. Some of the amendments attempt to address matters that are already adequately covered by extant provisions or PC1 as notified. Some of the amendments undermine the more detailed content of PC1.	Disallow	reject
S147.014	Wellington Fish and Game Council	FS30.183	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Ltd	FS30.183	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Ltd	Method 53: Support mana whenua / tangata whenua and	Oppose	B+LNZ generally oppose the submission on the grounds that's B+LNZ are seeking changes of the plan change are restricted to those necessary to give effect to the National Policy Statement for Urban Development and that any other matters should be	Disallow That the submission be disallowed with the exception of 147.007	reject

S42A Appendix 2 - HS6 Indigenous Ecosystems - Summary Recommendation Table

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
						community restoration initiatives for indigenous ecosystems		subject to proper review in the Schedule full review of the RPS in 2024 and in the scheduled reviews of the Natural Resources Plan in 2023 and 2024. This is because the changes materially impact on communities, including rural communities and we do not consider that the necessary engagement has been undertaken to adequately inform these provisions or to meet the requirements of Part 3.2 of the NPS-FM. Furthermore, there is a risk that including matters relating to climate change and indigenous biodiversity before key national legislation is gazetted is premature and will lead to the inefficient implementation and confusion amongst those who it impacts materially.		
S166.069	Masterton District Council			S166.069	Masterton District Council	Method 53: Support mana whenua / tangata whenua and community restoration initiatives for indigenous ecosystems	Support	A healthy natural environment is a key tool in creating a climate resilient district so we are supportive of this method.	Retain as notified.	Accept
S115.0113	Hutt City Council			S115.0113	Hutt City Council	Method 53: Support mana whenua / tangata whenua and community restoration initiatives for indigenous ecosystems	Oppose in part	Oppose the inclusion of non-regulatory policies and methods that apply to territorial authorities.	Amend Method 53 so that it does not apply to city and district councils.	reject
S131.0148	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust			S131.0148	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	Method 53: Support mana whenua / tangata whenua and community restoration initiatives for indigenous ecosystems	Support in part	Ātiawa support the principle of enabling partnership models for mana whenua through support such as funding. Ātiawa have sought that a clause that effectively seeks funding for mana whenua be included to all relevant methods. Ātiawa prefer that this clause be included in relevant methods, rather than the approach of Method 53, to ensure that funding occurs and is explicitly provided for.	Include the following clause to all methods that seek to partner with mana whenua: Mana whenua are enabled to partner with the Regional Council through adequate funding and resourcing	reject
S131.0148	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	FS29.267	Ngā Hapu o Otaki	FS29.267	Ngā Hapu o Otaki	Method 53: Support mana whenua / tangata	Support	Co-design under a treaty house model is about shaping plans and resource management avenues alongside manawhenua that appropriately recognise the intergenerational prosperity of the uri of Ngā Hapu	Not stated	reject

S42A Appendix 2 - HS6 Indigenous Ecosystems - Summary Recommendation Table

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
						whenua and community restoration initiatives for indigenous ecosystems		<p>o Otaki and the wider community.</p> <p>There are ongoing concerns Ngā Hapu o Otaki maintain with GWRC in regard to the policies addressing Co-governance, Co-management, Co-leadership and Co-collabroative operational processes. This submission goes to great length to define where and how further considerations can be made recognising the interconnected nature of matauranga maori, the inequitable impact environmental decline will have on mana whenua/tangata whenua and offers insight to the intuitive and inherent awareness manawhenua need to maintain to ensure our intergenerational survival and prosperity.</p> <p>3.4 Freshwater including Public Access – Support in Principal</p> <p>3.6 Indigenous Ecosystems – Support in Principal</p> <p>3.9 Regional Form, Design and Function – Support in Principal</p> <p>Ātiawa views regarding Freshwater, indigenous ecosystems and Regional design and function resonate with insights Ngā Hapu o Otaki maintain. Ngā Hapu o Otaki would like opportunity to speak further to such views during the hearing process. We share Ātiawas concerns for Mātauranga Māori as a foundation for equitable interchange of decision making. Their concerns regarding intensification and the further degredation of taonga across our coastline rings true to the ongoing journey we are on as manawhenua facing intense growth for the coming generation. We seek to join the conversation and endorse provisions that will see our whanaunga and other manawhenua groups recognise their environmental resilience and the cultural agility our shared whakapapa offers.</p>		
S140.0115	Wellington City Council (WCC)			S140.0115	Wellington City Council (WCC)	Method 53: Support mana whenua / tangata whenua and community restoration initiatives for indigenous ecosystems	Support	Support as proposed.	Retain as notified.	Accept
S163.0104	Wairarapa Federated Farmers			S163.0104	Wairarapa Federated Farmers	Method 53: Support mana whenua / tangata	Oppose	Defer to the full review of the RPS in 2024. General support for the intent but proposing an RPS Change One method is not a pre-condition for getting the job done.	That the amendments to Method 53 be deleted Delete the FW icon	Accept in part

S42A Appendix 2 - HS6 Indigenous Ecosystems - Summary Recommendation Table

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
						whenua and community restoration initiatives for indigenous ecosystems				
S163.0104	Wairarapa Federated Farmers	FS7.044	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society (Forest & Bird)	FS7.044	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society (Forest & Bird)	Method 53: Support mana whenua / tangata whenua and community restoration initiatives for indigenous ecosystems	Oppose	It is completely appropriate to include climate change, biodiversity and freshwater provisions in the plan change. This plan change creates efficiency by considering multiple policy directives from central government. The amendments sought by Federated Farmers fail to give effect to the NPSFM, the NPS for Indigenous Biodiversity, for which there is an exposure draft and the final version is due out this month, and do not achieve the purpose of the RMA or the Climate Change Response (Zero Carbon) Amendment Act 2019.	Disallow whole submission	Accept in part
S163.0104	Wairarapa Federated Farmers	FS20.166	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	FS20.166	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	Method 53: Support mana whenua / tangata whenua and community restoration initiatives for indigenous ecosystems	Oppose	Ātiawa oppose the entire submission by Wairarapa Federated Farmers. The relief sought by Federated Farmers is to effectively delete the entire proposed plan change (except for submission points S163.083, S163.084). The basis for deleting the proposed plan change is to delay decision-making. Ātiawa do not accept that delaying responding to national direction is an appropriate course of action, and will further compound environmental and resource management issues.	Disallow the entire submission by Wairarapa Federated Farmers.	Accept in part
S163.0104	Wairarapa Federated Farmers	FS29.017	Ngā Hapu o Otaki	FS29.017	Ngā Hapu o Otaki	Method 53: Support mana whenua / tangata whenua and community restoration initiatives for indigenous ecosystems	Oppose	Section 18, page 4: General Comments – OPPOSE Section 25, Page 5 Going Forward – OPPOSE It is disheartening to see that Wairarapa Federated Farmers aren't capable of recognizing the obligations GWRC must maintain with Treaty Partners. It must be understood that Manawhenua are not simply 'groups of people' but a representation of the signatories that signed the Treaty of Waitangi and the original kaitiaki and custodians of the taonga in question when considering how these plan changes are implemented. Wairarapa Federated Farmers indicate a lack of awareness to the value of manawhenua engagement. Their stated 'aspirations of delivering environmental improvements alongside a thriving bio-economy' aren't feasible without considering the intergenerational insight and technical direction that only Mātauranga Māori can offer.	Not stated	Accept in part
S163.0104	Wairarapa Federated Farmers	FS30.073	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Ltd	FS30.073	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Ltd	Method 53: Support mana whenua / tangata	Support	B+LNZ agree that the scope of RPS PC1 should be restricted to those changes necessary to give effect to the National Policy Statement for Urban Development and that any other matters should be subject to	Allow	reject

S42A Appendix 2 - HS6 Indigenous Ecosystems - Summary Recommendation Table

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
						whenua and community restoration initiatives for indigenous ecosystems		proper review in the Schedule full review of the RPS in 2024 and in the scheduled reviews of the Natural Resources Plan in 2023 and 2024. Where alternative relief is provided, B+LNZ generally support this relief.		
S165.0122	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society (Forest & Bird)			S165.0122	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society (Forest & Bird)	Method 53: Support mana whenua / tangata whenua and community restoration initiatives for indigenous ecosystems	Support in part	Support this method, but caution that if the identification processes under Methods IE.2 and CC.6 are not broad enough, or are not carried out appropriately, they may not capture all areas that would benefit from restoration. The policy should therefore be broader than currently drafted. There also needs to be provision for restoration support in the period of time up until those identification processes are complete. The reference to Method CC.7 appears to be in error. We have also sought deletion of method IE.2 (above), and seek deletion of the reference in this method. IE.2 is about an inventory of offsetting and compensation opportunities for consent applicants. Method 54 is aimed at assisting mana whenua/tangata whenua and communities restoration initiatives - this is different to offsetting and compensation, and the two concepts should not be mixed. It would be more appropriate to link this to the restoration priorities covered in the regional biodiversity strategy.	Delete reference to IE.2. Correct reference to CC.7. Refer to the regional biodiversity strategy, which appears to be intended to identify restoration priorities.	Accept
S165.0122	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society (Forest & Bird)	FS20.082	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	FS20.082	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	Method 53: Support mana whenua / tangata whenua and community restoration initiatives for indigenous ecosystems	Oppose	Ātiawa do not support the reasoning and relief sought by Forest and Bird in regards to these submission points. As in our original submission, Ātiawa support partnering with mana whenua to develop an inventory of opportunities for biodiversity offsetting or biodiversity compensation. Ātiawa's position is that priority should be given to protecting, maintaining or enhancing biodiversity. Ātiawa seek that this partnership approach shall be enabled through funding and resourcing.	Disallow	reject
S165.0122	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society (Forest & Bird)	FS30.319	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Ltd	FS30.319	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Ltd	Method 53: Support mana whenua / tangata whenua and community restoration initiatives for indigenous ecosystems	Oppose	B+LNZ generally oppose the submission on the grounds that's B+LNZ are seeking changes of the plan change are restricted to those necessary to give effect to the National Policy Statement for Urban Development and that any other matters should be subject to proper review in the Schedule full review of the RPS in 2024 and in the scheduled reviews of the Natural Resources Plan in 2023 and 2024. This is because the changes materially impact on communities, including rural communities and we do not consider that the necessary engagement has been	Disallow	reject

S42A Appendix 2 - HS6 Indigenous Ecosystems - Summary Recommendation Table

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
								undertaken to adequately inform these provisions or to meet the requirements of Part 3.2 of the NPS-FM. Furthermore, there is a risk that including matters relating to climate change and indigenous biodiversity before key national legislation is gazetted or implemented is premature and will lead to the inefficient implementation and confusion amongst those who it impacts materially.		
S167.0180	Taranaki Whānui			S167.0180	Taranaki Whānui	Method 53: Support mana whenua / tangata whenua and community restoration initiatives for indigenous ecosystems	Support	Taranaki Whānui support the principle of this new method. In particular the support stated for mana whenua and the change in focus of this method to include all indigenous ecosystems. Taranaki Whānui are keen to partner in the development of these initiatives.	Retain as notified.	Accept
S168.0100	Rangitāne O Wairarapa Inc			S168.0100	Rangitāne O Wairarapa Inc	Method 53: Support mana whenua / tangata whenua and community restoration initiatives for indigenous ecosystems	Support	Rangitāne o Wairarapa supports the amendments to this method.	Retain as notified.	Accept
S168.0100	Rangitāne O Wairarapa Inc	FS31.025	Sustainable Wairarapa Inc	FS31.025	Sustainable Wairarapa Inc	Method 53: Support mana whenua / tangata whenua and community restoration initiatives for indigenous ecosystems	Support	Kia ora koutou, My name is Ian Gunn, Secretary Sustainable Wairarapa inc. contact # 021567134, address 4B McKay Street, Paraparaumu Beach 5032. Firstly we'd like to state the time frame provided to peruse over 900 pages of submissions is in our opinion an abuse of process. The benefit of further submissions is for you the council to listen and hear the views of its ratepayers. The timeframe in our case does not allow a rigorous review of the original submissions to council. On top of this we are a week before Christmas- a very busy and chaotic time for most members of the community. It is highly likely that the majority of staff will take leave over the Christmas break so analysis of any further submissions will not occur until late January 2023-so why the short period to respond. While there is due process there is also good practise your management of the further submissions fails the good practise model. As a consequence we would like you to note Sustainable	Not stated	Accept

S42A Appendix 2 - HS6 Indigenous Ecosystems - Summary Recommendation Table

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
								Wairarapa's strong support of the original submissions lodged with council by the two Wairarapa Iwi-Ngati Kahungunu and Rangitane. Its clear that there is a poor understanding of nature based solutions this term needs further explanation. Sustainable Wairarapa acknowledges that while nature based solutions offer a wide variety of options its not the only solution. We are heartened by the widespread support for the original document. Thanks for an opportunity to make a further submission. Nga mihi nui lan Gun		
S30.097	Porirua City Council			S30.097	Porirua City Council	Method 54: Assist landowners to maintain, enhance and restore indigenous ecosystems	Support in part	There are other methods which should be added to this method for completeness, rates rebates are just one tool under a wider umbrella of non-regulatory support.	Amend method as follows: Assist landowners to maintain, enhance and/or restore indigenous ecosystems identified by Methods IE.2 and CC.7, including by, but not limited to: (a) assisting with the costs of legally protecting indigenous ecosystems by way of open space covenants with Queen Elizabeth the Second National Trust (QEII); (b) considering opportunities for providing advice, education, support and incentives rates rebates ; (c) assisting with the costs of controlling pest plants and animals; and (d) supporting landowners to restore significant indigenous ecosystems by fencing and planting. Implementation: Wellington Regional Council and city and district councils	Accept
S30.097	Porirua City Council	FS25.130	Peka Peka Farm Limited	FS25.130	Peka Peka Farm Limited	Method 54: Assist landowners to maintain, enhance and restore indigenous ecosystems	Support	The submission provides a comprehensive analysis of the proposed change including in relation to matters of scope and jurisdiction. It is supported without prejudice to the specific relief sought in the primary submission or this further submission by Peka Peka Farm Ltd.	Allow	Accept

S42A Appendix 2 - HS6 Indigenous Ecosystems - Summary Recommendation Table

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
S102.061	Te Tumu Paeroa Office of the Māori Trustee			S102.061	Te Tumu Paeroa Office of the Māori Trustee	Method 54: Assist landowners to maintain, enhance and restore indigenous ecosystems	Support in part	Generally supports the methods to implement in the 'Indigenous ecosystems' chapter. Supports the consideration for rates rebates, particularly as whenua Māori tends to have a greater amount of indigenous cover, limiting its land use capabilities. However, Māori landowners should be assisted in the cost to maintain, enhance and restore indigenous ecosystems by way of Ngā Whenua Rāhui as well as QEII covenants.	Amend Method 54 as follows: ... (a) assisting with the costs of legally protecting indigenous ecosystems by way of open space covenants with Queen Elizabeth the Second National Trust (QEII) and Ngā Whenua Rāhui;	Accept
S123.021	Peter Thompson			S123.021	Peter Thompson	Method 54: Assist landowners to maintain, enhance and restore indigenous ecosystems	Support	Assistance is needed by care-groups and lanowners to care for indigenous ecosystems	Retain as notified.	Accept
S144.026	Sustainable Wairarapa Inc			S144.026	Sustainable Wairarapa Inc	Method 54: Assist landowners to maintain, enhance and restore indigenous ecosystems	Support	Indigenous ecosystems are vital to adapt to climate change and to improve biodiversity and water resilience. Assistance is needed by care-groups and lanowners to care for indigenous ecosystems	Retain as notified.	Accept
S147.031	Wellington Fish and Game Council			S147.031	Wellington Fish and Game Council	Method 54: Assist landowners to maintain, enhance and restore indigenous ecosystems	Support in part	The suggested amendment follows from the suggested amendment to Objective 16, and is intended to give better effect to the NPS-FM (including Policy 10). While the protections of indigenous ecosystems and habitats is vital, so too is the maintaining and enhancing of the whole environment, including those containing valued introduced species. An unduly narrow indigenous - centric focus could lead to lessening or removal of protections for non-indigenous dominant systems, habitats, and species. The loss of protections, enhancements, and restorations risks adverse environmental effects and weakened climate change resilience for the region.	Amend title and text: Method 54: Assist landowners to maintain, enhance, and restore indigenous ecosystems and habitats with significant biodiversity or other values. Assist landowners to maintain, enhance and/or restore indigenous ecosystems and habitats with significant biodiversity or other values identified by Methods IE.2 and CC.7, including by, but not limited to:	reject
S147.031	Wellington Fish and Game Council	FS20.132	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	FS20.132	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	Method 54: Assist landowners to maintain, enhance and	Oppose	Ātiawa do not support the rationale set out by Fish and Game, - indigenous ecosystems must be afforded the greatest protection above the protection of introduced ecosystems which already dominate te taiao, to the detriment of indigenous ecosystems. The	Disallow	Accept

S42A Appendix 2 - HS6 Indigenous Ecosystems - Summary Recommendation Table

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
						restore indigenous ecosystems		relief sought by the submitter would like result in a status-quo outcome for indigenous ecosystems, Ātiawa are opposed to this outcome.		
S147.031	Wellington Fish and Game Council	FS19.095	Wellington Water Ltd ("Wellington Water")	FS19.095	Wellington Water Ltd ("Wellington Water")	Method 54: Assist landowners to maintain, enhance and restore indigenous ecosystems	Oppose	It is unnecessary and redundant to recreate NPSFM policies within the RPS. Most of the amendments sought do not in any event properly reflect the NPSFM. In particular, they do not accurately reflect the proviso to Policy 7, the requirements of clause 3.22, the limitation of Policy 10 to trout and salmon only, and the subservience of Policy 10 to Policy 9. Some of the amendments attempt to address matters that are already adequately covered by extant provisions or PC1 as notified. Some of the amendments undermine the more detailed content of PC1.	Disallow	Accept
S147.031	Wellington Fish and Game Council	FS30.200	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Ltd	FS30.200	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Ltd	Method 54: Assist landowners to maintain, enhance and restore indigenous ecosystems	Oppose	B+LNZ generally oppose the submission on the grounds that's B+LNZ are seeking changes of the plan change are restricted to those necessary to give effect to the National Policy Statement for Urban Development and that any other matters should be subject to proper review in the Schedule full review of the RPS in 2024 and in the scheduled reviews of the Natural Resources Plan in 2023 and 2024. This is because the changes materially impact on communities, including rural communities and we do not consider that the necessary engagement has been undertaken to adequately inform these provisions or to meet the requirements of Part 3.2 of the NPS-FM. Furthermore, there is a risk that including matters relating to climate change and indigenous biodiversity before key national legislation is gazetted is premature and will lead to the inefficient implementation and confusion amongst those who it impacts materially.	Disallow That the submission be disallowed with the exception of 147.007	Accept in part
S147.032	Wellington Fish and Game Council			S147.032	Wellington Fish and Game Council	Method 54: Assist landowners to maintain, enhance and restore indigenous ecosystems	Support in part	The suggested amendment follows from the suggested amendment to Objective 16, and is intended to give better effect to the NPS-FM (including Policy 10). While the protections of indigenous ecosystems and habitats is vital, so too is the maintaining and enhancing of the whole environment, including those containing valued introduced species. An unduly narrow indigenous - centric focus could lead to lessening or removal of protections for non-indigenous dominant systems, habitats, and species. The loss of protections, enhancements, and restorations risks adverse environmental effects and weakened climate change resilience for the region.	amend subclause: (d) supporting landowners to restore significant indigenous ecosystems and habitats with significant biodiversity or other values by fencing and planting.	Reject

S42A Appendix 2 - HS6 Indigenous Ecosystems - Summary Recommendation Table

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
S147.032	Wellington Fish and Game Council	FS20.133	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	FS20.133	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	Method 54: Assist landowners to maintain, enhance and restore indigenous ecosystems	Oppose	Ātiawa do not support the rationale set out by Fish and Game, - indigenous ecosystems must be afforded the greatest protection above the protection of introduced ecosystems which already dominate te taiao, to the detriment of indigenous ecosystems. The relief sought by the submitter would like result in a status-quo outcome for indigenous ecosystems, Ātiawa are opposed to this outcome.	Disallow	Accept
S147.032	Wellington Fish and Game Council	FS19.096	Wellington Water Ltd ("Wellington Water")	FS19.096	Wellington Water Ltd ("Wellington Water")	Method 54: Assist landowners to maintain, enhance and restore indigenous ecosystems	Oppose	It is unnecessary and redundant to recreate NPSFM policies within the RPS. Most of the amendments sought do not in any event properly reflect the NPSFM. In particular, they do not accurately reflect the proviso to Policy 7, the requirements of clause 3.22, the limitation of Policy 10 to trout and salmon only, and the subservience of Policy 10 to Policy 9. Some of the amendments attempt to address matters that are already adequately covered by extant provisions or PC1 as notified. Some of the amendments undermine the more detailed content of PC1.	Disallow	Accept
S147.032	Wellington Fish and Game Council	FS30.201	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Ltd	FS30.201	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Ltd	Method 54: Assist landowners to maintain, enhance and restore indigenous ecosystems	Oppose	B+LNZ generally oppose the submission on the grounds that's B+LNZ are seeking changes of the plan change are restricted to those necessary to give effect to the National Policy Statement for Urban Development and that any other matters should be subject to proper review in the Schedule full review of the RPS in 2024 and in the scheduled reviews of the Natural Resources Plan in 2023 and 2024. This is because the changes materially impact on communities, including rural communities and we do not consider that the necessary engagement has been undertaken to adequately inform these provisions or to meet the requirements of Part 3.2 of the NPS-FM. Furthermore, there is a risk that including matters relating to climate change and indigenous biodiversity before key national legislation is gazetted is premature and will lead to the inefficient implementation and confusion amongst those who it impacts materially.	Disallow That the submission be disallowed with the exception of 147.007	Accept in part
S166.070	Masterton District Council			S166.070	Masterton District Council	Method 54: Assist landowners to maintain, enhance and restore indigenous ecosystems	Support in part	What type of assistance does this intend to provide (Financial? Education? Plants?) and who will be responsible for it?	Clarifications. More information is required about what this would look like in practice.	Accept in part

S42A Appendix 2 - HS6 Indigenous Ecosystems - Summary Recommendation Table

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
S115.0114	Hutt City Council			S115.0114	Hutt City Council	Method 54: Assist landowners to maintain, enhance and restore indigenous ecosystems	Oppose in part	Oppose the inclusion of non-regulatory policies and methods that apply to territorial authorities.	Amend Method 54 so that it does not apply to city and district councils.	reject
S131.0149	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust			S131.0149	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	Method 54: Assist landowners to maintain, enhance and restore indigenous ecosystems	Support		Ātiawa support Method 54.	Accept
S131.0149	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	FS29.268	Ngā Hapu o Otaki	FS29.268	Ngā Hapu o Otaki	Method 54: Assist landowners to maintain, enhance and restore indigenous ecosystems	Support	<p>Co -design under a treaty house model is about shaping plans and resource management avenues alongside manawhenua that appropriately recognise the intergenerational prosperity of the uri of Ngā Hapu o Otaki and the wider community.</p> <p>There are ongoing concerns Ngā Hapu o Otaki maintain with GWRC in regard to the policies addressing Co-governance, Co-management, Co-leadership and Co-collabroative operational processes. This submission goes to great length to define where and how further considerations can be made recognising the interconnected nature of matauranga maori, the inequitable impact environmental decline will have on mana whenua/tangata whenua and offers insight to the intuitive and inherent awareness manawhenua need to maintain to ensure our intergenerational survival and prosperity.</p> <p>3.4 Freshwater including Public Access – Support in Principal</p> <p>3.6 Indigenous Ecosystems – Support in Principal</p> <p>3.9 Regional Form, Design and Function – Support in Principal</p> <p>Ātiawa views regarding Freshwater, indigenous ecosystems and Regional design and function resonate with insights Ngā Hapu o Otaki maintain. Ngā Hapu o Otaki would like opportunity to speak further to such views during the hearing process. We share Ātiawas concerns for Mātauranga Māori as a foundation for equitable interchange of decision making. Their concerns regarding intensification and the further degradation of taonga across our coastline rings true</p>	Not stated	Accept

S42A Appendix 2 - HS6 Indigenous Ecosystems - Summary Recommendation Table

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
								to the ongoing journey we are on as manawhenua facing intense growth for the coming generation. We seek to join the conversation and endorse provisions that will see our whanaunga and other manawhenua groups recognise their environmental resilience and the cultural agility our shared whakapapa offers.		
S140.0116	Wellington City Council (WCC)			S140.0116	Wellington City Council (WCC)	Method 54: Assist landowners to maintain, enhance and restore indigenous ecosystems	Support in part	Requiring just the consideration of rates rebates is restrictive and may not necessarily be the best option to assist landowners to maintain, enhance and restore indigenous ecosystems.	Assist landowners to maintain, enhance and/or restore indigenous ecosystems identified by Methods IE.2 and CC.7, including by, but not limited to: (a) assisting with the costs of legally protecting indigenous ecosystems by way of open space covenants with Queen Elizabeth the Second National Trust (QEII); (b) considering opportunities for rates rebates; (b) considering opportunities for an incentive packages; (c) assisting with the costs of controlling pest plants and animals; and (d) supporting landowners to restore significant indigenous ecosystems by fencing and planting	Accept
S140.0116	Wellington City Council (WCC)	FS14.048	Masterton District Council	FS14.048	Masterton District Council	Method 54: Assist landowners to maintain, enhance and restore indigenous ecosystems	Support in part	Agree with: Requiring just the consideration of rates rebates is restrictive and may not necessarily be the best option to assist landowners to maintain, enhance and restore indigenous ecosystems.	Not stated Agree with relief sought: Assist landowners to maintain, enhance and/or restore indigenous ecosystems identified by Methods IE.2 and CC.7, including by, but not limited to: (a) assisting with the costs of legally protecting indigenous ecosystems by way of open space covenants with Queen Elizabeth the Second National Trust (QEII);(b) considering opportunities for rates rebates;(b) considering	Accept

S42A Appendix 2 - HS6 Indigenous Ecosystems - Summary Recommendation Table

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
									opportunities for an incentive packages; (c) assisting with the costs of controlling pest plants and animals; and (d) supporting landowners to restore significant indigenous ecosystems by fencing and planting	
S163.0105	Wairarapa Federated Farmers			S163.0105	Wairarapa Federated Farmers	Method 54: Assist landowners to maintain, enhance and restore indigenous ecosystems	Oppose	Defer to the full review of the RPS in 2024. General support for the intent - including clause b in respect of rates rebates (currently an anomaly in the Council rating system) - but proposing an RPS Change One method is not a pre-condition for getting the job done.	That Method 54 be deleted. Delete the FW icon	Accept in part
S163.0105	Wairarapa Federated Farmers	FS7.045	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society (Forest & Bird)	FS7.045	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society (Forest & Bird)	Method 54: Assist landowners to maintain, enhance and restore indigenous ecosystems	Oppose	It is completely appropriate to include climate change, biodiversity and freshwater provisions in the plan change. This plan change creates efficiency by considering multiple policy directives from central government. The amendments sought by Federated Farmers fail to give effect to the NPSFM, the NPS for Indigenous Biodiversity, for which there is an exposure draft and the final version is due out this month, and do not achieve the purpose of the RMA or the Climate Change Response (Zero Carbon) Amendment Act 2019.	Disallow whole submission	Accept in part
S163.0105	Wairarapa Federated Farmers	FS20.167	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	FS20.167	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	Method 54: Assist landowners to maintain, enhance and restore indigenous ecosystems	Oppose	Ātiawa oppose the entire submission by Wairarapa Federated Farmers. The relief sought by Federated Farmers is to effectively delete the entire proposed plan change (except for submission points S163.083, S163.084). The basis for deleting the proposed plan change is to delay decision-making. Ātiawa do not accept that delaying responding to national direction is an appropriate course of action, and will further compound environmental and resource management issues.	Disallow the entire submission by Wairarapa Federated Farmers.	Accept in part
S163.0105	Wairarapa Federated Farmers	FS29.018	Ngā Hapu o Otaki	FS29.018	Ngā Hapu o Otaki	Method 54: Assist landowners to maintain, enhance and restore indigenous ecosystems	Oppose	Section 18, page 4: General Comments – OPPOSE Section 25, Page 5 Going Forward – OPPOSE It is disheartening to see that Wairarapa Federated Farmers aren't capable of recognizing the obligations GWRC must maintain with Treaty Partners. It must be understood that Manawhenua are not simply 'groups of people' but a representation of the signatories that signed the Treaty of Waitangi and the original kaitiaki and custodians of the taonga in question when considering how these plan changes are implemented. Wairarapa Federated Farmers indicate a lack of	Not stated	Accept in part

S42A Appendix 2 - HS6 Indigenous Ecosystems - Summary Recommendation Table

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
								awareness to the value of manawhenua engagement. Their stated 'aspirations of delivering environmental improvements alongside a thriving bio-economy' aren't feasible without considering the intergenerational insight and technical direction that only Mātauranga Māori can offer.		
S163.0105	Wairarapa Federated Farmers	FS30.074	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Ltd	FS30.074	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Ltd	Method 54: Assist landowners to maintain, enhance and restore indigenous ecosystems	Support	B+LNZ agree that the scope of RPS PC1 should be restricted to those changes necessary to give effect to the National Policy Statement for Urban Development and that any other matters should be subject to proper review in the Schedule full review of the RPS in 2024 and in the scheduled reviews of the Natural Resources Plan in 2023 and 2024. Where alternative relief is provided, B+LNZ generally support this relief.	Allow	reject
S165.0123	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society (Forest & Bird)			S165.0123	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society (Forest & Bird)	Method 54: Assist landowners to maintain, enhance and restore indigenous ecosystems	Support in part	Support this method, but caution that if the identification processes under Methods IE.2 and CC.6 are not broad enough, or are not carried out appropriately, they may not capture all areas that would benefit from restoration. The policy should therefore be broader than currently drafted. There also needs to be provision for restoration support in the period of time up until those identification processes are complete. The reference to Method CC.7 appears to be in error. We have also sought deletion of Method IE.2 (above), and seek deletion of the reference in this method. IE.2 is about an inventory of offsetting and compensation opportunities for consent applicants. Method 54 is aimed at assisting landowners with maintaining and restoring ecosystems - this is different to offsetting and compensation, and the two concepts should not be mixed. It would be more appropriate to link this to the restoration priorities covered in the regional biodiversity strategy.	Amend method to include the words "in particular those" before the words "identified by". Include provision in the method for restoration support prior to the identification processes having been completed. Correct the reference to Method CC.7 to CC.6. Delete reference to Method IE.2. Refer to the regional biodiversity strategy, which appears to be intended to identify restoration priorities.	Accept
S165.0123	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society (Forest & Bird)	FS20.083	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	FS20.083	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	Method 54: Assist landowners to maintain, enhance and restore indigenous ecosystems	Oppose	Ātiawa do not support the reasoning and relief sought by Forest and Bird in regards to these submission points. As in our original submission, Ātiawa support partnering with mana whenua to develop an inventory of opportunities for biodiversity offsetting or biodiversity compensation. Ātiawa's position is that priority should be given to protecting, maintaining or enhancing biodiversity. Ātiawa seek that this partnership approach shall be enabled through funding and resourcing.	Disallow	reject
S165.0123	Royal Forest and Bird Protection	FS30.319	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Ltd	FS30.319	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Ltd	Method 54: Assist landowners to	Oppose	B+LNZ generally oppose the submission on the grounds that's B+LNZ are seeking changes of the plan change are restricted to those necessary to give effect	Disallow	reject

S42A Appendix 2 - HS6 Indigenous Ecosystems - Summary Recommendation Table

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
	Society (Forest & Bird)					maintain, enhance and restore indigenous ecosystems		to the National Policy Statement for Urban Development and that any other matters should be subject to proper review in the Schedule full review of the RPS in 2024 and in the scheduled reviews of the Natural Resources Plan in 2023 and 2024. This is because the changes materially impact on communities, including rural communities and we do not consider that the necessary engagement has been undertaken to adequately inform these provisions or to meet the requirements of Part 3.2 of the NPS-FM. Furthermore, there is a risk that including matters relating to climate change and indigenous biodiversity before key national legislation is gazetted or implemented is premature and will lead to the inefficient implementation and confusion amongst those who it impacts materially.		
S167.0181	Taranaki Whānui			S167.0181	Taranaki Whānui	Method 54: Assist landowners to maintain, enhance and restore indigenous ecosystems	Support	Taranaki Whānui support the principle of this new method.	Retain as notified.	Accept in part
S131.008	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust			S131.008	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	General comments - anticipated environmental results	Not Stated / Neutral	Ātiawa is concerned that the proposed Anticipated Environmental Results (AERs) are so broad that it will not offer meaningful data in terms of monitoring the effectiveness and efficiency of the policies and methods. The AER should be specific and measurable (based on evidence when relevant), and appropriately, time-bound. AER and monitoring is an integral step (and statutory requirement) in the planning cycle (plan-do-monitor-review), and setting robust and meaningful AER produce better data to understand and assess the planning framework.	Ātiawa's position is that mana whenua identity is distinct from the community collective identity. As a result Ātiawa seeks that mana whenua are referred to in their own right. We seek changes to policies that lump together the values of mana whenua and the community.	Accept
S131.008	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	FS29.212	Ngā Hapu o Otaki	FS29.212	Ngā Hapu o Otaki	General comments - anticipated environmental results	Support	Co -design under a treaty house model is about shaping plans and resource management avenues alongside manawhenua that appropriately recognise the intergenerational prosperity of the uri of Ngā Hapu o Otaki and the wider community. There are ongoing concerns Ngā Hapu o Otaki maintain with GWRC in regard to the policies addressing Co-governance, Co-management, Co-leadership and Co-collabroative operational processes. This submission goes to great length to define where and how further considerations can be made recognising the interconnected nature of matauranga	Not stated	Accept

S42A Appendix 2 - HS6 Indigenous Ecosystems - Summary Recommendation Table

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
								<p>maori, the inequitable impact environmental decline will have on mana whenua/tangata whenua and offers insight to the intuitive and inherent awareness manawhenua need to maintain to ensure our intergenerational survival and prosperity.</p> <p>3.4 Freshwater including Public Access – Support in Principal</p> <p>3.6 Indigenous Ecosystems – Support in Principal</p> <p>3.9 Regional Form, Design and Function – Support in Principal</p> <p>Ātiawa views regarding Freshwater, indigenous ecosystems and Regional design and function resonate with insights Ngā Hapu o Otaki maintain. Ngā Hapu o Otaki would like opportunity to speak further to such views during the hearing process. We share Ātiawas concerns for Mātauranga Māori as a foundation for equitable interchange of decision making. Their concerns regarding intensification and the further degradation of taonga across our coastline rings true to the ongoing journey we are on as manawhenua facing intense growth for the coming generation. We seek to join the conversation and endorse provisions that will see our whanaunga and other manawhenua groups recognise their environmental resilience and the cultural agility our shared whakapapa offers.</p>		
S131.0155	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust			S131.0155	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	Indigenous ecosystems Anticipated environmental results	Support	<p>Ātiawa support the proposed AER for the kaupapa 'Indigenous Biodiversity'.</p> <p>Ātiawa seek further AER be included to ensure that mana whenua involvement in resource management is assessed and therefore those AER action is taken to achieve those AER.</p>	<p>Include the following AER to the kaupapa 'Indigenous Biodiversity': Mana whenua and Regional Council work in partnership in the management of indigenous biodiversity in the Wellington region. This partnership provides for governance and operational input into all aspects of resource management to address indigenous biodiversity, including decision-making. Mana whenua values including their relationship with their culture, ancestral lands, water, sites, wāhi tapu and other taonga are protected and provided for. Mātauranga Māori is applied</p>	Accept in part

S42A Appendix 2 - HS6 Indigenous Ecosystems - Summary Recommendation Table

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
									where appropriate, in accordance with tikanga and kawa, as guided by mana whenua.	
S131.0155	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	FS2.69	Rangitāne o Wairarapa Inc	FS2.69	Rangitāne o Wairarapa Inc	Indigenous ecosystems Anticipated environmental results	Support	Rangitāne support the amendment to the AERs for indigenous biodiversity proposed by Ātiawa.	Allow	Accept in part
S131.0155	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	FS29.275	Ngā Hapu o Otaki	FS29.275	Ngā Hapu o Otaki	Indigenous ecosystems Anticipated environmental results	Support	<p>Co-design under a treaty house model is about shaping plans and resource management avenues alongside manawhenua that appropriately recognise the intergenerational prosperity of the uri of Ngā Hapu o Otaki and the wider community.</p> <p>There are ongoing concerns Ngā Hapu o Otaki maintain with GWRC in regard to the policies addressing Co-governance, Co-management, Co-leadership and Co-collabroative operational processes. This submission goes to great length to define where and how further considerations can be made recognising the interconnected nature of matauranga maori, the inequitable impact environmental decline will have on mana whenua/tangata whenua and offers insight to the intuitive and inherent awareness manawhenua need to maintain to ensure our intergenerational survival and prosperity.</p> <p>3.4 Freshwater including Public Access – Support in Principal</p> <p>3.6 Indigenous Ecosystems – Support in Principal</p> <p>3.9 Regional Form, Design and Function – Support in Principal</p> <p>Ātiawa views regarding Freshwater, indigenous ecosystems and Regional design and function resonate with insights Ngā Hapu o Otaki maintain. Ngā Hapu o Otaki would like opportunity to speak further to such views during the hearing process. We share Ātiawas concerns for Mātauranga Māori as a foundation for equitable interchange of decision making. Their concerns regarding intensification and the further degradation of taonga across our coastline rings true to the ongoing journey we are on as manawhenua facing intense growth for the coming generation. We seek to join the conversation and endorse provisions that will see our whanaunga and other manawhenua groups recognise their environmental resilience and the cultural agility our shared whakapapa offers.</p>	Not stated	Accept in part

S42A Appendix 2 - HS6 Indigenous Ecosystems - Summary Recommendation Table

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
S131.0159	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust			S131.0159	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	General comments - anticipated environmental results	Support in part	Submission point relates to Table 17. Ātiawa maintain an interest in ensuring that mana whenua values, including taonga (including taonga species) are protected from residual affects of biodiversity offsetting and biodiversity compensation.	Not stated	Accept
S131.0159	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	FS29.279	Ngā Hapu o Otaki	FS29.279	Ngā Hapu o Otaki	General comments - anticipated environmental results	Support	Co -design under a treaty house model is about shaping plans and resource management avenues alongside manawhenua that appropriately recognise the intergenerational prosperity of the uri of Ngā Hapu o Otaki and the wider community. There are ongoing concerns Ngā Hapu o Otaki maintain with GWRC in regard to the policies addressing Co-governance, Co-management, Co-leadership and Co-collabroative operational processes. This submission goes to great length to define where and how further considerations can be made recognising the interconnected nature of matauranga maori, the inequitable impact environmental decline will have on mana whenua/tangata whenua and offers insight to the intuitive and inherent awareness manawhenua need to maintain to ensure our intergenerational survival and prosperity. 3.4 Freshwater including Public Access – Support in Principal 3.6 Indigenous Ecosystems – Support in Principal 3.9 Regional Form, Design and Function – Support in Principal Ātiawa views regarding Freshwater, indigenous ecosystems and Regional design and function resonate with insights Ngā Hapu o Otaki maintain. Ngā Hapu o Otaki would like opportunity to speak further to such views during the hearing process. We share Ātiawas concerns for Mātauranga Māori as a foundation for equitable interchange of decision making. Their concerns regarding intensification and the further degradation of taonga across our coastline rings true to the ongoing journey we are on as manawhenua facing intense growth for the coming generation. We seek to join the conversation and endorse provisions that will see our whanaunga and other manawhenua groups recognise their environmental resilience and the cultural agility our shared whakapapa offers.	Not stated	Accept
	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society			S165.0124	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society (Forest & Bird)	General comments - anticipated environmental results	Support	Retain Table 14.	Retain.	Accept

S42A Appendix 2 - HS6 Indigenous Ecosystems - Summary Recommendation Table

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
	(Forest & Bird)									
S165.0124	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society (Forest & Bird)	FS30.319	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Ltd	FS30.319	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Ltd	General comments - anticipated environmental results	Oppose	B+LNZ generally oppose the submission on the grounds that's B+LNZ are seeking changes of the plan change are restricted to those necessary to give effect to the National Policy Statement for Urban Development and that any other matters should be subject to proper review in the Schedule full review of the RPS in 2024 and in the scheduled reviews of the Natural Resources Plan in 2023 and 2024. This is because the changes materially impact on communities, including rural communities and we do not consider that the necessary engagement has been undertaken to adequately inform these provisions or to meet the requirements of Part 3.2 of the NPS-FM. Furthermore, there is a risk that including matters relating to climate change and indigenous biodiversity before key national legislation is gazetted or implemented is premature and will lead to the inefficient implementation and confusion amongst those who it impacts materially.	Disallow	reject
S167.0183	Taranaki Whānui			S167.0183	Taranaki Whānui	General comments - anticipated environmental results	Support in part	Support in partnership (resourcing/funding) with mana whenua. Taranaki Whānui are keen to understand the process to establish the AERs. What input has come from mana whenua? Taranaki Whānui feel strongly that AERs need to be developed and monitored in partnership with mana whenua and include mātauranga Māori. (State of Environment Reports).	Amend anticipated environmental results in partnership with mana whenua.	Accept in part
S167.0189	Taranaki Whānui			S167.0189	Taranaki Whānui	Indigenous ecosystems Anticipated environmental results	Not Stated / Neutral	Support in partnership (resourcing/funding) with mana whenua. Taranaki Whānui are keen to understand the process to establish the AERs. What input has come from mana whenua? Taranaki Whānui feel strongly that AERs need to be developed and monitored in partnership with mana whenua and include mātauranga Māori. (State of Environment Reports).	Amend anticipated environmental results in partnership with mana whenua	Accept in part
S32.037	Director-General of Conservation			S32.037	Director-General of Conservation	Appendix 1A: Limits to biodiversity offsetting and biodiversity compensation	Support in part	The inclusion of this table is an appropriate reflection of the status of the listed ecosystems and species, and is useful for implementation of the relevant policies. However, there are ongoing changes to our knowledge of the status of ecosystems and species (eg threat classifications for plants are currently under review), so the RPS will need to be able to reflect the most up-to-date information.	Retain Table 17, but prior to finalising decisions on the RPS change either update the table to ensure it is as up-to-date as possible, or add generic reference to threat classifications.	Accept

S42A Appendix 2 - HS6 Indigenous Ecosystems - Summary Recommendation Table

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
S32.037	Director-General of Conservation	FS30.315	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Ltd	FS30.315	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Ltd	Appendix 1A: Limits to biodiversity offsetting and biodiversity compensation	Oppose	B+LNZ generally oppose the submission on the grounds that's B+LNZ are seeking changes of the plan change are restricted to those necessary to give effect to the National Policy Statement for Urban Development and that any other matters should be subject to proper review in the Schedule full review of the RPS in 2024 and in the scheduled reviews of the Natural Resources Plan in 2023 and 2024. This is because the changes materially impact on communities, including rural communities and B+LNZ do not consider that the necessary engagement has been undertaken to adequately inform these provisions or to meet the requirements of Part 3.2 of the NPS-FM. Furthermore, there is a risk that including matters relating to climate change and indigenous biodiversity before key national legislation is gazetted or implemented is premature and will lead to the inefficient implementation and confusion amongst those who it impacts materially.	Disallow	Reject
S94.021	Guardians of the Bays Incorporated			S94.021	Guardians of the Bays Incorporated	Appendix 1A: Limits to biodiversity offsetting and biodiversity compensation	Support	Not stated	Retain as notified	Accept
S100.027	Meridian Energy Limited			S100.027	Meridian Energy Limited	Appendix 1A: Limits to biodiversity offsetting and biodiversity compensation	Oppose in part	The justification for inclusion of some of the items in proposed Appendix 1A is unclear.	Delete Appendix 1A	Reject
S100.027	Meridian Energy Limited	FS3.050	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	FS3.050	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	Appendix 1A: Limits to biodiversity offsetting and biodiversity compensation	Support	Waka Kotahi supports as the broad categories require further clarification provided on a more targeted and catchment-based approach to biodiversity offsetting with specific rationale given to appropriate methods on a case by case basis.	Allow	Reject
S123.022	Peter Thompson			S123.022	Peter Thompson	Appendix 1A: Limits to biodiversity offsetting and biodiversity compensation	Support	Limits are needed if the decline in biodiversity is to be halted	Retain as notified.	Accept
S144.035	Sustainable Wairarapa Inc			S144.035	Sustainable Wairarapa Inc	Appendix 1A: Limits to biodiversity offsetting and	Support	Limits are needed if the decline in biodiversity is to be halted	Retain as notified.	Accept

S42A Appendix 2 - HS6 Indigenous Ecosystems - Summary Recommendation Table

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
						biodiversity compensation				
S148.043	Wellington International Airport Ltd (WIAL)			S148.043	Wellington International Airport Ltd (WIAL)	Appendix 1A: Limits to biodiversity offsetting and biodiversity compensation	Oppose	<p>WIAL is concerned that the list of species in Table 17 is too broad. This coupled with the limits to offsetting and compensation that are set out in Appendix 1A and associated policies will mean that many projects which include beneficial ecological outcomes involving offsetting and/or compensation will not be able to be considered. For example, Table 17 sets out that "lake margins" meets or exceed Policy 24(b). The explanation set out in the Appendix 1A sets out that ecosystems and species that meet the criteria for Policy 24(b) exceed the limits of biodiversity compensation meaning that applications for compensation cannot be considered. This appears to be very broad for any activity which may affect a broadly defined "lake margin".</p> <p>Giant kelp which is present around the airport coastal area also triggers both Policy 24(a)(i) and NZCPS Policy 11(a) which when read against Appendix 1A appears that any activities which may impact on species would not be able to offer any offsetting or compensation and therefore proposals could not be considered.</p>	Delete both Appendix 1A and Table 17 in their entirety.	Reject
S148.043	Wellington International Airport Ltd (WIAL)	FS8.026	Guardians of the Bays Incorporated	FS8.026	Guardians of the Bays Incorporated	Appendix 1A: Limits to biodiversity offsetting and biodiversity compensation	Oppose	Appendix 1A: Limits to biodiversity offsetting and biodiversity compensation should include important marine plants such as giant kelp, similar to a tall tree forest on the land.	Disallow	Accept
S162.018	Winstone Aggregates			S162.018	Winstone Aggregates	Appendix 1A: Limits to biodiversity offsetting and biodiversity compensation	Oppose	<p>The introduction states that 'the setting of limits to the use of offsetting is one of the ten internationally accepted principles of biodiversity offsetting...'. The changes proposed via PPC1 incorrectly interpret this principle are at odds with RMA, case law and direction of the Draft NPSIB (which may or may not become operative), Limiting the total offset to 10% of effects is a crude way to apply limits and in practice will limit and/or prevent opportunities for significant biodiversity gains from our quarrying projects. Limiting offset based entirely on presence of species is inappropriate. The costs and benefits of this approach coupled with Policy 24 have not been properly considered or evaluation in the s32 report. It is unclear what the evidential basis is for the species list inclusion or the information that fed into the cost and benefit evaluation.</p>	Delete Appendix 1A. <i>[Note: Submission reference to prior submission point 009, the rejection of changes to Policy 24]</i>	Reject

S42A Appendix 2 - HS6 Indigenous Ecosystems - Summary Recommendation Table

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
								The proposed changes effectively mean that will be unable to use offsetting or compensation in the most common situations where they are most likely to be required, sterilising the aggregate resource and leaving no pathway for quarrying in these circumstances despite the need to occur where the resource is based.		
S162.018	Winstone Aggregates	FS7.028	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society (Forest & Bird)	FS7.028	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society (Forest & Bird)	Appendix 1A: Limits to biodiversity offsetting and biodiversity compensation	Oppose	Deletion of Appendix 1A is not appropriate.	Disallow submission point	Accept
S162.018	Winstone Aggregates	FS11.026	Fulton Hogan Limited	FS11.026	Fulton Hogan Limited	Appendix 1A: Limits to biodiversity offsetting and biodiversity compensation	Support	the list in Appendix 1A covers a significant number of ecosystems and species within the region. We understand that the list is based on ecosystems and species that are 'naturally uncommon'. Further investigation into the costs of such an approach to develop Appendix 1A and the subsequent offsetting and compensation exclusions is required. Coupled with policy 24, limiting the use of offsetting and compensation has the potential to effectively halt developments across a significant portion of the region where effects cannot be avoided or mitigated. This effectively sterilises the use of the site. This has significant implications for quarrying which can only occur where the resource is located. By limiting offsets and compensation is such a way, the policy effectively prohibits activities where effects cannot be avoided or mitigated, does not allow for a site specific consideration and may in fact result in missed opportunities for net biodiversity gain. It is unclear if Appendix 1A has been developed based on the criteria in policy 23.	Allow	Reject
S162.018	Winstone Aggregates	FS20.286	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	FS20.286	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	Appendix 1A: Limits to biodiversity offsetting and biodiversity compensation	Oppose	Ātiawa oppose the submissions from Aggregate and Quarry Association and Winstone Aggregates to the extent that the relief sought is inconsistent with national direction, particularly the NPS-FM. Ātiawa are particularly sensitive to aggregate extraction from awa, it is mana whenua who are guaranteed tino rangatiratanga over the land, waterways and all other taonga (including aggregate) through Te Tiriti o Waitangi. Historically aggregate extraction industry has failed to uphold the articles and the principles of Te Tiriti. Additionally, aggregate extraction has adverse effects on te taiao and mana whenua values.	Disallow	Accept

S42A Appendix 2 - HS6 Indigenous Ecosystems - Summary Recommendation Table

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
								On the matter of 'balancing' national policy statements', recent case law states that the NPS-FM 2020 and NPS-UD 2020 are to be read together and reconciled under the regional policy statement and the district plans. It goes on to say, development capacity does not outweigh (trump) Te Mana o te Wai. Te Mana o te Wai is the fundamental concept of freshwater management: any thinking to the converse would not give effect to either national policy statement. Therefore, to reconcile national direction, it is not a balancing act, or even a compromise, the NPS-FM must be given effect to while achieving the purpose of the NPS-UD for example. This can be applied to aggregate extraction, the activity must be consistent with Te Mana o te Wai and the NPS-FM. The need for housing capacity is not license to forgo the requirements of the NPS-FM.		
S168.082	Rangitāne O Wairarapa Inc			S168.082	Rangitāne O Wairarapa Inc	Appendix 1A: Limits to biodiversity offsetting and biodiversity compensation	Support	Rangitāne o Wairarapa support this appendix, noting the above comments on Policy 24. The inclusion of ecosystem and species names for clarity is supported, acknowledging that this does not preclude additional species or ecosystems being considered.	Retain as notified	Accept
S168.082	Rangitāne O Wairarapa Inc	FS31.192	Sustainable Wairarapa Inc	FS31.192	Sustainable Wairarapa Inc	Appendix 1A: Limits to biodiversity offsetting and biodiversity compensation	Support	Kia ora koutou, My name is Ian Gunn, Secretary Sustainable Wairarapa inc. contact # 021567134, address 4B McKay Street, Paraparaumu Beach 5032. Firstly we'd like to state the time frame provided to peruse over 900 pages of submissions is in our opinion an abuse of process. The benefit of further submissions is for you the council to listen and hear the views of its ratepayers. The timeframe in our case does not allow a rigorous review of the original submissions to council. On top of this we are a week before Christmas- a very busy and chaotic time for most members of the community. It is highly likely that the majority of staff will take leave over the Christmas break so analysis of any further submissions will not occur until late January 2023-so why the short period to respond. While there is due process there is also good practise your management of the further submissions fails the good practise model. As a consequence we would like you to note Sustainable Wairarapa's strong support of the original submissions lodged with council by the two Wairarapa Iwi-Ngati Kahungunu and Rangitane. Its clear that there is a poor understanding of nature based solutions this term needs further explanation. Sustainable	Not stated	Accept

S42A Appendix 2 - HS6 Indigenous Ecosystems - Summary Recommendation Table

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
								Wairarapa acknowledges that while nature based solutions offer a wide variety of options its not the only solution. We are heartened by the widespread support for the original document. Thanks for an opportunity to make a further submission. Nga mihi nui lan Gun		
S115.0117	Hutt City Council			S115.0117	Hutt City Council	Appendix 1A: Limits to biodiversity offsetting and biodiversity compensation	Oppose	While indigenous biodiversity is a key issue, we expect the government to soon gazette a National Policy Statement on Indigenous Biodiversity ("NPS-IB"). The proposed provisions may well conflict with the NPS-IB especially with regards to the process for identifying indigenous ecosystems. We request that all provisions relating to indigenous biodiversity be deleted and if regional direction is thought necessary after the NPS-IB is gazetted, that should occur through a variation or a separate policy statement change.	Delete Appendix 1A.	Reject
S115.0117	Hutt City Council	FS3.051	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	FS3.051	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	Appendix 1A: Limits to biodiversity offsetting and biodiversity compensation	Support	Waka Kotahi supports this submission point, as regional direction should be aligned with national direction.	Allow	Reject
S131.0158	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust			S131.0158	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	Appendix 1A: Limits to biodiversity offsetting and biodiversity compensation	Support in part	Ātiawa acknowledge the need for biodiversity offsetting and biodiversity compensation, Ātiawa are concerned that offsetting and compensation may be preferred over protecting existing biodiversity. Ātiawa maintain an interest in ensuring that mana whenua values, including our relationship with our culture, ancestral lands, water, sites, wāhi tapu and taonga (including taonga species) are protected from biodiversity offsetting and biodiversity compensation. It is important to note that not all mana whenua values can be replaced or replicated, therefore it is not appropriate to apply biodiversity offsetting or compensation where an area contains our values.	Amend to include new subclause: Policy 24(a) directs that where policies and/or rules in district and regional plans enable the use of biodiversity offsetting they shall not provide for biodiversity offsetting: where there is no appropriate site, knowledge, proven methods, expertise or mechanism available to design and implement an adequate biodiversity offset (clause (i)); or when an activity is anticipated to causes residual adverse effects on an area after an offset has been implemented if the ecosystem or species is threatened or the ecosystem is naturally uncommon (clause (ii)) or the indigenous ecosystem or habitat	Reject

S42A Appendix 2 - HS6 Indigenous Ecosystems - Summary Recommendation Table

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
									<p>contains mana whenua values (including spiritual, historical or cultural significance to mana whenua).</p> <p>(Policy 24(b) directs that where policies and/or rules in district and regional plans enable the use of biodiversity compensation they shall not provide for biodiversity compensation where an activity is anticipated to cause residual adverse effects on an area if the ecosystem or species is threatened or the ecosystem is naturally uncommon or, the ecosystem or habitat contains mana whenua values (including spiritual, historical or cultural significance to mana whenua).</p>	
S131.0158	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	FS29.278	Ngā Hapu o Otaki	FS29.278	Ngā Hapu o Otaki	Appendix 1A: Limits to biodiversity offsetting and biodiversity compensation	Support	<p>Co -design under a treaty house model is about shaping plans and resource management avenues alongside manawhenua that appropriately recognise the intergenerational prosperity of the uri of Ngā Hapu o Otaki and the wider community.</p> <p>There are ongoing concerns Ngā Hapu o Otaki maintain with GWRC in regard to the policies addressing Co-governance, Co-management, Co-leadership and Co-collabroative operational processes. This submission goes to great length to define where and how further considerations can be made recognising the interconnected nature of matauranga maori, the inequitable impact environmental decline will have on mana whenua/tangata whenua and offers insight to the intuitive and inherent awareness manawhenua need to maintain to ensure our intergenerational survival and prosperity.</p> <p>3.4 Freshwater including Public Access – Support in Principal</p> <p>3.6 Indigenous Ecosystems – Support in Principal</p> <p>3.9 Regional Form, Design and Function – Support in Principal</p> <p>Atiawa views regarding Freshwater, indigenous</p>	Not stated	No recommendation

S42A Appendix 2 - HS6 Indigenous Ecosystems - Summary Recommendation Table

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
								ecosystems and Regional design and function resonate with insights Ngā Hapu o Otaki maintain. Ngā Hapu o Otaki would like opportunity to speak further to such views during the hearing process. We share Ātiawas concerns for Mātauranga Māori as a foundation for equitable interchange of decision making. Their concerns regarding intensification and the further degradation of taonga across our coastline rings true to the ongoing journey we are on as manawhenua facing intense growth for the coming generation. We seek to join the conversation and endorse provisions that will see our whanaunga and other manawhenua groups recognise their environmental resilience and the cultural agility our shared whakapapa offers.		
S165.0148	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society (Forest & Bird)			S165.0148	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society (Forest & Bird)	Appendix 1A: Limits to biodiversity offsetting and biodiversity compensation	Support in part	Threat classification for species and ecosystems change over time.	The appendix is supported but amendment is sought to be clear that Appendix 1A is not fixed in time and recognises that the threat status of species and ecosystems may change over time. If this occurs the most up to date information should be used.	Accept
S165.0148	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society (Forest & Bird)	FS30.319	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Ltd	FS30.319	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Ltd	Appendix 1A: Limits to biodiversity offsetting and biodiversity compensation	Oppose	B+LNZ generally oppose the submission on the grounds that's B+LNZ are seeking changes of the plan change are restricted to those necessary to give effect to the National Policy Statement for Urban Development and that any other matters should be subject to proper review in the Schedule full review of the RPS in 2024 and in the scheduled reviews of the Natural Resources Plan in 2023 and 2024. This is because the changes materially impact on communities, including rural communities and we do not consider that the necessary engagement has been undertaken to adequately inform these provisions or to meet the requirements of Part 3.2 of the NPS-FM. Furthermore, there is a risk that including matters relating to climate change and indigenous biodiversity before key national legislation is gazetted or implemented is premature and will lead to the inefficient implementation and confusion amongst those who it impacts materially.	Disallow	Reject
S167.0192	Taranaki Whānui			S167.0192	Taranaki Whānui	Appendix 1A: Limits to biodiversity offsetting and	Support in part	Taranaki Whānui are keen to understand the method used for compiling and rating/grading the list in Appendix 1A.	Amend this provision to address the relief sought. [Note.: This submission point	Accept in part

S42A Appendix 2 - HS6 Indigenous Ecosystems - Summary Recommendation Table

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
						biodiversity compensation		What input has come from mana whenua? Taranaki Whānui feel strongly that this list needs to be developed in partnership with mana whenua and to include mātauranga Māori. Due to the significance of the list and what it protects, mana whenua should also partner in the management/regulating and monitoring of the implementation of Policy 24.	refers back to S167.088 in relation to Policy 24]	
S137.022	Greater Wellington Regional Council (GWRC)			S137.022	Greater Wellington Regional Council (GWRC)	Biodiversity compensation	Support in part	Amend to align with the offsetting definition and the similar definition in the National Policy Statement for Indigenous Biodiversity exposure draft. Also amend to reflect the fact that we are directing a net benefit outcome from the use of compensation.	Amend definition as follows: Biodiversity compensation A measurable positive environmental outcome resulting from actions that are designed to compensate for residual adverse biodiversity effects that cannot be otherwise managed after avoidance, minimisation, remediation, and biodiversity offset measures have been applied.	Accept
S162.020	Winstone Aggregates			S162.020	Winstone Aggregates	Biodiversity compensation	Oppose	Opposed/ neutral to the inclusion of the listed new definitions. It is unclear where some of these defined terms have come from or what the basis is for defining these terms in this way. Some do not appear to reflect up to date caselaw, the RMA or even the draft NPS-IB. Others appear to reflect NRP definitions but it is unclear how these change the interpretation of the RPS policies. Concerned about seeking to adopt the draft NPS-IB definitions in advance of these being settled. There is insufficient information contained in the s32 evaluation to understand how the impact of these definitions or how they will impact original wording and policies as well as proposed objectives, policies and methods. Further information and evidence as to how these have been developed is requested. Concerned that the definitions take an overly restrictive approach, may have unintended consequences and seeks amendments be made to ensure that the definitions are in line with the NPS and RMA caselaw and ensure that there is a viable and workable pathway to continue to undertake /consent quarrying activities.	Any amendments required to address the submitters concerns set out above or consequential amendments required to the policies, objectives and methods than refer to these definitions.	Accept in part
S162.020	Winstone Aggregates	FS11.030	Fulton Hogan Limited	FS11.030	Fulton Hogan Limited	Biodiversity compensation	Support	It is unclear where the definition for biodiversity compensation within the RPS has come from but it differs from the definition contained in the exposure draft of the NPS-IB. This supported in so far as it	Allow	Accept in part

S42A Appendix 2 - HS6 Indigenous Ecosystems - Summary Recommendation Table

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
								identifies potential challenges with the RPS definition and potential inconsistency with future NPS.		
S162.020	Winstone Aggregates	FS20.288	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	FS20.288	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	Biodiversity compensation	Oppose	<p>Ātiawa oppose the submissions from Aggregate and Quarry Association and Winstone Aggregates to the extent that the relief sought is inconsistent with national direction, particularly the NPS-FM. Ātiawa are particularly sensitive to aggregate extraction from awa, it is mana whenua who are guaranteed tino rangatiratanga over the land, waterways and all other taonga (including aggregate) through Te Tiriti o Waitangi. Historically aggregate extraction industry has failed to uphold the articles and the principles of Te Tiriti. Additionally, aggregate extraction has adverse effects on te taiao and mana whenua values.</p> <p>On the matter of 'balancing' national policy statements', recent case law states that the NPS-FM 2020 and NPS-UD 2020 are to be read together and reconciled under the regional policy statement and the district plans. It goes on to say, development capacity does not outweigh (trump) Te Mana o te Wai. Te Mana o te Wai is the fundamental concept of freshwater management: any thinking to the converse would not give effect to either national policy statement. Therefore, to reconcile national direction, it is not a balancing act, or even a compromise, the NPS-FM must be given effect to while achieving the purpose of the NPS-UD for example. This can be applied to aggregate extraction, the activity must be consistent with Te Mana o te Wai and the NPS-FM. The need for housing capacity is not license to forgo the requirements of the NPS-FM.</p>	Disallow	Accept in part
S168.084	Rangitāne O Wairarapa Inc			S168.084	Rangitāne O Wairarapa Inc	Biodiversity compensation	Support in part	<p>Rangitāne o Wairarapa support the inclusion of a definition of biodiversity compensation. However, amendments are requested to clarify the purpose and use of biodiversity compensation. The definition must be clear that compensation is the riskiest management approach and comes after all measures to avoid, minimise, remedy or offset have been explored. Compensation is also not necessarily a measurable outcome.</p>	Amend the definition as follows: A measurable positive environmental outcome resulting from actions that are designed to compensate for residual adverse biodiversity effects that cannot be otherwise managed avoided, minimised, remediated or offset.	Accept in part
S168.084	Rangitāne O Wairarapa Inc	FS26.072	Meridian Energy Limited	FS26.072	Meridian Energy Limited	Biodiversity compensation	Support in part	Rangitane o Wairarapa requests amendment of the definition as follows:	Allow in part but retain the word 'measurable' and consider and consider	Accept in part

S42A Appendix 2 - HS6 Indigenous Ecosystems - Summary Recommendation Table

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
								'A measurable positive environmental outcome resulting from 'actions that are designed to compensate for residual adverse biodiversity effects that cannot be otherwise managed avoided, minimised, remediated or offset. '* Meridian reiterates the comments made in relation to submission point S147.022 above. Inclusion of 'measurable' reflects the settled wording of the Proposed Natural Resources Plan.	amending the definition to include constructive guidance on the circumstances when plans should provide for biodiversity compensation.	
S168.084	Rangitāne O Wairarapa Inc	FS31.194	Sustainable Wairarapa Inc	FS31.194	Sustainable Wairarapa Inc	Biodiversity compensation	Support	Kia ora koutou, My name is Ian Gunn, Secretary Sustainable Wairarapa inc. contact # 021567134, address 4B McKay Street, Paraparaumu Beach 5032. Firstly we'd like to state the time frame provided to peruse over 900 pages of submissions is in our opinion an abuse of process. The benefit of further submissions is for you the council to listen and hear the views of its ratepayers. The timeframe in our case does not allow a rigorous review of the original submissions to council. On top of this we are a week before Christmas- a very busy and chaotic time for most members of the community. It is highly likely that the majority of staff will take leave over the Christmas break so analysis of any further submissions will not occur until late January 2023-so why the short period to respond. While there is due process there is also good practise your management of the further submissions fails the good practise model. As a consequence we would like you to note Sustainable Wairarapa's strong support of the original submissions lodged with council by the two Wairarapa Iwi-Ngati Kahungunu and Rangitane. Its clear that there is a poor understanding of nature based solutions this term needs further explanation. Sustainable Wairarapa acknowledges that while nature based solutions offer a wide variety of options its not the only solution. We are heartened by the widespread support for the original document. Thanks for an opportunity to make a further submission. Nga mihi nui Ian Gun	Not stated	Accept in part
S165.0125	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society (Forest & Bird)			S165.0125	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society (Forest & Bird)	Biodiversity compensation	Support in part	The reference to 'otherwise managed' is unclear. We also suggest, as per the submission point re policy 24, that this definition should link to a set of mandatory compensation principles contained in the RPS.	Amend definition to: A measurable positive environmental outcome resulting from actions that are designed to compensate for residual adverse biodiversity effects that cannot be avoided remedied	Accept

S42A Appendix 2 - HS6 Indigenous Ecosystems - Summary Recommendation Table

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
									mitigated or offset otherwise managed. Include a requirement to meet the principles set out in an appendix.	
S165.0125	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society (Forest & Bird)	FS20.084	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	FS20.084	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	Biodiversity compensation	Support in part	Ātiawa seek to ensure that the definitions of Biodiversity Offsetting and Biodiversity Compensation are clarified to ensure they are implemented as intended.	Allow	Accept in part
S165.0125	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society (Forest & Bird)	FS26.071	Meridian Energy Limited	FS26.071	Meridian Energy Limited	Biodiversity compensation	Oppose	Forest & Bird seeks amendment to: 'A measurable positive environmental outcome resulting from actions that are designed to compensate for residual adverse biodiversity effects that cannot be avoided remedied mitigated or offset otherwise managed. ' The amendments proposed to Policy 47 include 'minimising' effects as a response (which Meridian agrees is appropriate). The definition should also refer to minimisation (it is omitted from the Forest and Bird suggestion).	Disallow	Reject
S165.0125	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society (Forest & Bird)	FS30.319	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Ltd	FS30.319	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Ltd	Biodiversity compensation	Oppose	B+LNZ generally oppose the submission on the grounds that's B+LNZ are seeking changes of the plan change are restricted to those necessary to give effect to the National Policy Statement for Urban Development and that any other matters should be subject to proper review in the Schedule full review of the RPS in 2024 and in the scheduled reviews of the Natural Resources Plan in 2023 and 2024. This is because the changes materially impact on communities, including rural communities and we do not consider that the necessary engagement has been undertaken to adequately inform these provisions or to meet the requirements of Part 3.2 of the NPS-FM. Furthermore, there is a risk that including matters relating to climate change and indigenous biodiversity before key national legislation is gazetted or implemented is premature and will lead to the inefficient implementation and confusion amongst those who it impacts materially.	Disallow	Reject
S137.023	Greater Wellington Regional Council (GWRC)			S137.023	Greater Wellington Regional Council (GWRC)	Biodiversity offsetting	Support in part	Delete appropriate as it is imprecise. Also amend to reflect the fact that we are directing a net gain outcome from the use of offsetting.	Amend definition as follows: Biodiversity offsetting A measurable positive environmental outcome resulting from actions designed to redress for the	Accept in part

S42A Appendix 2 - HS6 Indigenous Ecosystems - Summary Recommendation Table

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
									residual adverse effects on biodiversity arising from activities after appropriate avoidance, minimisation, and remediation measures have been applied. The goal of biodiversity offsetting is to achieve no net loss, and preferably at least a 10 percent net gain, of indigenous biodiversity values.	
S137.023	Greater Wellington Regional Council (GWRC)	FS22.003	Director-General of Conservation	FS22.003	Director-General of Conservation	Biodiversity offsetting	Support	The proposed changes more accurately reflect the proposed approach of the RPS, and would better give effect to the NPSIB exposure draft.	Allow	Accept in part
S137.023	Greater Wellington Regional Council (GWRC)	FS27.033	Winstone Aggregates	FS27.033	Winstone Aggregates	Biodiversity offsetting	Oppose	As with the proposed changes to Policy 24, the requested amendments to this definition have significant implications for biodiversity offsetting objectives and policies in the RPS. Winstone considers that this submission point should be rejected as the proposed amendments represent a substantial and tangible shift in policy direction, and further reinforce the impracticality of the offsetting provisions. Winstone does not oppose the request to delete 'appropriate' from the definition	Disallow	Accept in part
S137.023	Greater Wellington Regional Council (GWRC)	FS26.073	Meridian Energy Limited	FS26.073	Meridian Energy Limited	Biodiversity offsetting	Oppose	GWRC (p. 4 of 9): Amend definition as follows: 'A measurable positive environmental outcome resulting from actions designed to redress for the residual adverse effects on biodiversity arising from activities after appropriate avoidance, minimisation, and remediation measures have been applied. The goal of biodiversity offsetting is to achieve no net loss, and preferably at least a 10 percent net gain, of indigenous biodiversity values.' Include a requirement to meet the principles set out in an appendix. Meridian opposes the requirement for a specified minimum 10% net biodiversity gain and seeks retention of the reference to no net loss.	Disallow	Accept in part
S162.021	Winstone Aggregates			S162.021	Winstone Aggregates	Biodiversity offsetting	Oppose	Opposed/ neutral to the inclusion of the listed new definitions. It is unclear where some of these defined terms have come from or what the basis is for defining these terms in this way. Some do not appear to reflect up to date caselaw, the RMA or even the draft NPS-IB. Others appear to reflect NRP definitions but it is	Any amendments required to address the submitters concerns set out above or consequential amendments required to the policies,	Reject

S42A Appendix 2 - HS6 Indigenous Ecosystems - Summary Recommendation Table

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
								unclear how these change the interpretation of the RPS policies. Concerned about seeking to adopt the draft NPS-IB definitions in advance of these being settled. There is insufficient information contained in the s32 evaluation to understand how the impact of these definitions or how they will impact original wording and policies as well as proposed objectives, policies and methods. Further information and evidence as to how these have been developed is requested. Concerned that the definitions take an overly restrictive approach, may have unintended consequences and seeks amendments be made to ensure that the definitions are in line with the NPS and RMA caselaw and ensure that there is a viable and workable pathway to continue to undertake /consent quarrying activities.	objectives and methods than refer to these definitions.	
S162.021	Winstone Aggregates	FS11.031	Fulton Hogan Limited	FS11.031	Fulton Hogan Limited	Biodiversity offsetting	Support	It is unclear where the definition for biodiversity offsetting has come from within the RPS. This submission is supported in so far as it identifies potential challenges with the RPS definition and potential inconsistency with future NPS.	Allow	Reject
S162.021	Winstone Aggregates	FS20.289	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	FS20.289	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	Biodiversity offsetting	Oppose	Ātiawa oppose the submissions from Aggregate and Quarry Association and Winstone Aggregates to the extent that the relief sought is inconsistent with national direction, particularly the NPS-FM. Ātiawa are particularly sensitive to aggregate extraction from awa, it is mana whenua who are guaranteed tino rangatiratanga over the land, waterways and all other taonga (including aggregate) through Te Tiriti o Waitangi. Historically aggregate extraction industry has failed to uphold the articles and the principles of Te Tiriti. Additionally, aggregate extraction has adverse effects on te taiao and mana whenua values. On the matter of 'balancing' national policy statements', recent case law states that the NPS-FM 2020 and NPS-UD 2020 are to be read together and reconciled under the regional policy statement and the district plans. It goes on to say, development capacity does not outweigh (trump) Te Mana o te Wai. Te Mana o te Wai is the fundamental concept of freshwater management: any thinking to the converse would not give effect to either national policy statement. Therefore, to reconcile national direction, it is not a balancing act, or even a compromise, the NPS-FM must be given effect to while achieving the	Disallow	Accept

S42A Appendix 2 - HS6 Indigenous Ecosystems - Summary Recommendation Table

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
								purpose of the NPS-UD for example. This can be applied to aggregate extraction, the activity must be consistent with Te Mana o te Wai and the NPS-FM. The need for housing capacity is not license to forgo the requirements of the NPS-FM.		
S168.083	Rangitāne O Wairarapa Inc			S168.083	Rangitāne O Wairarapa Inc	Biodiversity offsetting	Support in part	Rangitāne o Wairarapa generally support the biodiversity offsetting definition as it is consistent with New Zealand guidance. However, an amendment is required to ensure it aligns with the 10% net gain goal specified in Policy 24 and Appendix 1A.	Amend the definition to be consistent with the 10% net gain goal specified in Policy 24 and Appendix 1A.	Accept in part
S168.083	Rangitāne O Wairarapa Inc	FS26.075	Meridian Energy Limited	FS26.075	Meridian Energy Limited	Biodiversity offsetting	Oppose in part	Rangitāne o Wairarapa seek amendment to be consistent with the 10% net gain goal specified in Policy 24 and Appendix 1A. Meridian opposes the requirement for a 10% net gain in Policy 24.	Disallow	Accept in part
S168.083	Rangitāne O Wairarapa Inc	FS31.193	Sustainable Wairarapa Inc	FS31.193	Sustainable Wairarapa Inc	Biodiversity offsetting	Support	Kia ora koutou, My name is Ian Gunn, Secretary Sustainable Wairarapa inc. contact # 021567134, address 4B McKay Street, Paraparaumu Beach 5032. Firstly we'd like to state the time frame provided to peruse over 900 pages of submissions is in our opinion an abuse of process. The benefit of further submissions is for you the council to listen and hear the views of its ratepayers. The timeframe in our case does not allow a rigorous review of the original submissions to council. On top of this we are a week before Christmas- a very busy and chaotic time for most members of the community. It is highly likely that the majority of staff will take leave over the Christmas break so analysis of any further submissions will not occur until late January 2023-so why the short period to respond. While there is due process there is also good practise your management of the further submissions fails the good practise model. As a consequence we would like you to note Sustainable Wairarapa's strong support of the original submissions lodged with council by the two Wairarapa Iwi-Ngati Kahungunu and Rangitane. Its clear that there is a poor understanding of nature based solutions this term needs further explanation. Sustainable Wairarapa acknowledges that while nature based solutions offer a wide variety of options its not the only solution. We are heartened by the widespread support for the original document. Thanks for an opportunity to make a further submission. Nga mihi nui Ian Gun	Not stated	Accept in part

S42A Appendix 2 - HS6 Indigenous Ecosystems - Summary Recommendation Table

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
S165.0126	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society (Forest & Bird)			S165.0126	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society (Forest & Bird)	Biodiversity offsetting	Support in part	The reference to minimisation is unclear. Suggest, as per the submission point re policy 24, that this definition should link to a set of mandatory offsetting principles contained in the RPS.	Amend definition to: A measurable positive environmental outcome resulting from actions designed to redress for the residual adverse effects on biodiversity arising from activities after appropriate avoidance, minimisation, and remediation and mitigation measures have been applied. The goal of biodiversity offsetting is to achieve no net loss, and preferably a net gain, of indigenous biodiversity values. Include a requirement to meet the principles set out in an appendix.	Accept in part
S165.0126	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society (Forest & Bird)	FS20.085	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	FS20.085	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	Biodiversity offsetting	Support in part	Ātiawa seek to ensure that the definitions of Biodiversity Offsetting and Biodiversity Compensation are clarified to ensure they are implemented as intended.	Allow	Accept in part
S165.0126	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society (Forest & Bird)	FS26.074	Meridian Energy Limited	FS26.074	Meridian Energy Limited	Biodiversity offsetting	Oppose	Forest & Bird: Amend definition to: 'A measurable positive environmental outcome resulting from actions designed to redress for the residual adverse effects on biodiversity arising from activities after appropriate avoidance, minimisation, and remediation and mitigation measures have been applied. The goal of biodiversity offsetting is to achieve no net loss, and preferably a net gain, of indigenous biodiversity values.' Include a requirement to meet the principles set out in an appendix. The proposed amendments to Policy 47 include reference to minimisation and this should also be referenced in the definition.	Disallow	Accept in part
S165.0126	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society (Forest & Bird)	FS30.319	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Ltd	FS30.319	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Ltd	Biodiversity offsetting	Oppose	B+LNZ generally oppose the submission on the grounds that's B+LNZ are seeking changes of the plan change are restricted to those necessary to give effect to the National Policy Statement for Urban Development and that any other matters should be subject to proper review in the Schedule full review of the RPS in 2024 and in the scheduled reviews of the Natural Resources Plan in 2023 and 2024. This is	Disallow	Accept in part

S42A Appendix 2 - HS6 Indigenous Ecosystems - Summary Recommendation Table

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
								because the changes materially impact on communities, including rural communities and we do not consider that the necessary engagement has been undertaken to adequately inform these provisions or to meet the requirements of Part 3.2 of the NPS-FM. Furthermore, there is a risk that including matters relating to climate change and indigenous biodiversity before key national legislation is gazetted or implemented is premature and will lead to the inefficient implementation and confusion amongst those who it impacts materially.		
S162.022	Winstone Aggregates			S162.022	Winstone Aggregates	Ecological connectivity	Oppose	<p>Opposed/ neutral to the inclusion of the listed new definitions. It is unclear where some of these defined terms have come from or what the basis is for defining these terms in this way. Some do not appear to reflect up to date caselaw, the RMA or even the draft NPS-IB. Others appear to reflect NRP definitions but it is unclear how these change the interpretation of the RPS policies.</p> <p>Concerned about seeking to adopt the draft NPS-IB definitions in advance of these being settled. There is insufficient information contained in the s32 evaluation to understand how the impact of these definitions or how they will impact original wording and policies as well as proposed objectives, policies and methods. Further information and evidence as to how these have been developed is requested.</p> <p>Concerned that the definitions take an overly restrictive approach, may have unintended consequences and seeks amendments be made to ensure that the definitions are in line with the NPS and RMA caselaw and ensure that there is a viable and workable pathway to continue to undertake /consent quarrying activities.</p>	Any amendments required to address the submitters concerns set out above or consequential amendments required to the policies, objectives and methods than refer to these definitions.	reject
S162.022	Winstone Aggregates	FS11.032	Fulton Hogan Limited	FS11.032	Fulton Hogan Limited	Ecological connectivity	Support	It is unclear where the definition of ecological connectivity has come from. It is also similar to the definition of 'connectivity' within the exposure draft of the NPS-IB. This submission is supported in so far as it identifies potential challenges with the RPS definition and potential with future NPS.	Allow	reject
S162.022	Winstone Aggregates	FS20.290	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	FS20.290	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	Ecological connectivity	Oppose	Ātiawa oppose the submissions from Aggregate and Quarry Association and Winstone Aggregates to the extent that the relief sought is inconsistent with national direction, particularly the NPS-FM. Ātiawa are particularly sensitive to aggregate extraction from awa, it is mana whenua who are	Disallow	Accept

S42A Appendix 2 - HS6 Indigenous Ecosystems - Summary Recommendation Table

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
								<p>guaranteed tino rangatiratanga over the land, waterways and all other taonga (including aggregate) through Te Tiriti o Waitangi. Historically aggregate extraction industry has failed to uphold the articles and the principles of Te Tiriti. Additionally, aggregate extraction has adverse effects on te taiao and mana whenua values.</p> <p>On the matter of 'balancing' national policy statements', recent case law states that the NPS-FM 2020 and NPS-UD 2020 are to be read together and reconciled under the regional policy statement and the district plans. It goes on to say, development capacity does not outweigh (trump) Te Mana o te Wai. Te Mana o te Wai is the fundamental concept of freshwater management: any thinking to the converse would not give effect to either national policy statement. Therefore, to reconcile national direction, it is not a balancing act, or even a compromise, the NPS-FM must be given effect to while achieving the purpose of the NPS-UD for example. This can be applied to aggregate extraction, the activity must be consistent with Te Mana o te Wai and the NPS-FM. The need for housing capacity is not license to forgo the requirements of the NPS-FM.</p>		
S168.085	Rangitāne O Wairarapa Inc			S168.085	Rangitāne O Wairarapa Inc	Ecological connectivity	Support	Rangitāne o Wairarapa supports the inclusion of this definition and the clarification it provides.	Retain as notified.	Accept
S168.085	Rangitāne O Wairarapa Inc	FS31.195	Sustainable Wairarapa Inc	FS31.195	Sustainable Wairarapa Inc	Ecological connectivity	Support	<p>Kia ora koutou, My name is Ian Gunn, Secretary Sustainable Wairarapa inc. contact # 021567134, address 4B McKay Street, Paraparaumu Beach 5032. Firstly we'd like to state the time frame provided to peruse over 900 pages of submissions is in our opinion an abuse of process. The benefit of further submissions is for you the council to listen and hear the views of its ratepayers. The timeframe in our case does not allow a rigorous review of the original submissions to council. On top of this we are a week before Christmas- a very busy and chaotic time for most members of the community. It is highly likely that the majority of staff will take leave over the Christmas break so analysis of any further submissions will not occur until late January 2023-so why the short period to respond. While there is due process there is also good practise your management of the further submissions fails the good practise model. As a consequence we would like you to note Sustainable Wairarapa's strong support of the original submissions</p>	Not stated	Accept

S42A Appendix 2 - HS6 Indigenous Ecosystems - Summary Recommendation Table

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
								lodged with council by the two Wairarapa Iwi-Ngati Kahungunu and Rangitane. Its clear that there is a poor understanding of nature based solutions this term needs further explanation. Sustainable Wairarapa acknowledges that while nature based solutions offer a wide variety of options its not the only solution. We are heartened by the widespread support for the original document. Thanks for an opportunity to make a further submission. Nga mihi nui lan Gun		
S140.0121	Wellington City Council (WCC)			S140.0121	Wellington City Council (WCC)	Ecological connectivity	Support in part	The current definition of "ecological connectivity" is confusing and does not provide a clear meaning for the term. It also ignores the Exposure Draft NPS-IB's definition of 'connectivity' which should replace the current definition	Amend: Refers to the degree of connection that provides for the movement of genetic alleles and species and the maintenance of ecosystem processes within and between populations and ecosystems. To the definition of connectivity used in the Exposure Draft National Policy Statement for Indigenous Biodiversity: "refers to the structural or functional links or connections between habitats and ecosystems that provide for the movement of species and processes among and between the habitats or ecosystems"	Accept
S165.0130	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society (Forest & Bird)			S165.0130	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society (Forest & Bird)	Ecological connectivity	Support in part	Drafting improvement	Replace "alleles" with "material"	Accept
S165.0130	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society (Forest & Bird)	FS20.089	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	FS20.089	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	Ecological connectivity	Support in part	Ātiawa seek that the definitions are retained as drafted.	Disallow the submission point, and retain the definitions as drafted.	reject

S42A Appendix 2 - HS6 Indigenous Ecosystems - Summary Recommendation Table

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
S165.0130	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society (Forest & Bird)	FS30.319	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Ltd	FS30.319	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Ltd	Ecological connectivity	Oppose	B+LNZ generally oppose the submission on the grounds that's B+LNZ are seeking changes of the plan change are restricted to those necessary to give effect to the National Policy Statement for Urban Development and that any other matters should be subject to proper review in the Schedule full review of the RPS in 2024 and in the scheduled reviews of the Natural Resources Plan in 2023 and 2024. This is because the changes materially impact on communities, including rural communities and we do not consider that the necessary engagement has been undertaken to adequately inform these provisions or to meet the requirements of Part 3.2 of the NPS-FM. Furthermore, there is a risk that including matters relating to climate change and indigenous biodiversity before key national legislation is gazetted or implemented is premature and will lead to the inefficient implementation and confusion amongst those who it impacts materially.	Disallow	reject
S137.024	Greater Wellington Regional Council (GWRC)			S137.024	Greater Wellington Regional Council (GWRC)	Ecological integrity	Support in part	Amend to align with the National Policy Statement for Indigenous Biodiversity exposure draft.	Amend definition as follows: Ecological Integrity The full potential of indigenous biotic and abiotic features and natural processes, functioning in sustainable communities, habitats, and landscapes. Means the extent to which an ecosystem is able to support and maintain its:(a) composition (being its natural diversity of indigenous species, habitats, and communities); and(b) structure (being its biotic and abiotic physical features); and (c) functions (being its ecological and physical processes)	Accept
S137.024	Greater Wellington Regional Council (GWRC)	FS22.004	Director-General of Conservation	FS22.004	Director-General of Conservation	Ecological integrity	Support	The proposed changes are appropriate in terms of ecological science, and would better give effect to the NPSIB exposure draft.	Allow	Accept
S162.023	Winstone Aggregates			S162.023	Winstone Aggregates	Ecological integrity	Oppose	Opposed/ neutral to the inclusion of the listed new definitions. It is unclear where some of these defined terms have come from or what the basis is for defining	Any amendments required to address the submitters concerns set out above or	reject

S42A Appendix 2 - HS6 Indigenous Ecosystems - Summary Recommendation Table

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
								<p>these terms in this way. Some do not appear to reflect up to date caselaw, the RMA or even the draft NPS-IB. Others appear to reflect NRP definitions but it is unclear how these change the interpretation of the RPS policies.</p> <p>Concerned about seeking to adopt the draft NPS-IB definitions in advance of these being settled. There is insufficient information contained in the s32 evaluation to understand how the impact of these definitions or how they will impact original wording and policies as well as proposed objectives, policies and methods. Further information and evidence as to how these have been developed is requested.</p> <p>Concerned that the definitions take an overly restrictive approach, may have unintended consequences and seeks amendments be made to ensure that the definitions are in line with the NPS and RMA caselaw and ensure that there is a viable and workable pathway to continue to undertake /consent quarrying activities.</p>	consequential amendments required to the policies, objectives and methods than refer to these definitions.	
S162.023	Winstone Aggregates	FS11.033	Fulton Hogan Limited	FS11.033	Fulton Hogan Limited	Ecological integrity	Support	The definition of ecological integrity includes vague terms like 'full potential' and 'functioning in sustainable communities'. The definition is inconsistent with the definition included within the exposure draft of the NPS-IB. This submission is supported in so far as it identifies potential challenges with the RPS definition and potential inconsistency with future NPS.	Allow	reject
S162.023	Winstone Aggregates	FS20.291	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	FS20.291	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	Ecological integrity	Oppose	<p>Ātiawa oppose the submissions from Aggregate and Quarry Association and Winstone Aggregates to the extent that the relief sought is inconsistent with national direction, particularly the NPS-FM. Ātiawa are particularly sensitive to aggregate extraction from awa, it is mana whenua who are guaranteed tino rangatiratanga over the land, waterways and all other taonga (including aggregate) through Te Tiriti o Waitangi. Historically aggregate extraction industry has failed to uphold the articles and the principles of Te Tiriti. Additionally, aggregate extraction has adverse effects on te taiao and mana whenua values.</p> <p>On the matter of 'balancing' national policy statements', recent case law states that the NPS-FM 2020 and NPS-UD 2020 are to be read together and reconciled under the regional policy statement and</p>	Disallow	Accept

S42A Appendix 2 - HS6 Indigenous Ecosystems - Summary Recommendation Table

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
								the district plans. It goes on to say, development capacity does not outweigh (trump) Te Mana o te Wai. Te Mana o te Wai is the fundamental concept of freshwater management: any thinking to the converse would not give effect to either national policy statement. Therefore, to reconcile national direction, it is not a balancing act, or even a compromise, the NPS-FM must be given effect to while achieving the purpose of the NPS-UD for example. This can be applied to aggregate extraction, the activity must be consistent with Te Mana o te Wai and the NPS-FM. The need for housing capacity is not license to forgo the requirements of the NPS-FM.		
S168.086	Rangitāne O Wairarapa Inc			S168.086	Rangitāne O Wairarapa Inc	Ecological integrity	Support	Rangitāne o Wairarapa supports the inclusion of this definition and the clarification it provides.	Retain as notified.	Accept in part
S168.086	Rangitāne O Wairarapa Inc	FS31.196	Sustainable Wairarapa Inc	FS31.196	Sustainable Wairarapa Inc	Ecological integrity	Support	Kia ora koutou, My name is Ian Gunn, Secretary Sustainable Wairarapa inc. contact # 021567134, address 4B McKay Street, Paraparaumu Beach 5032. Firstly we'd like to state the time frame provided to peruse over 900 pages of submissions is in our opinion an abuse of process. The benefit of further submissions is for you the council to listen and hear the views of its ratepayers. The timeframe in our case does not allow a rigorous review of the original submissions to council. On top of this we are a week before Christmas- a very busy and chaotic time for most members of the community. It is highly likely that the majority of staff will take leave over the Christmas break so analysis of any further submissions will not occur until late January 2023-so why the short period to respond. While there is due process there is also good practise your management of the further submissions fails the good practise model. As a consequence we would like you to note Sustainable Wairarapa's strong support of the original submissions lodged with council by the two Wairarapa Iwi-Ngati Kahungunu and Rangitane. Its clear that there is a poor understanding of nature based solutions this term needs further explanation. Sustainable Wairarapa acknowledges that while nature based solutions offer a wide variety of options its not the only solution. We are heartened by the widespread support for the original document. Thanks for an opportunity to make a further submission. Nga mihi nui Ian Gun	Not stated	Accept in part

S42A Appendix 2 - HS6 Indigenous Ecosystems - Summary Recommendation Table

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
S165.0131	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society (Forest & Bird)			S165.0131	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society (Forest & Bird)	Ecological integrity	Support in part	The definition could be improved by replacing it with one that includes more appropriate detail.	The current definition is: Delete definition and replace with: "the ability of the natural environment to support and maintain the full range of indigenous biodiversity and ecosystem functioning, both within and across ecosystems. It requires supporting and maintaining: a. ecological representation: the occurrence and extent of ecosystems and indigenous species and their habitats across the full range of environments; b. b. composition: the natural diversity and abundance of indigenous species, habitats, and communities within and across ecosystems; c. structure: the biotic and abiotic physical features and characteristics of ecosystems; d. functions: the ecological and physical functions and processes of an ecosystem; and e. resilience: any other properties that contribute to resilience of the indigenous components of ecosystems to the adverse impacts of natural or human disturbances."	Accept in part
S165.0131	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society (Forest & Bird)	FS20.090	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	FS20.090	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	Ecological integrity	Support in part	Ātiawa seek that the definitions are retained as drafted.	Disallow the submission point, and retain the definitions as drafted.	Accept in part
S165.0131	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	FS30.319	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Ltd	FS30.319	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Ltd	Ecological integrity	Oppose	B+LNZ generally oppose the submission on the grounds that's B+LNZ are seeking changes of the plan change are restricted to those necessary to give effect to the National Policy Statement for Urban	Disallow	reject

S42A Appendix 2 - HS6 Indigenous Ecosystems - Summary Recommendation Table

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
	(Forest & Bird)							Development and that any other matters should be subject to proper review in the Schedule full review of the RPS in 2024 and in the scheduled reviews of the Natural Resources Plan in 2023 and 2024. This is because the changes materially impact on communities, including rural communities and we do not consider that the necessary engagement has been undertaken to adequately inform these provisions or to meet the requirements of Part 3.2 of the NPS-FM. Furthermore, there is a risk that including matters relating to climate change and indigenous biodiversity before key national legislation is gazetted or implemented is premature and will lead to the inefficient implementation and confusion amongst those who it impacts materially.		
S162.024	Winstone Aggregates			S162.024	Winstone Aggregates	Ecosystem health	Oppose	<p>Opposed/ neutral to the inclusion of the listed new definitions. It is unclear where some of these defined terms have come from or what the basis is for defining these terms in this way. Some do not appear to reflect up to date caselaw, the RMA or even the draft NPS-IB. Others appear to reflect NRP definitions but it is unclear how these change the interpretation of the RPS policies.</p> <p>Concerned about seeking to adopt the draft NPS-IB definitions in advance of these being settled. There is insufficient information contained in the s32 evaluation to understand how the impact of these definitions or how they will impact original wording and policies as well as proposed objectives, policies and methods. Further information and evidence as to how these have been developed is requested.</p> <p>Concerned that the definitions take an overly restrictive approach, may have unintended consequences and seeks amendments be made to ensure that the definitions are in line with the NPS and RMA caselaw and ensure that there is a viable and workable pathway to continue to undertake /consent quarrying activities.</p>	Any amendments required to address the submitters concerns set out above or consequential amendments required to the policies, objectives and methods than refer to these definitions.	reject
S162.024	Winstone Aggregates	FS20.292	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	FS20.292	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	Ecosystem health	Oppose	<p>Ātiawa oppose the submissions from Aggregate and Quarry Association and Winstone Aggregates to the extent that the relief sought is inconsistent with national direction, particularly the NPS-FM.</p> <p>Ātiawa are particularly sensitive to aggregate extraction from awa, it is mana whenua who are guaranteed tino rangatiratanga over the land, waterways and all other taonga (including aggregate)</p>	Disallow	Accept

S42A Appendix 2 - HS6 Indigenous Ecosystems - Summary Recommendation Table

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
								<p>through Te Tiriti o Waitangi. Historically aggregate extraction industry has failed to uphold the articles and the principles of Te Tiriti. Additionally, aggregate extraction has adverse effects on te taiao and mana whenua values.</p> <p>On the matter of 'balancing' national policy statements', recent case law states that the NPS-FM 2020 and NPS-UD 2020 are to be read together and reconciled under the regional policy statement and the district plans. It goes on to say, development capacity does not outweigh (trump) Te Mana o te Wai. Te Mana o te Wai is the fundamental concept of freshwater management: any thinking to the converse would not give effect to either national policy statement. Therefore, to reconcile national direction, it is not a balancing act, or even a compromise, the NPS-FM must be given effect to while achieving the purpose of the NPS-UD for example. This can be applied to aggregate extraction, the activity must be consistent with Te Mana o te Wai and the NPS-FM. The need for housing capacity is not license to forgo the requirements of the NPS-FM.</p>		
S168.087	Rangitāne O Wairarapa Inc			S168.087	Rangitāne O Wairarapa Inc	Ecosystem health	Support	Rangitāne o Wairarapa supports the inclusion of this definition and the clarification it provides.	Retain as notified.	Accept
S168.087	Rangitāne O Wairarapa Inc	FS31.197	Sustainable Wairarapa Inc	FS31.197	Sustainable Wairarapa Inc	Ecosystem health	Support	<p>Kia ora koutou, My name is Ian Gunn, Secretary Sustainable Wairarapa inc. contact # 021567134, address 4B McKay Street, Paraparaumu Beach 5032.</p> <p>Firstly we'd like to state the time frame provided to peruse over 900 pages of submissions is in our opinion an abuse of process. The benefit of further submissions is for you the council to listen and hear the views of its ratepayers. The timeframe in our case does not allow a rigorous review of the original submissions to council. On top of this we are a week before Christmas- a very busy and chaotic time for most members of the community. It is highly likely that the majority of staff will take leave over the Christmas break so analysis of any further submissions will not occur until late January 2023-so why the short period to respond. While there is due process there is also good practise your management of the further submissions fails the good practise model. As a consequence we would like you to note Sustainable Wairarapa's strong support of the original submissions lodged with council by the two Wairarapa Iwi-Ngati Kahungunu and Rangitane. Its clear that there is a</p>	Not stated	Accept

S42A Appendix 2 - HS6 Indigenous Ecosystems - Summary Recommendation Table

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
								poor understanding of nature based solutions this term needs further explanation. Sustainable Wairarapa acknowledges that while nature based solutions offer a wide variety of options its not the only solution. We are heartened by the widespread support for the original document. Thanks for an opportunity to make a further submission. Nga mihi nui lan Gun		
S165.0132	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society (Forest & Bird)			S165.0132	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society (Forest & Bird)	Ecosystem health	Support in part	Support the definition. However, we seek clarification on how the definition will interact with the NPSFM compulsory value of 'ecosystem health', which is described in Appendix 1A NPSFM. Policy 44 for example refers to ecosystem health in terms of freshwater takes. It is not clear how the RPS definition and the NPSFM value would apply.	Retain, but seek clarity on use of the term in freshwater provisions and make amendments as necessary. Two definitions may be needed to differentiate the terms.	Accept in part
S165.0132	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society (Forest & Bird)	FS20.091	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	FS20.091	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	Ecosystem health	Support in part	Ātiawa seek that the definitions are retained as drafted.	Disallow the submission point, and retain the definitions as drafted.	Accept in part
S165.0132	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society (Forest & Bird)	FS30.319	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Ltd	FS30.319	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Ltd	Ecosystem health	Oppose	B+LNZ generally oppose the submission on the grounds that's B+LNZ are seeking changes of the plan change are restricted to those necessary to give effect to the National Policy Statement for Urban Development and that any other matters should be subject to proper review in the Schedule full review of the RPS in 2024 and in the scheduled reviews of the Natural Resources Plan in 2023 and 2024. This is because the changes materially impact on communities, including rural communities and we do not consider that the necessary engagement has been undertaken to adequately inform these provisions or to meet the requirements of Part 3.2 of the NPS-FM. Furthermore, there is a risk that including matters relating to climate change and indigenous biodiversity before key national legislation is gazetted or implemented is premature and will lead to the inefficient implementation and confusion amongst those who it impacts materially.	Disallow	reject
S32.040	Director-General of Conservation			S32.040	Director-General of Conservation	Enhancement (in relation to indigenous biodiversity)	Support in part	Proposed definitions relating to indigenous biodiversity are generally appropriate. However, if an NPS for Indigenous Biodiversity is gazetted prior to decisions being made on the definitions, then they	Retain as notified, subject to any changes which may be required to give effect to an NPS for Indigenous Biodiversity.	Accept

S42A Appendix 2 - HS6 Indigenous Ecosystems - Summary Recommendation Table

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
								should be reviewed for compliance with that document.		
S32.040	Director-General of Conservation	FS30.318	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Ltd	FS30.318	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Ltd	Enhancement (in relation to indigenous biodiversity)	Oppose	B+LNZ generally oppose the submission on the grounds that's B+LNZ are seeking changes of the plan change are restricted to those necessary to give effect to the National Policy Statement for Urban Development and that any other matters should be subject to proper review in the Schedule full review of the RPS in 2024 and in the scheduled reviews of the Natural Resources Plan in 2023 and 2024. This is because the changes materially impact on communities, including rural communities and B+LNZ do not consider that the necessary engagement has been undertaken to adequately inform these provisions or to meet the requirements of Part 3.2 of the NPS-FM. Furthermore, there is a risk that including matters relating to climate change and indigenous biodiversity before key national legislation is gazetted or implemented is premature and will lead to the inefficient implementation and confusion amongst those who it impacts materially.	Disallow	reject
S162.025	Winstone Aggregates			S162.025	Winstone Aggregates	Enhancement (in relation to indigenous biodiversity)	Oppose	Opposed/ neutral to the inclusion of the listed new definitions. It is unclear where some of these defined terms have come from or what the basis is for defining these terms in this way. Some do not appear to reflect up to date caselaw, the RMA or even the draft NPS-IB. Others appear to reflect NRP definitions but it is unclear how these change the interpretation of the RPS policies. Concerned about seeking to adopt the draft NPS-IB definitions in advance of these being settled. There is insufficient information contained in the s32 evaluation to understand how the impact of these definitions or how they will impact original wording and policies as well as proposed objectives, policies and methods. Further information and evidence as to how these have been developed is requested. Concerned that the definitions take an overly restrictive approach, may have unintended consequences and seeks amendments be made to ensure that the definitions are in line with the NPS and RMA caselaw and ensure that there is a viable and workable pathway to continue to undertake /consent quarrying activities.	Any amendments required to address the submitters concerns set out above or consequential amendments required to the policies, objectives and methods than refer to these definitions.	reject
S162.025	Winstone Aggregates	FS20.293	Ātiawa ki Whakarongot	FS20.293	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai	Enhancement (in relation to	Oppose	Ātiawa oppose the submissions from Aggregate and Quarry Association and Winstone Aggregates to the	Disallow	Accept

S42A Appendix 2 - HS6 Indigenous Ecosystems - Summary Recommendation Table

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
			ai Charitable Trust		Charitable Trust	indigenous biodiversity)		<p>extent that the relief sought is inconsistent with national direction, particularly the NPS-FM. Ātiawa are particularly sensitive to aggregate extraction from awa, it is mana whenua who are guaranteed tino rangatiratanga over the land, waterways and all other taonga (including aggregate) through Te Tiriti o Waitangi. Historically aggregate extraction industry has failed to uphold the articles and the principles of Te Tiriti. Additionally, aggregate extraction has adverse effects on te taiao and mana whenua values.</p> <p>On the matter of 'balancing' national policy statements', recent case law states that the NPS-FM 2020 and NPS-UD 2020 are to be read together and reconciled under the regional policy statement and the district plans. It goes on to say, development capacity does not outweigh (trump) Te Mana o te Wai. Te Mana o te Wai is the fundamental concept of freshwater management: any thinking to the converse would not give effect to either national policy statement. Therefore, to reconcile national direction, it is not a balancing act, or even a compromise, the NPS-FM must be given effect to while achieving the purpose of the NPS-UD for example. This can be applied to aggregate extraction, the activity must be consistent with Te Mana o te Wai and the NPS-FM. The need for housing capacity is not license to forgo the requirements of the NPS-FM.</p>		
S168.088	Rangitāne O Wairarapa Inc			S168.088	Rangitāne O Wairarapa Inc	Enhancement (in relation to indigenous biodiversity)	Support	Rangitāne o Wairarapa supports the inclusion of this definition and the clarification it provides.	Retain as notified.	Accept
S168.088	Rangitāne O Wairarapa Inc	FS31.198	Sustainable Wairarapa Inc	FS31.198	Sustainable Wairarapa Inc	Enhancement (in relation to indigenous biodiversity)	Support	<p>Kia ora koutou, My name is Ian Gunn, Secretary Sustainable Wairarapa inc. contact # 021567134, address 4B McKay Street, Paraparaumu Beach 5032. Firstly we'd like to state the time frame provided to peruse over 900 pages of submissions is in our opinion an abuse of process. The benefit of further submissions is for you the council to listen and hear the views of its ratepayers. The timeframe in our case does not allow a rigorous review of the original submissions to council. On top of this we are a week before Christmas- a very busy and chaotic time for most members of the community. It is highly likely that the majority of staff will take leave over the Christmas break so analysis of any further submissions</p>	Not stated	Accept

S42A Appendix 2 - HS6 Indigenous Ecosystems - Summary Recommendation Table

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
								will not occur until late January 2023-so why the short period to respond. While there is due process there is also good practise your management of the further submissions fails the good practise model. As a consequence we would like you to note Sustainable Wairarapa's strong support of the original submissions lodged with council by the two Wairarapa Iwi-Ngati Kahungunu and Rangitane. Its clear that there is a poor understanding of nature based solutions this term needs further explanation. Sustainable Wairarapa acknowledges that while nature based solutions offer a wide variety of options its not the only solution. We are heartened by the widespread support for the original document. Thanks for an opportunity to make a further submission. Nga mihi nui Ian Gun		
S165.0133	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society (Forest & Bird)			S165.0133	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society (Forest & Bird)	Enhancement (in relation to indigenous biodiversity)	Support		Retain	Accept
S165.0133	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society (Forest & Bird)	FS20.092	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	FS20.092	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	Enhancement (in relation to indigenous biodiversity)	Support in part	Ātiawa seek that the definitions are retained as drafted.	Disallow the submission point, and retain the definitions as drafted.	Accept in part
S165.0133	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society (Forest & Bird)	FS30.319	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Ltd	FS30.319	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Ltd	Enhancement (in relation to indigenous biodiversity)	Oppose	B+LNZ generally oppose the submission on the grounds that's B+LNZ are seeking changes of the plan change are restricted to those necessary to give effect to the National Policy Statement for Urban Development and that any other matters should be subject to proper review in the Schedule full review of the RPS in 2024 and in the scheduled reviews of the Natural Resources Plan in 2023 and 2024. This is because the changes materially impact on communities, including rural communities and we do not consider that the necessary engagement has been undertaken to adequately inform these provisions or to meet the requirements of Part 3.2 of the NPS-FM. Furthermore, there is a risk that including matters relating to climate change and indigenous biodiversity before key national legislation is gazetted or implemented is premature and will lead to the	Disallow	reject

S42A Appendix 2 - HS6 Indigenous Ecosystems - Summary Recommendation Table

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
								inefficient implementation and confusion amongst those who it impacts materially.		
S16.089	Kāpiti Coast District Council			S16.089	Kāpiti Coast District Council	Maintain /maintained /maintenance: (in relation to indigenous biodiversity)	Oppose	Council notes restoration and enhancement are separate activities that require a greater level of intervention and action than that required to maintain. Council opposes the definition including restoration and enhancement activities as part of the maintenance of indigenous biodiversity.	Amend as follows: Maintain /maintained /maintenance (in relation to indigenous biodiversity) At least no reduction in the following: a) the size of populations of indigenous species b) indigenous species occupancy across their natural range c) the properties and function of ecosystems and habitats d) the full range and extent of ecosystems and habitats e) connectivity between and buffering around, ecosystems f) the resilience and adaptability of ecosystems. The maintenance of indigenous biodiversity may also require the restoration or enhancement of ecosystems and habitats.	reject
S100.026	Meridian Energy Limited			S100.026	Meridian Energy Limited	Maintain /maintained /maintenance: (in relation to indigenous biodiversity)	Oppose in part	Restoration and enhancement infer improvement, rather than maintenance. The need for and appropriateness of restoration or enhancement should be addressed in the relevant policies.	Delete the reference to restoration and enhancement in the last paragraph: a) the size of populations of indigenous species b) indigenous species occupancy across their natural range c) the properties and function of ecosystems and habitats d) the full range and extent of ecosystems and habitats e) connectivity between and buffering around, ecosystems f) the resilience and adaptability of ecosystems.	reject

S42A Appendix 2 - HS6 Indigenous Ecosystems - Summary Recommendation Table

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
									The maintenance of indigenous biodiversity may also require the restoration or enhancement of ecosystems and habitats.	
S100.026	Meridian Energy Limited	FS11.034	Fulton Hogan Limited	FS11.034	Fulton Hogan Limited	Maintain /maintained /maintenance: (in relation to indigenous biodiversity)	Support	Restoration and enhancement infer improvement, rather than maintenance. The need for, and appropriateness of, restoration and enhancement should be addressed through policy direction and not included within the definition. The reference to restoration or enhancement should be deleted from the definition to be consistent with the exposure draft of the NPS-IB.	Allow	reject
S114.006	Fulton Hogan Ltd			S114.006	Fulton Hogan Limited	Maintain /maintained /maintenance: (in relation to indigenous biodiversity)	Support in part	This definition appears to respond to the NPS-IB, and should be consistent with the final version of that policy.	Retain as notified	Accept
S134.019	Powerco Limited			S134.019	Powerco Limited	Maintain /maintained /maintenance: (in relation to indigenous biodiversity)	Oppose	Distinct definitions of restoration and enhancement are included and infer improvement of the existing state. It is inappropriate to incorporate these terms in the defined concept of 'maintenance'. If restoration or enhancement are appropriate in relation to development within a certain ecosystem or habitat that should be addressed at a policy level.	Amend the definition of maintain / maintained / maintenance by deleting the reference to restoration and enhancement, as follows: Maintain /maintained /maintenance (in relation to indigenous biodiversity) At least no reduction in the following: a) the size of populations of indigenous species b) indigenous species occupancy across their natural range c) the properties and function of ecosystems and habitats d) the full range and extent of ecosystems and habitats e) connectivity between and buffering around, ecosystems f) the resilience and adaptability of ecosystems. The maintenance of indigenous biodiversity may also require the restoration	reject

S42A Appendix 2 - HS6 Indigenous Ecosystems - Summary Recommendation Table

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
									or enhancement of ecosystems and habitats.	
S148.057	Wellington International Airport Ltd (WIAL)			S148.057	Wellington International Airport Ltd (WIAL)	Maintain /maintained /maintenance: (in relation to indigenous biodiversity)	Oppose in part	WIAL seeks to ensure that this definition is consistent with national direction that may be contained in the NPSIB. In its current drafting it also appears to achieve a level of protection, which is arguably higher than a requirement to "maintain".	Delete this definition	reject
S157.047	BP Oil NZ Ltd, Mobil Oil Ltd and Z Energy Ltd			S157.047	BP Oil NZ Ltd Mobil Oil NZ Ltd and Z Energy Ltd (the Fuel Companies)	Maintain /maintained /maintenance: (in relation to indigenous biodiversity)	Oppose	Distinct definitions of restoration and enhancement are included and infer improvement of the existing state. It is inappropriate to incorporate these terms in the defined concept of 'maintenance'. If restoration or enhancement are appropriate in relation to development within a certain ecosystem or habitat that should be addressed at a policy level.	Amend the definition of maintain / maintained / maintenance by deleting the reference to restoration and enhancement, as follow: Maintain /maintained /maintenance (in relation to indigenous biodiversity) The maintenance of indigenous biodiversity may also require the restoration or enhancement of ecosystems and habitats.	reject
S157.047	BP Oil NZ Ltd, Mobil Oil Ltd and Z Energy Ltd	FS19.050	Wellington Water Ltd ("Wellington Water")	FS19.050	Wellington Water Ltd ("Wellington Water")	Maintain /maintained /maintenance: (in relation to indigenous biodiversity)	Support	Maintenance is already a very high bar and should mean what it says, rather than representing an aspiration.	Allow	reject
S162.026	Winstone Aggregates			S162.026	Winstone Aggregates	Maintain /maintained /maintenance: (in relation to indigenous biodiversity)	Oppose	Winstone is opposed/ neutral to the inclusion of the listed new definitions. It is unclear where some of these defined terms have come from or what the basis is for defining these terms in this way. Some do not appear to reflect up to date caselaw, the RMA or even the draft NPS-IB. Others appear to reflect NRP definitions but it is unclear how these change the interpretation of the RPS policies. Winstone is concerned about seeking to adopt the draft NPS-IB definitions in advance of these being settled. There is insufficient information contained in the s32 evaluation to understand how the impact of these definitions or how they will impact original wording and policies as well as proposed objectives, policies and methods. Further information and evidence as to how these have been developed is requested.	Any amendments required to address the submitters concerns set out above or consequential amendments required to the policies, objectives and methods than refer to these definitions.	Accept in part

S42A Appendix 2 - HS6 Indigenous Ecosystems - Summary Recommendation Table

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
								Winstone is concerned that the definitions take an overly restrictive approach, may have unintended consequences and seeks amendments be made to ensure that the definitions are in line with the NPS and RMA caselaw and ensure that there is a viable and workable pathway to continue to undertake /consent quarrying activities.		
S162.026	Winstone Aggregates	FS20.294	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	FS20.294	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	Maintain /maintained /maintenance: (in relation to indigenous biodiversity)	Oppose	<p>Ātiawa oppose the submissions from Aggregate and Quarry Association and Winstone Aggregates to the extent that the relief sought is inconsistent with national direction, particularly the NPS-FM. Ātiawa are particularly sensitive to aggregate extraction from awa, it is mana whenua who are guaranteed tino rangatiratanga over the land, waterways and all other taonga (including aggregate) through Te Tiriti o Waitangi. Historically aggregate extraction industry has failed to uphold the articles and the principles of Te Tiriti. Additionally, aggregate extraction has adverse effects on te taiao and mana whenua values.</p> <p>On the matter of 'balancing' national policy statements', recent case law states that the NPS-FM 2020 and NPS-UD 2020 are to be read together and reconciled under the regional policy statement and the district plans. It goes on to say, development capacity does not outweigh (trump) Te Mana o te Wai. Te Mana o te Wai is the fundamental concept of freshwater management: any thinking to the converse would not give effect to either national policy statement. Therefore, to reconcile national direction, it is not a balancing act, or even a compromise, the NPS-FM must be given effect to while achieving the purpose of the NPS-UD for example. This can be applied to aggregate extraction, the activity must be consistent with Te Mana o te Wai and the NPS-FM. The need for housing capacity is not license to forgo the requirements of the NPS-FM.</p>	Disallow	Accept in part
S168.089	Rangitāne O Wairarapa Inc			S168.089	Rangitāne O Wairarapa Inc	Maintain /maintained /maintenance: (in relation to indigenous biodiversity)	Support	Rangitāne o Wairarapa supports the inclusion of this definition and the clarification it provides.	Retain as notified.	Accept in part
S168.089	Rangitāne O Wairarapa Inc	FS31.199	Sustainable Wairarapa Inc	FS31.199	Sustainable Wairarapa Inc	Maintain /maintained /maintenance:	Support	Kia ora koutou, My name is Ian Gunn, Secretary Sustainable Wairarapa inc. contact # 021567134, address 4B McKay Street, Paraparaumu Beach 5032.	Not stated	Accept in part

S42A Appendix 2 - HS6 Indigenous Ecosystems - Summary Recommendation Table

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
						(in relation to indigenous biodiversity)		<p>Firstly we'd like to state the time frame provided to peruse over 900 pages of submissions is in our opinion an abuse of process. The benefit of further submissions is for you the council to listen and hear the views of its ratepayers. The timeframe in our case does not allow a rigorous review of the original submissions to council. On top of this we are a week before Christmas- a very busy and chaotic time for most members of the community. It is highly likely that the majority of staff will take leave over the Christmas break so analysis of any further submissions will not occur until late January 2023-so why the short period to respond. While there is due process there is also good practise your management of the further submissions fails the good practise model. As a consequence we would like you to note Sustainable Wairarapa's strong support of the original submissions lodged with council by the two Wairarapa Iwi-Ngati Kahungunu and Rangitane. Its clear that there is a poor understanding of nature based solutions this term needs further explanation. Sustainable Wairarapa acknowledges that while nature based solutions offer a wide variety of options its not the only solution. We are heartened by the widespread support for the original document. Thanks for an opportunity to make a further submission. Nga mihi nui Ian Gun</p>		
S34.0102	Te Kaunihera o Te Awa Kairangi ki Uta, Upper Hutt City Council			S34.0102	Te Kaunihera o Te Awa Kairangi ki Uta, Upper Hutt City Council	Maintain /maintained /maintenance: (in relation to indigenous biodiversity)	Support in part	<p>Regarding the definition of maintenance of IB - the definition refers to at least no reduction in which may result in perverse outcomes in relation to any restoration or enhancement activities and the statement at the end of the definition does not resolve this if some temporary 'reduction' is required to carry out effective restoration or enhancement activities.</p> <p>In addition enabling activities such as trimming or modification of vegetation to occur as necessary for the maintenance of infrastructure or prevention of harm (such as fire breaks or clearance on roads or near powerlines).</p>	Amend definition to be more clearly enabling of restoration or enhancement activities which may temporarily reduce components of the ecosystem or habitat and enable modification that is a functional need for infrastructure, health and safety and access.	reject
S163.0108	Wairarapa Federated Farmers			S163.0108	Wairarapa Federated Farmers	Maintain /maintained /maintenance: (in relation to indigenous biodiversity)	Oppose	<p>Defer to the 2024 RPS review</p> <p>Do not agree that "maintain" means 'restore' or "enhance".</p>	<p>Delete the new definition</p> <p>Delete the FW icon</p>	Accept in part

S42A Appendix 2 - HS6 Indigenous Ecosystems - Summary Recommendation Table

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
S163.0108	Wairarapa Federated Farmers	FS7.048	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society (Forest & Bird)	FS7.048	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society (Forest & Bird)	Maintain /maintained /maintenance: (in relation to indigenous biodiversity)	Oppose	It is completely appropriate to include climate change, biodiversity and freshwater provisions in the plan change. This plan change creates efficiency by considering multiple policy directives from central government. The amendments sought by Federated Farmers fail to give effect to the NPSFM, the NPS for Indigenous Biodiversity, for which there is an exposure draft and the final version is due out this month, and do not achieve the purpose of the RMA or the Climate Change Response (Zero Carbon) Amendment Act 2019.	Disallow whole submission	Accept in part
S163.0108	Wairarapa Federated Farmers	FS20.170	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	FS20.170	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	Maintain /maintained /maintenance: (in relation to indigenous biodiversity)	Oppose	Ātiawa oppose the entire submission by Wairarapa Federated Farmers. The relief sought by Federated Farmers is to effectively delete the entire proposed plan change (except for submission points S163.083, S163.084). The basis for deleting the proposed plan change is to delay decision-making. Ātiawa do not accept that delaying responding to national direction is an appropriate course of action, and will further compound environmental and resource management issues.	Disallow the entire submission by Wairarapa Federated Farmers.	Accept in part
S163.0108	Wairarapa Federated Farmers	FS29.021	Ngā Hapu o Otaki	FS29.021	Ngā Hapu o Otaki	Maintain /maintained /maintenance: (in relation to indigenous biodiversity)	Oppose	Section 18, page 4: General Comments – OPPOSE Section 25, Page 5 Going Forward – OPPOSE It is disheartening to see that Wairarapa Federated Farmers aren't capable of recognizing the obligations GWRC must maintain with Treaty Partners. It must be understood that Manawhenua are not simply 'groups of people' but a representation of the signatories that signed the Treaty of Waitangi and the original kaitiaki and custodians of the taonga in question when considering how these plan changes are implemented. Wairarapa Federated Farmers indicate a lack of awareness to the value of manawhenua engagement. Their stated 'aspirations of delivering environmental improvements alongside a thriving bio-economy' aren't feasible without considering the intergenerational insight and technical direction that only Mātauranga Māori can offer.	Not stated	Accept in part
S163.0108	Wairarapa Federated Farmers	FS30.077	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Ltd	FS30.077	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Ltd	Maintain /maintained /maintenance: (in relation to indigenous biodiversity)	Support	B+LNZ agree that the scope of RPS PC1 should be restricted to those changes necessary to give effect to the National Policy Statement for Urban Development and that any other matters should be subject to proper review in the Schedule full review of the RPS in 2024 and in the scheduled reviews of the Natural	Allow	Awaiting recommendation

S42A Appendix 2 - HS6 Indigenous Ecosystems - Summary Recommendation Table

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
								Resources Plan in 2023 and 2024. Where alternative relief is provided, B+LNZ generally support this relief.		
S165.0134	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society (Forest & Bird)			S165.0134	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society (Forest & Bird)	Maintain /maintained /maintenance: (in relation to indigenous biodiversity)	Support in part	<p>Defining the maintenance of biodiversity, and what it requires is critical for ensuring management actions are properly focused and are consistent across the region.</p> <p>There are, however, some issues with how the concept is framed in the RPS:</p> <p>1. Para (c): the term "properties" is not defined. This is not clear.</p> <p>2. Para (c): this para then refers to "the functions of ecosystems". We query whether a definition of ecosystem function may be needed. If one is included, we seek that it replicates the definition of 'ecosystem processes' used in the Critical factors report. [6].</p> <p>[Note: 6 Walker et al, Critical factors to maintain biodiversity: what effects must be avoided, remedied, or mitigated to halt biodiversity loss? LC3116, May 2018.]</p> <p>Strongly support the recognition that maintenance may require restoration or enhancement.</p>	<p>This definition appears to be based on the proposed NPSIB clause 1.5 definition. We repeat the relevant parts of our submission made in relation to that term here, and seek the same relief:</p> <p>Amend as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Insert definition of "properties of ecosystems and habitats". It is suggested that Manaaki Whenua is asked for advice on this as it prepared the Critical factors report on which the concept is based. • Consider including a definition of ecosystem function to comprise full definition from Critical factors report:[7] <p>[Note 7 references Walker et al, Critical factors to maintain biodiversity: what effects must be avoided, remedied, or mitigated to halt biodiversity loss? LC3116, May 2018. At pg. 41 as follows] "abiotic (physical) and biotic (biological) flows that are properties of an ecosystem, including the water cycle, nutrient cycling (including decomposition, plant nutrient uptake, microbial respiration, nitrification, denitrification), energy flow (photosynthesis, respiration, primary production), community dynamics (including population processes such as migration, dispersal, pollination, herbivory, population dynamics,</p>	reject

S42A Appendix 2 - HS6 Indigenous Ecosystems - Summary Recommendation Table

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
									predator-prey dynamics, competition, predation, succession, source-sink dynamics), and natural selection." Amend (c) to read: "ecosystem function and the properties of ecosystems and habitats".	
S165.0134	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society (Forest & Bird)	FS20.093	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	FS20.093	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	Maintain /maintained /maintenance: (in relation to indigenous biodiversity)	Support in part	Ātiawa seek that the definitions are retained as drafted.	Disallow the submission point, and retain the definitions as drafted.	Accept in part
S165.0134	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society (Forest & Bird)	FS26.076	Meridian Energy Limited	FS26.076	Meridian Energy Limited	Maintain /maintained /maintenance: (in relation to indigenous biodiversity)	Oppose	Forest & Bird queries whether a definition of ecosystem function may be needed (and, if included, it should replicate the definition of 'ecosystem processes' used in the Critical factors report) and strongly supports the recognition that maintenance may require restoration or enhancement. Meridian considers that 'maintain' does not extend to restoration or enhancement.	Disallow	Reject
S165.0134	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society (Forest & Bird)	FS30.319	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Ltd	FS30.319	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Ltd	Maintain /maintained /maintenance: (in relation to indigenous biodiversity)	Oppose	B+LNZ generally oppose the submission on the grounds that's B+LNZ are seeking changes of the plan change are restricted to those necessary to give effect to the National Policy Statement for Urban Development and that any other matters should be subject to proper review in the Schedule full review of the RPS in 2024 and in the scheduled reviews of the Natural Resources Plan in 2023 and 2024. This is because the changes materially impact on communities, including rural communities and we do not consider that the necessary engagement has been undertaken to adequately inform these provisions or to meet the requirements of Part 3.2 of the NPS-FM. Furthermore, there is a risk that including matters relating to climate change and indigenous biodiversity before key national legislation is gazetted or implemented is premature and will lead to the inefficient implementation and confusion amongst those who it impacts materially.	Disallow	Reject
S162.027	Winstone Aggregates			S162.027	Winstone Aggregates	Naturally uncommon ecosystems	Oppose	Winstone is opposed/ neutral to the inclusion of the listed new definitions. It is unclear where some of these defined terms have come from or what the basis	Any amendments required to address the submitters concerns set out above or	Accept in part

S42A Appendix 2 - HS6 Indigenous Ecosystems - Summary Recommendation Table

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
								<p>is for defining these terms in this way. Some do not appear to reflect up to date caselaw, the RMA or even the draft NPS-IB. Others appear to reflect NRP definitions but it is unclear how these change the interpretation of the RPS policies.</p> <p>Winstone is concerned about seeking to adopt the draft NPS-IB definitions in advance of these being settled. There is insufficient information contained in the s32 evaluation to understand how the impact of these definitions or how they will impact original wording and policies as well as proposed objectives, policies and methods. Further information and evidence as to how these have been developed is requested.</p> <p>Winstone is concerned that the definitions take an overly restrictive approach, may have unintended consequences and seeks amendments be made to ensure that the definitions are in line with the NPS and RMA caselaw and ensure that there is a viable and workable pathway to continue to undertake /consent quarrying activities.</p>	consequential amendments required to the policies, objectives and methods than refer to these definitions.	
S162.027	Winstone Aggregates	FS20.295	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	FS20.295	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	Naturally uncommon ecosystems	Oppose	<p>Ātiawa oppose the submissions from Aggregate and Quarry Association and Winstone Aggregates to the extent that the relief sought is inconsistent with national direction, particularly the NPS-FM.</p> <p>Ātiawa are particularly sensitive to aggregate extraction from awa, it is mana whenua who are guaranteed tino rangatiratanga over the land, waterways and all other taonga (including aggregate) through Te Tiriti o Waitangi. Historically aggregate extraction industry has failed to uphold the articles and the principles of Te Tiriti. Additionally, aggregate extraction has adverse effects on te taiao and mana whenua values.</p> <p>On the matter of 'balancing' national policy statements', recent case law states that the NPS-FM 2020 and NPS-UD 2020 are to be read together and reconciled under the regional policy statement and the district plans. It goes on to say, development capacity does not outweigh (trump) Te Mana o te Wai. Te Mana o te Wai is the fundamental concept of freshwater management: any thinking to the converse would not give effect to either national policy statement. Therefore, to reconcile national direction, it is not a balancing act, or even a compromise, the NPS-FM must be given effect to while achieving the purpose of the NPS-UD for example. This can be</p>	Disallow	Accept in part

S42A Appendix 2 - HS6 Indigenous Ecosystems - Summary Recommendation Table

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
								applied to aggregate extraction, the activity must be consistent with Te Mana o te Wai and the NPS-FM. The need for housing capacity is not license to forgo the requirements of the NPS-FM.		
S168.091	Rangitāne O Wairarapa Inc			S168.091	Rangitāne O Wairarapa Inc	Naturally uncommon ecosystems	Support	Rangitāne o Wairarapa supports the inclusion of this definition and the clarification it provides.	Retain as notified.	Accept
S168.091	Rangitāne O Wairarapa Inc	FS31.201	Sustainable Wairarapa Inc	FS31.201	Sustainable Wairarapa Inc	Naturally uncommon ecosystems	Support	Kia ora koutou, My name is Ian Gunn, Secretary Sustainable Wairarapa inc. contact # 021567134, address 4B McKay Street, Paraparaumu Beach 5032. Firstly we'd like to state the time frame provided to peruse over 900 pages of submissions is in our opinion an abuse of process. The benefit of further submissions is for you the council to listen and hear the views of its ratepayers. The timeframe in our case does not allow a rigorous review of the original submissions to council. On top of this we are a week before Christmas- a very busy and chaotic time for most members of the community. It is highly likely that the majority of staff will take leave over the Christmas break so analysis of any further submissions will not occur until late January 2023-so why the short period to respond. While there is due process there is also good practise your management of the further submissions fails the good practise model. As a consequence we would like you to note Sustainable Wairarapa's strong support of the original submissions lodged with council by the two Wairarapa Iwi-Ngati Kahungunu and Rangitane. Its clear that there is a poor understanding of nature based solutions this term needs further explanation. Sustainable Wairarapa acknowledges that while nature based solutions offer a wide variety of options its not the only solution. We are heartened by the widespread support for the original document. Thanks for an opportunity to make a further submission. Nga mihi nui Ian Gun	Not stated	Accept
S34.0104	Te Kaunihera o Te Awa Kairangi ki Uta, Upper Hutt City Council			S34.0104	Te Kaunihera o Te Awa Kairangi ki Uta, Upper Hutt City Council	Naturally uncommon ecosystems	Oppose in part	Only 15 of 72 across NZ are mapped so we cannot know what the implications of these are. Council notes these seem to relate mainly to coastal features including dunes and areas, but they also talk about strongly leached terraces, inland dunes from river sands and habitats of acutely and chronically threatened indigenous species. It is unclear the legislative basis for the inclusion of this definition, particularly ahead of the gazetting of the NPS-IB.	Delete the proposed definition and review once NPS-IB has been gazetted and more detailed information on these ecosystems is available.	reject

S42A Appendix 2 - HS6 Indigenous Ecosystems - Summary Recommendation Table

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
S165.0135	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society (Forest & Bird)			S165.0135	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society (Forest & Bird)	Naturally uncommon ecosystems	Support		Retain	Accept
S165.0135	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society (Forest & Bird)	FS20.094	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	FS20.094	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	Naturally uncommon ecosystems	Support in part	Ātiawa seek that the definitions are retained as drafted.	Disallow the submission point, and retain the definitions as drafted.	reject
S165.0135	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society (Forest & Bird)	FS30.319	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Ltd	FS30.319	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Ltd	Naturally uncommon ecosystems	Oppose	B+LNZ generally oppose the submission on the grounds that's B+LNZ are seeking changes of the plan change are restricted to those necessary to give effect to the National Policy Statement for Urban Development and that any other matters should be subject to proper review in the Schedule full review of the RPS in 2024 and in the scheduled reviews of the Natural Resources Plan in 2023 and 2024. This is because the changes materially impact on communities, including rural communities and we do not consider that the necessary engagement has been undertaken to adequately inform these provisions or to meet the requirements of Part 3.2 of the NPS-FM. Furthermore, there is a risk that including matters relating to climate change and indigenous biodiversity before key national legislation is gazetted or implemented is premature and will lead to the inefficient implementation and confusion amongst those who it impacts materially.	Disallow	reject
S31.030	Robert Anker			S31.030	Robert Anker	Protect (in relation to indigenous biodiversity)	Oppose	This is another definition that is draconian in that it can be read to cover everything everywhere if GWRC believes it to be appropriate. Again there has been no consultation and its wide sweeping nature can be viewed as abuse of power by GWRC.	Require GWRC to engage in meaningful consultation with the community regarding the powers that is seeking to give to itself.	Accept in part
S62.027	Philip Clegg			S62.027	Philip Clegg	Protect (in relation to indigenous biodiversity)	Oppose in part	The definition of 'protect' is worryingly broad and vague and needs to be made more specific.	Make the components of the 'protect' definition more specific so it can be meaningfully understood and consistently applied. Consult with the community on the redrafted definition to promote its legitimacy.	Accept in part

S42A Appendix 2 - HS6 Indigenous Ecosystems - Summary Recommendation Table

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
S96.023	Sarah (Dr) Kerkin			S96.023	Sarah (Dr) Kerkin	Protect (in relation to indigenous biodiversity)	Oppose in part	The definition of 'protect' is worryingly broad and vague and needs to be made more specific.	Make the components of the 'protect' definition more specific so it can be meaningfully understood and consistently applied. Consult with the community on the redrafted definition to promote its legitimacy.	Accept in part
S148.058	Wellington International Airport Ltd (WIAL)			S148.058	Wellington International Airport Ltd (WIAL)	Protect (in relation to indigenous biodiversity)	Oppose in part	WIAL seeks to ensure that this definition is consistent with national direction that may be contained in the NPSIB.	Delete this definition.	Accept
S148.058	Wellington International Airport Ltd (WIAL)	FS26.079	Meridian Energy Limited	FS26.079	Meridian Energy Limited	Protect (in relation to indigenous biodiversity)	Support in part	WIAL seeks to ensure that this definition is consistent with national direction that may be contained in the NPSIB. Delete the definition. The definition needs to reflect the relevant definition from the NPS-IB (once gazetted).	Allow	Accept
S162.030	Winstone Aggregates			S162.030	Winstone Aggregates	Protect (in relation to indigenous biodiversity)	Oppose	Winstone is opposed/ neutral to the inclusion of the listed new definitions. It is unclear where some of these defined terms have come from or what the basis is for defining these terms in this way. Some do not appear to reflect up to date caselaw, the RMA or even the draft NPS-IB. Others appear to reflect NRP definitions but it is unclear how these change the interpretation of the RPS policies. Winstone is concerned about seeking to adopt the draft NPS-IB definitions in advance of these being settled. There is insufficient information contained in the s32 evaluation to understand how the impact of these definitions or how they will impact original wording and policies as well as proposed objectives, policies and methods. Further information and evidence as to how these have been developed is requested. Winstone is concerned that the definitions take an overly restrictive approach, may have unintended consequences and seeks amendments be made to ensure that the definitions are in line with the NPS and RMA caselaw and ensure that there is a viable and workable pathway to continue to undertake /consent quarrying activities.	Any amendments required to address the submitters concerns set out above or consequential amendments required to the policies, objectives and methods than refer to these definitions.	Accept in part
S162.030	Winstone Aggregates	FS11.035	Fulton Hogan Limited	FS11.035	Fulton Hogan Limited	Protect (in relation to	Support	The definition is vague (e.g. buffered) and doesn't provide clear direction as to when 'protection' is achieved. Sentence two of the definition could be	Allow	Accept in part

S42A Appendix 2 - HS6 Indigenous Ecosystems - Summary Recommendation Table

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
						indigenous biodiversity)		interpreted to mean that, provided the species is secured from extinction, it has been protected. This provides incomplete guidance for plan makers and submitters on future planning processes and is therefore inefficient		
S162.030	Winstone Aggregates	FS20.298	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	FS20.298	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	Protect (in relation to indigenous biodiversity)	Oppose	<p>Ātiawa oppose the submissions from Aggregate and Quarry Association and Winstone Aggregates to the extent that the relief sought is inconsistent with national direction, particularly the NPS-FM. Ātiawa are particularly sensitive to aggregate extraction from awa, it is mana whenua who are guaranteed tino rangatiratanga over the land, waterways and all other taonga (including aggregate) through Te Tiriti o Waitangi. Historically aggregate extraction industry has failed to uphold the articles and the principles of Te Tiriti. Additionally, aggregate extraction has adverse effects on te taiao and mana whenua values.</p> <p>On the matter of 'balancing' national policy statements', recent case law states that the NPS-FM 2020 and NPS-UD 2020 are to be read together and reconciled under the regional policy statement and the district plans. It goes on to say, development capacity does not outweigh (trump) Te Mana o te Wai. Te Mana o te Wai is the fundamental concept of freshwater management: any thinking to the converse would not give effect to either national policy statement. Therefore, to reconcile national direction, it is not a balancing act, or even a compromise, the NPS-FM must be given effect to while achieving the purpose of the NPS-UD for example. This can be applied to aggregate extraction, the activity must be consistent with Te Mana o te Wai and the NPS-FM. The need for housing capacity is not license to forgo the requirements of the NPS-FM.</p>	Disallow	Accept in part
S168.092	Rangitāne O Wairarapa Inc			S168.092	Rangitāne O Wairarapa Inc	Protect (in relation to indigenous biodiversity)	Support	Rangitāne o Wairarapa supports the inclusion of this definition and the clarification it provides.	Retain as notified.	reject
S168.092	Rangitāne O Wairarapa Inc	FS31.202	Sustainable Wairarapa Inc	FS31.202	Sustainable Wairarapa Inc	Protect (in relation to indigenous biodiversity)	Support	<p>Kia ora koutou, My name is Ian Gunn, Secretary Sustainable Wairarapa inc. contact # 021567134, address 4B McKay Street, Paraparaumu Beach 5032. Firstly we'd like to state the time frame provided to peruse over 900 pages of submissions is in our opinion an abuse of process. The benefit of further submissions is for you the council to listen and hear</p>	Not stated	reject

S42A Appendix 2 - HS6 Indigenous Ecosystems - Summary Recommendation Table

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
								the views of its ratepayers. The timeframe in our case does not allow a rigorous review of the original submissions to council. On top of this we are a week before Christmas- a very busy and chaotic time for most members of the community. It is highly likely that the majority of staff will take leave over the Christmas break so analysis of any further submissions will not occur until late January 2023-so why the short period to respond. While there is due process there is also good practise your management of the further submissions fails the good practise model. As a consequence we would like you to note Sustainable Wairarapa's strong support of the original submissions lodged with council by the two Wairarapa Iwi-Ngati Kahungunu and Rangitane. Its clear that there is a poor understanding of nature based solutions this term needs further explanation. Sustainable Wairarapa acknowledges that while nature based solutions offer a wide variety of options its not the only solution. We are heartened by the widespread support for the original document. Thanks for an opportunity to make a further submission. Nga mihi nui lan Gun		
S34.0106	Te Kaunihera o Te Awa Kairangi ki Uta, Upper Hutt City Council			S34.0106	Te Kaunihera o Te Awa Kairangi ki Uta, Upper Hutt City Council	Protect (in relation to indigenous biodiversity)	Oppose	The definition itself is very directive, and it is unclear how this relates to the NPS-IB, and the legal protection included.	Delete and review once NPS-IB has been gazetted.	Accept
S34.0106	Te Kaunihera o Te Awa Kairangi ki Uta, Upper Hutt City Council	FS26.078	Meridian Energy Limited	FS26.078	Meridian Energy Limited	Protect (in relation to indigenous biodiversity)	Support in part	Upper Hutt CC seeks deletion of the definition, with a review once the NPS-IB has been gazetted. The definition needs to reflect the relevant definition from the NPS-IB (once gazetted).	Allow	Awaiting recommendation
S163.0112	Wairarapa Federated Farmers			S163.0112	Wairarapa Federated Farmers	Protect (in relation to indigenous biodiversity)	Oppose	Defer to the 2024 RPS review	Delete the new definition Delete the FW icon	Accept
S163.0112	Wairarapa Federated Farmers	FS7.053	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society (Forest & Bird)	FS7.053	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society (Forest & Bird)	Protect (in relation to indigenous biodiversity)	Oppose	It is completely appropriate to include climate change, biodiversity and freshwater provisions in the plan change. This plan change creates efficiency by considering multiple policy directives from central government. The amendments sought by Federated Farmers fail to give effect to the NPSFM, the NPS for	Disallow whole submission	reject

S42A Appendix 2 - HS6 Indigenous Ecosystems - Summary Recommendation Table

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
								Indigenous Biodiversity, for which there is an exposure draft and the final version is due out this month, and do not achieve the purpose of the RMA or the Climate Change Response (Zero Carbon) Amendment Act 2019.		
S163.0112	Wairarapa Federated Farmers	FS20.175	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	FS20.175	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	Protect (in relation to indigenous biodiversity)	Oppose	Ātiawa oppose the entire submission by Wairarapa Federated Farmers. The relief sought by Federated Farmers is to effectively delete the entire proposed plan change (except for submission points S163.083, S163.084). The basis for deleting the proposed plan change is to delay decision-making. Ātiawa do not accept that delaying responding to national direction is an appropriate course of action, and will further compound environmental and resource management issues.	Disallow the entire submission by Wairarapa Federated Farmers.	reject
S163.0112	Wairarapa Federated Farmers	FS29.026	Ngā Hapu o Otaki	FS29.026	Ngā Hapu o Otaki	Protect (in relation to indigenous biodiversity)	Oppose	Section 18, page 4: General Comments – OPPOSE Section 25, Page 5 Going Forward – OPPOSE It is disheartening to see that Wairarapa Federated Farmers aren't capable of recognizing the obligations GWRC must maintain with Treaty Partners. It must be understood that Manawhenua are not simply 'groups of people' but a representation of the signatories that signed the Treaty of Waitangi and the original kaitiaki and custodians of the taonga in question when considering how these plan changes are implemented. Wairarapa Federated Farmers indicate a lack of awareness to the value of manawhenua engagement. Their stated 'aspirations of delivering environmental improvements alongside a thriving bio-economy' aren't feasible without considering the intergenerational insight and technical direction that only Mātauranga Māori can offer.	Not stated	reject
S163.0112	Wairarapa Federated Farmers	FS30.082	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Ltd	FS30.082	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Ltd	Protect (in relation to indigenous biodiversity)	Support	B+LNZ agree that the scope of RPS PC1 should be restricted to those changes necessary to give effect to the National Policy Statement for Urban Development and that any other matters should be subject to proper review in the Schedule full review of the RPS in 2024 and in the scheduled reviews of the Natural Resources Plan in 2023 and 2024. Where alternative relief is provided, B+LNZ generally support this relief.	Allow	Accept
S165.0138	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society			S165.0138	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society (Forest & Bird)	Protect (in relation to indigenous biodiversity)	Oppose	The definition is vague and unhelpful. It starts with the words "looking after", which provides little guidance. It then refers to maintain, which is a different concept. The reference to extinction is not appropriate, as it	Either delete or redraft along the following lines: Ensure that biodiversity and the ecosystem processes are	Accept

S42A Appendix 2 - HS6 Indigenous Ecosystems - Summary Recommendation Table

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
	(Forest & Bird)							implies that all that is sought is to ensure that species are not made extinct.	kept safe from harm in both the short and long term. This involves managing all threats to species and ensuring that populations are buffered from the impacts of the loss of genetic diversity and longer-term environmental events such as climate change	
S165.0138	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society (Forest & Bird)	FS19.037	Wellington Water Ltd ("Wellington Water")	FS19.037	Wellington Water Ltd ("Wellington Water")	Protect (in relation to indigenous biodiversity)	Oppose	The policy framework needs to allow for progressive improvement for existing activities	Disallow	reject
S165.0138	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society (Forest & Bird)	FS20.097	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	FS20.097	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	Protect (in relation to indigenous biodiversity)	Support in part	Ātiawa seek that the definitions are retained as drafted.	Disallow the submission point, and retain the definitions as drafted.	Accept in part
S165.0138	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society (Forest & Bird)	FS26.077	Meridian Energy Limited	FS26.077	Meridian Energy Limited	Protect (in relation to indigenous biodiversity)	Support in part	Forest & Bird seeks to ensure that biodiversity and the ecosystem processes are kept safe from harm in both the short and long term. This involves managing all threats to species and ensuring that populations are buffered from the impacts of the loss of genetic diversity and longer-term environmental events such as climate change. The definition needs to specify that it applies to indigenous biodiversity only and needs to reflect the relevant definition in the NPS-IB (once gazetted).	Allow in part Refine the requested relief to clarify that the definition applies only to indigenous biodiversity	reject
S165.0138	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society (Forest & Bird)	FS30.319	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Ltd	FS30.319	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Ltd	Protect (in relation to indigenous biodiversity)	Oppose	B+LNZ generally oppose the submission on the grounds that's B+LNZ are seeking changes of the plan change are restricted to those necessary to give effect to the National Policy Statement for Urban Development and that any other matters should be subject to proper review in the Schedule full review of the RPS in 2024 and in the scheduled reviews of the Natural Resources Plan in 2023 and 2024. This is because the changes materially impact on communities, including rural communities and we do not consider that the necessary engagement has been undertaken to adequately inform these provisions or to meet the requirements of Part 3.2 of the NPS-FM.	Disallow	reject

S42A Appendix 2 - HS6 Indigenous Ecosystems - Summary Recommendation Table

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
								Furthermore, there is a risk that including matters relating to climate change and indigenous biodiversity before key national legislation is gazetted or implemented is premature and will lead to the inefficient implementation and confusion amongst those who it impacts materially.		
S162.031	Winstone Aggregates			S162.031	Winstone Aggregates	Resilience (in relation to a natural ecosystem)	Oppose	<p>Winstone is opposed/ neutral to the inclusion of the listed new definitions. It is unclear where some of these defined terms have come from or what the basis is for defining these terms in this way. Some do not appear to reflect up to date caselaw, the RMA or even the draft NPS-IB. Others appear to reflect NRP definitions but it is unclear how these change the interpretation of the RPS policies.</p> <p>Winstone is concerned about seeking to adopt the draft NPS-IB definitions in advance of these being settled. There is insufficient information contained in the s32 evaluation to understand how the impact of these definitions or how they will impact original wording and policies as well as proposed objectives, policies and methods. Further information and evidence as to how these have been developed is requested.</p> <p>Winstone is concerned that the definitions take an overly restrictive approach, may have unintended consequences and seeks amendments be made to ensure that the definitions are in line with the NPS and RMA caselaw and ensure that there is a viable and workable pathway to continue to undertake /consent quarrying activities.</p>	Any amendments required to address the submitters concerns set out above or consequential amendments required to the policies, objectives and methods than refer to these definitions.	reject
S162.031	Winstone Aggregates	FS20.299	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	FS20.299	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	Resilience (in relation to a natural ecosystem)	Oppose	<p>Ātiawa oppose the submissions from Aggregate and Quarry Association and Winstone Aggregates to the extent that the relief sought is inconsistent with national direction, particularly the NPS-FM.</p> <p>Ātiawa are particularly sensitive to aggregate extraction from awa, it is mana whenua who are guaranteed tino rangatiratanga over the land, waterways and all other taonga (including aggregate) through Te Tiriti o Waitangi. Historically aggregate extraction industry has failed to uphold the articles and the principles of Te Tiriti. Additionally, aggregate extraction has adverse effects on te taiao and mana whenua values.</p> <p>On the matter of 'balancing' national policy statements', recent case law states that the NPS-FM 2020 and NPS-UD 2020 are to be read together and</p>	Disallow	Accept

S42A Appendix 2 - HS6 Indigenous Ecosystems - Summary Recommendation Table

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
								reconciled under the regional policy statement and the district plans. It goes on to say, development capacity does not outweigh (trump) Te Mana o te Wai. Te Mana o te Wai is the fundamental concept of freshwater management: any thinking to the converse would not give effect to either national policy statement. Therefore, to reconcile national direction, it is not a balancing act, or even a compromise, the NPS-FM must be given effect to while achieving the purpose of the NPS-UD for example. This can be applied to aggregate extraction, the activity must be consistent with Te Mana o te Wai and the NPS-FM. The need for housing capacity is not license to forgo the requirements of the NPS-FM.		
S168.093	Rangitāne O Wairarapa Inc			S168.093	Rangitāne O Wairarapa Inc	Resilience (in relation to a natural ecosystem)	Support	Rangitāne o Wairarapa supports the inclusion of this definition and the clarification it provides.	Retain as notified.	Accept
S168.093	Rangitāne O Wairarapa Inc	FS31.203	Sustainable Wairarapa Inc	FS31.203	Sustainable Wairarapa Inc	Resilience (in relation to a natural ecosystem)	Support	Kia ora koutou, My name is Ian Gunn, Secretary Sustainable Wairarapa inc. contact # 021567134, address 4B McKay Street, Paraparaumu Beach 5032. Firstly we'd like to state the time frame provided to peruse over 900 pages of submissions is in our opinion an abuse of process. The benefit of further submissions is for you the council to listen and hear the views of its ratepayers. The timeframe in our case does not allow a rigorous review of the original submissions to council. On top of this we are a week before Christmas- a very busy and chaotic time for most members of the community. It is highly likely that the majority of staff will take leave over the Christmas break so analysis of any further submissions will not occur until late January 2023-so why the short period to respond. While there is due process there is also good practise your management of the further submissions fails the good practise model. As a consequence we would like you to note Sustainable Wairarapa's strong support of the original submissions lodged with council by the two Wairarapa Iwi-Ngati Kahungunu and Rangitane. Its clear that there is a poor understanding of nature based solutions this term needs further explanation. Sustainable Wairarapa acknowledges that while nature based solutions offer a wide variety of options its not the only solution. We are heartened by the widespread support for the original document. Thanks for an	Not stated	Accept

S42A Appendix 2 - HS6 Indigenous Ecosystems - Summary Recommendation Table

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
								opportunity to make a further submission. Nga mihi nui lan Gun		
S34.0107	Te Kaunihera o Te Awa Kairangi ki Uta, Upper Hutt City Council			S34.0107	Te Kaunihera o Te Awa Kairangi ki Uta, Upper Hutt City Council	Resilience (in relation to a natural ecosystem)	Not Stated / Neutral	Should relate to all resilience identified in the plan not just ecosystems e.g., resilience for people.	Amend to address comments.	reject
S165.0139	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society (Forest & Bird)			S165.0139	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society (Forest & Bird)	Resilience (in relation to a natural ecosystem)	Support		Retain	Accept
S165.0139	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society (Forest & Bird)	FS20.098	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	FS20.098	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	Resilience (in relation to a natural ecosystem)	Support in part	Ātiawa seek that the definitions are retained as drafted.	Disallow the submission point, and retain the definitions as drafted.	Awaiting recommendation
S165.0139	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society (Forest & Bird)	FS30.319	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Ltd	FS30.319	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Ltd	Indigenous ecosystems introductory text	Oppose	B+LNZ generally oppose the submission on the grounds that's B+LNZ are seeking changes of the plan change are restricted to those necessary to give effect to the National Policy Statement for Urban Development and that any other matters should be subject to proper review in the Schedule full review of the RPS in 2024 and in the scheduled reviews of the Natural Resources Plan in 2023 and 2024. This is because the changes materially impact on communities, including rural communities and we do not consider that the necessary engagement has been undertaken to adequately inform these provisions or to meet the requirements of Part 3.2 of the NPS-FM. Furthermore, there is a risk that including matters relating to climate change and indigenous biodiversity before key national legislation is gazetted or implemented is premature and will lead to the inefficient implementation and confusion amongst those who it impacts materially.	Disallow	Awaiting recommendation
S20.005	Mangaroa Peatland Focus Group_Paul Dyson			S20.005	Mangaroa Peatland Focus Group_Paul Dyson	Restoration	Oppose in part	The process of restoration as outlined in the definition is so wide sweeping that it needs to be redefined. It should not be undertaken without extensive community consultation and support. The perspective - whose desired former state is - needs to be defined, as does the time at which that former state existed.	Insert a clause requiring GWRC to engage with the community to define what restoration means for each habitat, ecosystem, landform or landscape and only	reject

S42A Appendix 2 - HS6 Indigenous Ecosystems - Summary Recommendation Table

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
								<p>Some reference to expert opinion needs to be included.</p> <p>Balancing perspectives are needed from expert advisors and from people directly affected in the local community. The perspectives of people indirectly affected may also be relevant but should be given less weight than those directly affected.</p>	<p>proceed once they have a community approval in each case.</p>	

S42A Appendix 2 - HS6 Indigenous Ecosystems - Summary Recommendation Table

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
S21.005	Mangaroa Peatland Focus Group_Liorah Atkinson			S21.005	Mangaroa Peatland Focus Group_Liorah Atkinson	Restoration	Oppose in part	The process of restoration as outlined in the definition is so wide sweeping that it needs to be redefined. It should not be undertaken without extensive community consultation and support. The perspective - whose desired former state is - needs to be defined, as does the time at which that former state existed. Some reference to expert opinion needs to be included. Balancing perspectives are needed from expert advisors and from people directly affected in the local community. The perspectives of people indirectly affected may also be relevant but should be given less weight than those directly affected.	Insert a clause requiring GWRC to engage with the community to define what restoration means for each habitat, ecosystem, landform or landscape and only proceed once they have a community approval in each case.	Reject
S23.005	Mangaroa Peatland Focus Group_Ian Spendlove			S23.005	Mangaroa Peatland Focus Group_Ian Spendlove	Restoration	Oppose in part	The process of restoration as outlined in the definition is so wide sweeping that it needs to be redefined. It should not be undertaken without extensive community consultation and support. The perspective - whose desired former state is - needs to be defined, as does the time at which that former state existed. Some reference to expert opinion needs to be included. Balancing perspectives are needed from expert advisors and from people directly affected in the local community. The perspectives of people indirectly affected may also be relevant but should be given less weight than those directly affected.	Insert a clause requiring GWRC to engage with the community to define what restoration means for each habitat, ecosystem, landform or landscape and only proceed once they have a community approval in each case.	Reject
S26.005	Mangaroa Peatland Focus Group_Andrea Follett			S26.005	Mangaroa Peatland Focus Group_Andrea Follett	Restoration	Oppose in part	The process of restoration as outlined in the definition is so wide sweeping that it needs to be redefined. It should not be undertaken without extensive community consultation and support. The perspective - whose desired former state is - needs to be defined, as does the time at which that former state existed. Some reference to expert opinion needs to be included. Balancing perspectives are needed from expert advisors and from people directly affected in the local community. The perspectives of people indirectly affected may also be relevant but should be given less weight than those directly affected.	Insert a clause requiring GWRC to engage with the community to define what restoration means for each habitat, ecosystem, landform or landscape and only proceed once they have a community approval in each case.	Reject
S31.031	Robert Anker			S31.031	Robert Anker	Restoration	Oppose in part	The process of restoration as outlined in the definition is so wide sweeping that it should not be undertaken without extensive community consultation and support.	Insert a clause requiring GWRC to engage with the community and only proceed with community approval in each case.	Reject

S42A Appendix 2 - HS6 Indigenous Ecosystems - Summary Recommendation Table

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
S33.005	Mangaroa Peatland Focus Group_Sandy , Judith, Kauika-Stevens			S33.005	Mangaroa Peatland Focus Group_Sandy, Judith, Kauika-Stevens	Restoration	Oppose in part	The process of restoration as outlined in the definition is so wide sweeping that it needs to be redefined. It should not be undertaken without extensive community consultation and support. The perspective - whose desired former state is - needs to be defined, as does the time at which that former state existed. Some reference to expert opinion needs to be included. The assessment of what is needed to restore a habitat etc. should not come down to the subjective opinion of a council official, given that GWRC has strongly stated environmental goals. Balancing perspectives are needed from expert advisors and from people directly affected in the local community. The perspectives of people indirectly affected may also be relevant but should be given less weight than those directly affected.	Insert a clause requiring GWRC to engage with the community to define what restoration means for each habitat, ecosystem, landform or landscape and only proceed once they have a community approval in each case.	Reject
S38.005	Mangaroa Peatland Focus Group_Heather McKay			S38.005	Mangaroa Peatland Focus Group_Heather McKay	Restoration	Oppose in part	The process of restoration as outlined in the definition is so wide sweeping that it needs to be redefined. It should not be undertaken without extensive community consultation and support. The perspective - whose desired former state is - needs to be defined, as does the time at which that former state existed. Some reference to expert opinion needs to be included. Balancing perspectives are needed from expert advisors and from people directly affected in the local community. The perspectives of people indirectly affected may also be relevant but should be given less weight than those directly affected.	Insert a clause requiring GWRC to engage with the community to define what restoration means for each habitat, ecosystem, landform or landscape and only proceed once they have a community approval in each case.	Reject
S39.005	Mangaroa Peatland Focus Group_Colin Hawes			S39.005	Mangaroa Peatland Focus Group_Colin Hawes	Restoration	Oppose in part	The process of restoration as outlined in the definition is so wide sweeping that it needs to be redefined. It should not be undertaken without extensive community consultation and support. The perspective - whose desired former state is - needs to be defined, as does the time at which that former state existed. Some reference to expert opinion needs to be included. Balancing perspectives are needed from expert advisors and from people directly affected in the local community. The perspectives of people indirectly affected may also be relevant but should be given less weight than those directly affected.	Insert a clause requiring GWRC to engage with the community to define what restoration means for each habitat, ecosystem, landform or landscape and only proceed once they have a community approval in each case.	Reject
S40.005	Mangaroa Peatland Focus			S40.005	Mangaroa Peatland Focus	Restoration	Oppose in part	The process of restoration as outlined in the definition is so wide sweeping that it needs to be redefined. It should not be undertaken without extensive community consultation and support. The perspective	Insert a clause requiring GWRC to engage with the community to define what restoration means for each	Reject

S42A Appendix 2 - HS6 Indigenous Ecosystems - Summary Recommendation Table

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
	Group_Lauritz & Julie Rust				Group_Lauritz & Julie Rust			- whose desired former state is - needs to be defined, as does the time at which that former state existed. Some reference to expert opinion needs to be included. Balancing perspectives are needed from expert advisors and from people directly affected in the local community. The perspectives of people indirectly affected may also be relevant but should be given less weight than those directly affected.	habitat, ecosystem, landform or landscape and only proceed once they have a community approval in each case.	
S41.005	Mangaroa Peatland Focus Group_Andrew Ayrton & Carol Reeves			S41.005	Mangaroa Peatland Focus Group_Andrew Ayrton & Carol Reeves	Restoration	Oppose in part	The process of restoration as outlined in the definition is so wide sweeping that it needs to be redefined. It should not be undertaken without extensive community consultation and support. The perspective - whose desired former state is - needs to be defined, as does the time at which that former state existed. Some reference to expert opinion needs to be included. Balancing perspectives are needed from expert advisors and from people directly affected in the local community. The perspectives of people indirectly affected may also be relevant but should be given less weight than those directly affected.	Insert a clause requiring GWRC to engage with the community to define what restoration means for each habitat, ecosystem, landform or landscape and only proceed once they have a community approval in each case.	Reject
S42.005	Mangaroa Peatland Focus Group_Gregor & Stephanie Kempt			S42.005	Mangaroa Peatland Focus Group_Gregor & Stephanie Kempt	Restoration	Oppose in part	The process of restoration as outlined in the definition is so wide sweeping that it needs to be redefined. It should not be undertaken without extensive community consultation and support. The perspective - whose desired former state is - needs to be defined, as does the time at which that former state existed. Some reference to expert opinion needs to be included. Balancing perspectives are needed from expert advisors and from people directly affected in the local community. The perspectives of people indirectly affected may also be relevant but should be given less weight than those directly affected.	Insert a clause requiring GWRC to engage with the community to define what restoration means for each habitat, ecosystem, landform or landscape and only proceed once they have a community approval in each case.	Reject
S43.005	Mangaroa Peatland Focus Group_Carol Dormer			S43.005	Mangaroa Peatland Focus Group_Carol Dormer	Restoration	Oppose in part	The process of restoration as outlined in the definition is so wide sweeping that it needs to be redefined. It should not be undertaken without extensive community consultation and support. The perspective - whose desired former state is - needs to be defined, as does the time at which that former state existed. Some reference to expert opinion needs to be included. Balancing perspectives are needed from expert advisors and from people directly affected in the local community. The perspectives of people indirectly	Insert a clause requiring GWRC to engage with the community to define what restoration means for each habitat, ecosystem, landform or landscape and only proceed once they have a community approval in each case.	Reject

S42A Appendix 2 - HS6 Indigenous Ecosystems - Summary Recommendation Table

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
								affected may also be relevant but should be given less weight than those directly affected.		
S44.005	Mangaroa Peatland Focus Group_Richard Dormer			S44.005	Mangaroa Peatland Focus Group_Richard Dormer	Restoration	Oppose in part	The process of restoration as outlined in the definition is so wide sweeping that it needs to be redefined. It should not be undertaken without extensive community consultation and support. The perspective - whose desired former state is - needs to be defined, as does the time at which that former state existed. Some reference to expert opinion needs to be included. The assessment of what is needed to restore a habitat etc. should not come down to the subjective opinion of a council official, given that GWRC has strongly stated environmental goals. Balancing perspectives are needed from expert advisors and from people directly affected in the local community. The perspectives of people indirectly affected may also be relevant but should be given less weight than those directly affected.	Insert a clause requiring GWRC to engage with the community to define what restoration means for each habitat, ecosystem, landform or landscape and only proceed once they have a community approval in each case.	Reject
S45.005	Mangaroa Peatland Focus Group_Weston Hill			S45.005	Mangaroa Peatland Focus Group_Weston Hill	Restoration	Oppose in part	The process of restoration as outlined in the definition is so wide sweeping that it needs to be redefined. It should not be undertaken without extensive community consultation and support. The perspective - whose desired former state is - needs to be defined, as does the time at which that former state existed. Some reference to expert opinion needs to be included. Balancing perspectives are needed from expert advisors and from people directly affected in the local community. The perspectives of people indirectly affected may also be relevant but should be given less weight than those directly affected.	Insert a clause requiring GWRC to engage with the community to define what restoration means for each habitat, ecosystem, landform or landscape and only proceed once they have a community approval in each case.	Reject
S46.005	Mangaroa Peatland Focus Group_Lynne Hill			S46.005	Mangaroa Peatland Focus Group_Lynne Hill	Restoration	Oppose in part	The process of restoration as outlined in the definition is so wide sweeping that it needs to be redefined. It should not be undertaken without extensive community consultation and support. The perspective - whose desired former state is - needs to be defined, as does the time at which that former state existed. Some reference to expert opinion needs to be included. Balancing perspectives are needed from expert advisors and from people directly affected in the local community. The perspectives of people indirectly affected may also be relevant but should be given less weight than those directly affected.	Insert a clause requiring GWRC to engage with the community to define what restoration means for each habitat, ecosystem, landform or landscape and only proceed once they have a community approval in each case.	Reject

S42A Appendix 2 - HS6 Indigenous Ecosystems - Summary Recommendation Table

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
S47.005	Mangaroa Peatland Focus Group_Norman Hill			S47.005	Mangaroa Peatland Focus Group_Norman Hill	Restoration	Oppose in part	The process of restoration as outlined in the definition is so wide sweeping that it needs to be redefined. It should not be undertaken without extensive community consultation and support. The perspective - whose desired former state is - needs to be defined, as does the time at which that former state existed. Some reference to expert opinion needs to be included. Balancing perspectives are needed from expert advisors and from people directly affected in the local community. The perspectives of people indirectly affected may also be relevant but should be given less weight than those directly affected.	Insert a clause requiring GWRC to engage with the community to define what restoration means for each habitat, ecosystem, landform or landscape and only proceed once they have a community approval in each case.	Reject
S48.005	Mangaroa Peatland Focus Group_Duncan Carmichael			S48.005	Mangaroa Peatland Focus Group_Duncan Carmichael	Restoration	Oppose in part	The process of restoration as outlined in the definition is so wide sweeping that it needs to be redefined. It should not be undertaken without extensive community consultation and support. The perspective - whose desired former state is - needs to be defined, as does the time at which that former state existed. Some reference to expert opinion needs to be included. Balancing perspectives are needed from expert advisors and from people directly affected in the local community. The perspectives of people indirectly affected may also be relevant but should be given less weight than those directly affected.	Insert a clause requiring GWRC to engage with the community to define what restoration means for each habitat, ecosystem, landform or landscape and only proceed once they have a community approval in each case.	Reject
S52.006	Gerald Keown_Mangaroa Peatland Focus Group			S52.006	Gerald Keown_Mangaroa Peatland Focus Group	Restoration	Oppose in part	The process of restoration as outlined in the definition is so wide sweeping that it needs to be redefined. It should not be undertaken without extensive community consultation and support. The perspective - whose desired former state is - needs to be defined, as does the time at which that former state existed. Some reference to expert opinion needs to be included. Balancing perspectives are needed from expert advisors and from people directly affected in the local community. The perspectives of people indirectly affected may also be relevant but should be given less weight than those directly affected.	Insert a clause requiring GWRC to engage with the community to define what restoration means for each habitat, ecosystem, landform or landscape and only proceed once they have a community approval in each case.	Reject
S52.006	Gerald Keown_Mangaroa Peatland Focus Group	FS5.4	Brendan Herder	FS5.4	Brendan Herder	Restoration	Support	In my other further submission points I have supported the removal of references to concepts of restoration - in large part due to the difficulty of establishing and agreeing the desired former state. If concepts of restoration are to be retained the Council should allow this submission to insert a requirement for specific community and expert consultation so that	Allow	Reject

S42A Appendix 2 - HS6 Indigenous Ecosystems - Summary Recommendation Table

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
								the desired former state for any relevant habitat, ecosystem, landform or landscape is defined and informed by a range of relevant perspectives.		
S54.005	Mangaroa Peatland Focus Group_Helen Masters			S54.005	Mangaroa Peatland Focus Group_Helen Masters	Restoration	Oppose in part	The process of restoration as outlined in the definition is so wide sweeping that it needs to be redefined. It should not be undertaken without extensive community consultation and support. The perspective - whose desired former state is - needs to be defined, as does the time at which that former state existed. Some reference to expert opinion needs to be included. Balancing perspectives are needed from expert advisors and from people directly affected in the local community. The perspectives of people indirectly affected may also be relevant but should be given less weight than those directly affected.	Insert a clause requiring GWRC to engage with the community to define what restoration means for each habitat, ecosystem, landform or landscape and only proceed once they have a community approval in each case.	Reject
S55.005	Mangaroa Peatland Focus Group_Matthew Scrimshaw			S55.005	Mangaroa Peatland Focus Group_Matthew Scrimshaw	Restoration	Oppose in part	The process of restoration as outlined in the definition is so wide sweeping that it needs to be redefined. It should not be undertaken without extensive community consultation and support. The perspective - whose desired former state is - needs to be defined, as does the time at which that former state existed. Some reference to expert opinion needs to be included. Balancing perspectives are needed from expert advisors and from people directly affected in the local community. The perspectives of people indirectly affected may also be relevant but should be given less weight than those directly affected.	Insert a clause requiring GWRC to engage with the community to define what restoration means for each habitat, ecosystem, landform or landscape and only proceed once they have a community approval in each case.	Reject
S57.006	Colleen Munro_Mangaroa Peatland Focus Group			S57.006	Colleen Munro_Mangaroa Peatland Focus Group	Restoration	Oppose in part	The process of restoration as outlined in the definition is so wide sweeping that it needs to be redefined. It should not be undertaken without extensive community consultation and support. The perspective - whose desired former state is - needs to be defined, as does the time at which that former state existed. Some reference to expert opinion needs to be included. Balancing perspectives are needed from expert advisors and from people directly affected in the local community. The perspectives of people indirectly affected may also be relevant but should be given less weight than those directly affected.	Insert a clause requiring GWRC to engage with the community to define what restoration means for each habitat, ecosystem, landform or landscape and only proceed once they have a community approval in each case.	Reject
S58.006	Grant Munro_Mangaroa			S58.006	Grant Munro_Mangaroa	Restoration	Oppose in part	The process of restoration as outlined in the definition is so wide sweeping that it needs to be redefined. It should not be undertaken without extensive	Insert a clause requiring GWRC to engage with the community to define what	Reject

S42A Appendix 2 - HS6 Indigenous Ecosystems - Summary Recommendation Table

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
	Peatland Focus Group				Peatland Focus Group			community consultation and support. The perspective - whose desired former state is - needs to be defined, as does the time at which that former state existed. Some reference to expert opinion needs to be included. Balancing perspectives are needed from expert advisors and from people directly affected in the local community. The perspectives of people indirectly affected may also be relevant but should be given less weight than those directly affected.	restoration means for each habitat, ecosystem, landform or landscape and only proceed once they have a community approval in each case.	
S58.006	Grant Munro_Mangaroa Peatland Focus Group	FS7.005	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society (Forest & Bird)	FS7.005	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society (Forest & Bird)	Restoration	Oppose	The definition of restoration is necessarily broad to cover the range of habitats and ecosystems that could be subject to restoration. The relief sought to require consultation and approval from every community is unreasonable.	Disallow whole submission point.	Accept in part
S59.005	Mangaroa Peatland Focus Group_Sandra & Mat Gerrard			S59.005	Mangaroa Peatland Focus Group_Sandra & Mat Gerrard	Restoration	Oppose in part	The process of restoration as outlined in the definition is so wide sweeping that it needs to be redefined. It should not be undertaken without extensive community consultation and support. The perspective - whose desired former state is - needs to be defined, as does the time at which that former state existed. Some reference to expert opinion needs to be included. Balancing perspectives are needed from expert advisors and from people directly affected in the local community. The perspectives of people indirectly affected may also be relevant but should be given less weight than those directly affected.	Insert a clause requiring GWRC to engage with the community to define what restoration means for each habitat, ecosystem, landform or landscape and only proceed once they have a community approval in each case.	Reject
S62.028	Philip Clegg			S62.028	Philip Clegg	Restoration	Oppose in part	The process of restoration as outlined in the definition is so wide sweeping that it needs to be redefined. It should not be undertaken without extensive community consultation and support. The perspective - whose desired former state is - needs to be defined, as does the time at which that former state existed. Some reference to expert opinion needs to be included. Balancing perspectives are needed from expert advisors and from people directly affected in the local community. The perspectives of people indirectly affected may also be relevant but should be given less weight than those directly affected.	Make the components of the 'restoration' definition more specific so it can be meaningfully understood and consistently applied. Consult with the community on the redrafted definition to promote its legitimacy.	Reject
S87.005	Roger O'Brien_Mangaroa			S87.005	Roger O'Brien_Mangaroa	Restoration	Oppose in part	The process of restoration as outlined in the definition is so wide sweeping that it needs to be redefined. It should not be undertaken without extensive	Insert a clause requiring GWRC to engage with the community to define what	Reject

S42A Appendix 2 - HS6 Indigenous Ecosystems - Summary Recommendation Table

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
	Peatland Focus Group_				aroa Peatland Focus Group_			community consultation and support. The perspective - whose desired former state is - needs to be defined, as does the time at which that former state existed. Some reference to expert opinion needs to be included. The assessment of what is needed to restore a habitat etc. should not come down to the subjective opinion of a council official, given that GWRC has strongly stated environmental goals.	restoration means for each habitat, ecosystem, landform or landscape and only proceed once they have a community approval in each case.	
S91.005	Mangaroa Peatland Focus Group_Gavin Kirton			S91.005	Mangaroa Peatland Focus Group_Gavin Kirton	Restoration	Oppose in part	The process of restoration as outlined in the definition is so wide sweeping that it needs to be redefined. It should not be undertaken without extensive community consultation and support. The perspective - whose desired former state is - needs to be defined, as does the time at which that former state existed. Some reference to expert opinion needs to be included. Balancing perspectives are needed from expert advisors and from people directly affected in the local community. The perspectives of people indirectly affected may also be relevant but should be given less weight than those directly affected.	Insert a clause requiring GWRC to engage with the community to define what restoration means for each habitat, ecosystem, landform or landscape and only proceed once they have a community approval in each case.	Reject
S96.024	Sarah (Dr) Kerkin			S96.024	Sarah (Dr) Kerkin	Restoration	Oppose in part	The process of restoration as outlined in the definition is so wide sweeping that it needs to be redefined. It should not be undertaken without extensive community consultation and support. The perspective - whose desired former state is - needs to be defined, as does the time at which that former state existed. Some reference to expert opinion needs to be included. Balancing perspectives are needed from expert advisors and from people directly affected in the local community. The perspectives of people indirectly affected may also be relevant but should be given less weight than those directly affected.	Make the components of the 'restoration' definition more specific so it can be meaningfully understood and consistently applied. Consult with the community on the redrafted definition to promote its legitimacy.	Reject
S96.024	Sarah (Dr) Kerkin	FS5.8	Brendan Herder	FS5.8	Brendan Herder	Restoration	Support	In my other further submission points I have supported the removal of references to concepts of restoration - in large part due to the difficulty of establishing and agreeing the desired former state. If concepts of restoration are to be retained the Council should allow this submission to specify the components of the definition so it can be meaningfully understood and consistently applied. Consult with the community on the redrafted definition to promote its legitimacy. It is critical to the interpretation of the proposed Climate Change Introductory Text and Policy 18 that the desired former state for any relevant	Allow	Reject

S42A Appendix 2 - HS6 Indigenous Ecosystems - Summary Recommendation Table

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
								habitat, ecosystem, landform or landscape is defined and informed by a range of relevant perspectives.		
S97.005	Mangaroa Peatland Focus Group_Nicola Rothwell			S97.005	Mangaroa Peatland Focus Group_Nicola Rothwell	Restoration	Oppose in part	<p>The process of restoration as outlined in the definition is so wide sweeping that it needs to be redefined. It should not be undertaken without extensive community consultation and support. The perspective - whose desired former state is - needs to be defined, as does the time at which that former state existed. Some reference to expert opinion needs to be included.</p> <p>Balancing perspectives are needed from expert advisors and from people directly affected in the local community. The perspectives of people indirectly affected may also be relevant but should be given less weight than those directly affected.</p>	Insert a clause requiring GWRC to engage with the community to define what restoration means for each habitat, ecosystem, landform or landscape and only proceed once they have a community approval in each case.	Reject
S101.005	Mangaroa Peatland Focus Group_Madeline Keown			S101.005	Mangaroa Peatland Focus Group_Madeline Keown	Restoration	Oppose in part	<p>The process of restoration as outlined in the definition is so wide sweeping that it needs to be redefined. It should not be undertaken without extensive community consultation and support. The perspective - whose desired former state is - needs to be defined, as does the time at which that former state existed. Some reference to expert opinion needs to be included.</p> <p>Balancing perspectives are needed from expert advisors and from people directly affected in the local community. The perspectives of people indirectly affected may also be relevant but should be given less weight than those directly affected.</p>	Insert a clause requiring GWRC to engage with the community to define what restoration means for each habitat, ecosystem, landform or landscape and only proceed once they have a community approval in each case.	Reject
S103.005	Mangaroa Peatland Focus Group_Stacey Jack-Kino			S103.005	Mangaroa Peatland Focus Group_Stacey Jack-Kino	Restoration	Oppose in part	<p>The process of restoration as outlined in the definition is so wide sweeping that it needs to be redefined. It should not be undertaken without extensive community consultation and support. The perspective - whose desired former state is - needs to be defined, as does the time at which that former state existed. Some reference to expert opinion needs to be included.</p> <p>Balancing perspectives are needed from expert advisors and from people directly affected in the local community. The perspectives of people indirectly affected may also be relevant but should be given less weight than those directly affected.</p>	Insert a clause requiring GWRC to engage with the community to define what restoration means for each habitat, ecosystem, landform or landscape and only proceed once they have a community approval in each case.	Reject
S104.005	Hamish McDonald_M			S104.005	Hamish McDonald_Ma	Restoration	Oppose in part	<p>The process of restoration as outlined in the definition is so wide sweeping that it needs to be redefined. It</p>	Insert a clause requiring GWRC to engage with the	Reject

S42A Appendix 2 - HS6 Indigenous Ecosystems - Summary Recommendation Table

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
	angaroo Peatland Focus Group				angaroo Peatland Focus Group			should not be undertaken without extensive community consultation and support. The perspective - whose desired former state is - needs to be defined, as does the time at which that former state existed. Some reference to expert opinion needs to be included. Balancing perspectives are needed from expert advisors and from people directly affected in the local community. The perspectives of people indirectly affected may also be relevant but should be given less weight than those directly affected.	community to define what restoration means for each habitat, ecosystem, landform or landscape and only proceed once they have a community approval in each case.	
S105.005	Sharlene McDonald_Mangaroo Peatland Focus Group			S105.005	Sharlene McDonald_Mangaroo Peatland Focus Group	Restoration	Oppose in part	The process of restoration as outlined in the definition is so wide sweeping that it needs to be redefined. It should not be undertaken without extensive community consultation and support. The perspective - whose desired former state is - needs to be defined, as does the time at which that former state existed. Some reference to expert opinion needs to be included. Balancing perspectives are needed from expert advisors and from people directly affected in the local community. The perspectives of people indirectly affected may also be relevant but should be given less weight than those directly affected.	Insert a clause requiring GWRC to engage with the community to define what restoration means for each habitat, ecosystem, landform or landscape and only proceed once they have a community approval in each case.	Reject
S107.006	Lisa Keown_Mangaroo Peatland Focus Group			S107.006	Lisa Keown_Mangaroo Peatland Focus Group	Restoration	Oppose in part	The process of restoration as outlined in the definition is so wide sweeping that it needs to be redefined. It should not be undertaken without extensive community consultation and support. The perspective - whose desired former state is - needs to be defined, as does the time at which that former state existed. Some reference to expert opinion needs to be included. Balancing perspectives are needed from expert advisors and from people directly affected in the local community. The perspectives of people indirectly affected may also be relevant but should be given less weight than those directly affected.	Insert a clause requiring GWRC to engage with the community to define what restoration means for each habitat, ecosystem, landform or landscape and only proceed once they have a community approval in each case.	Reject
S108.005	Mangaroo Peatland Focus Group_Kerry Ryan			S108.005	Mangaroo Peatland Focus Group_Kerry Ryan	Restoration	Oppose in part	The process of restoration as outlined in the definition is so wide sweeping that it needs to be redefined. It should not be undertaken without extensive community consultation and support. The perspective - whose desired former state is - needs to be defined, as does the time at which that former state existed. Some reference to expert opinion needs to be included. Balancing perspectives are needed from expert	Insert a clause requiring GWRC to engage with the community to define what restoration means for each habitat, ecosystem, landform or landscape and only proceed once they have a community approval in each case.	Reject

S42A Appendix 2 - HS6 Indigenous Ecosystems - Summary Recommendation Table

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
								advisors and from people directly affected in the local community. The perspectives of people indirectly affected may also be relevant but should be given less weight than those directly affected.		
S109.005	Mangaroa Peatland Focus Group_Christine withey			S109.005	Mangaroa Peatland Focus Group_Christine withey	Restoration	Oppose in part	The process of restoration as outlined in the definition is so wide sweeping that it needs to be redefined. It should not be undertaken without extensive community consultation and support. The perspective - whose desired former state is - needs to be defined, as does the time at which that former state existed. Some reference to expert opinion needs to be included. Balancing perspectives are needed from expert advisors and from people directly affected in the local community. The perspectives of people indirectly affected may also be relevant but should be given less weight than those directly affected.	Insert a clause requiring GWRC to engage with the community to define what restoration means for each habitat, ecosystem, landform or landscape and only proceed once they have a community approval in each case	Reject
S110.005	Mangaroa Peatland Focus Group_John Ryan			S110.005	Mangaroa Peatland Focus Group_John Ryan	Restoration	Oppose in part	The process of restoration as outlined in the definition is so wide sweeping that it needs to be redefined. It should not be undertaken without extensive community consultation and support. The perspective - whose desired former state is - needs to be defined, as does the time at which that former state existed. Some reference to expert opinion needs to be included. Balancing perspectives are needed from expert advisors and from people directly affected in the local community. The perspectives of people indirectly affected may also be relevant but should be given less weight than those directly affected.	Insert a clause requiring GWRC to engage with the community to define what restoration means for each habitat, ecosystem, landform or landscape and only proceed once they have a community approval in each case	Reject
S111.005	Mangaroa Peatland Focus Group_Sheila Ryan			S111.005	Mangaroa Peatland Focus Group_Sheila Ryan	Restoration	Oppose in part	The process of restoration as outlined in the definition is so wide sweeping that it needs to be redefined. It should not be undertaken without extensive community consultation and support. The perspective - whose desired former state is - needs to be defined, as does the time at which that former state existed. Some reference to expert opinion needs to be included. Balancing perspectives are needed from expert advisors and from people directly affected in the local community. The perspectives of people indirectly affected may also be relevant but should be given less weight than those directly affected.	Insert a clause requiring GWRC to engage with the community to define what restoration means for each habitat, ecosystem, landform or landscape and only proceed once they have a community approval in each case.	Reject
S112.005	Mangaroa Peatland			S112.005	Mangaroa Peatland Focus	Restoration	Oppose in part	The process of restoration as outlined in the definition is so wide sweeping that it needs to be redefined. It	Insert a clause requiring GWRC to engage with the	Reject

S42A Appendix 2 - HS6 Indigenous Ecosystems - Summary Recommendation Table

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
	Focus Group_Russe II Flood-Smith				Group_Russell Flood-Smith			should not be undertaken without extensive community consultation and support. The perspective - whose desired former state is - needs to be defined, as does the time at which that former state existed. Some reference to expert opinion needs to be included. Balancing perspectives are needed from expert advisors and from people directly affected in the local community. The perspectives of people indirectly affected may also be relevant but should be given less weight than those directly affected.	community to define what restoration means for each habitat, ecosystem, landform or landscape and only proceed once they have a community approval in each case.	
S121.005	Mangaroo Peatland Focus Group_Shane Stratford			S121.005	Mangaroo Peatland Focus Group_Shane Stratford	Restoration	Oppose in part	The process of restoration as outlined in the definition is so wide sweeping that it needs to be redefined. It should not be undertaken without extensive community consultation and support. The perspective - whose desired former state is - needs to be defined, as does the time at which that former state existed. Some reference to expert opinion needs to be included. Balancing perspectives are needed from expert advisors and from people directly affected in the local community. The perspectives of people indirectly affected may also be relevant but should be given less weight than those directly affected.	Insert a clause requiring GWRC to engage with the community to define what restoration means for each habitat, ecosystem, landform or landscape and only proceed once they have a community approval in each case.	Reject
S122.005	Mangaroo Peatland Focus Group_Jaime Walsh			S122.005	Mangaroo Peatland Focus Group_Jaime Walsh	Restoration	Oppose in part	The process of restoration as outlined in the definition is so wide sweeping that it needs to be redefined. It should not be undertaken without extensive community consultation and support. The perspective - whose desired former state is - needs to be defined, as does the time at which that former state existed. Some reference to expert opinion needs to be included. Balancing perspectives are needed from expert advisors and from people directly affected in the local community. The perspectives of people indirectly affected may also be relevant but should be given less weight than those directly affected.	Insert a clause requiring GWRC to engage with the community to define what restoration means for each habitat, ecosystem, landform or landscape and only proceed once they have a community approval in each case.	Reject
S138.005	Mangaroo Peatland Focus Group_Jody Sinclair & Josh Lowny			S138.005	Mangaroo Peatland Focus Group_Jody Sinclair & Josh Lowny	Restoration	Oppose in part	The process of restoration as outlined in the definition is so wide sweeping that it needs to be redefined. It should not be undertaken without extensive community consultation and support. The perspective - whose desired former state is - needs to be defined, as does the time at which that former state existed. Some reference to expert opinion needs to be included. Balancing perspectives are needed from expert	Insert a clause requiring GWRC to engage with the community to define what restoration means for each habitat, ecosystem, landform or landscape and only proceed once they have a community approval in each case.	Reject

S42A Appendix 2 - HS6 Indigenous Ecosystems - Summary Recommendation Table

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
								advisors and from people directly affected in the local community. The perspectives of people indirectly affected may also be relevant but should be given less weight than those directly affected.		
S146.005	Mangaroa Peatland Focus Group_Alan Rothwell			S146.005	Mangaroa Peatland Focus Group_Alan Rothwell	Restoration	Oppose in part	The process of restoration as outlined in the definition is so wide sweeping that it needs to be redefined. It should not be undertaken without extensive community consultation and support. The perspective - whose desired former state is - needs to be defined, as does the time at which that former state existed. Some reference to expert opinion needs to be included. Balancing perspectives are needed from expert advisors and from people directly affected in the local community. The perspectives of people indirectly affected may also be relevant but should be given less weight than those directly affected.	Insert a clause requiring GWRC to engage with the community to define what restoration means for each habitat, ecosystem, landform or landscape and only proceed once they have a community approval in each case.	Reject
S149.005	Mangaroa Peatland Focus Group_Matthew Rothwell			S149.005	Mangaroa Peatland Focus Group_Matthew Rothwell	Restoration	Oppose in part	The process of restoration as outlined in the definition is so wide sweeping that it needs to be redefined. It should not be undertaken without extensive community consultation and support. The perspective - whose desired former state is - needs to be defined, as does the time at which that former state existed. Some reference to expert opinion needs to be included. Balancing perspectives are needed from expert advisors and from people directly affected in the local community. The perspectives of people indirectly affected may also be relevant but should be given less weight than those directly affected.	Insert a clause requiring GWRC to engage with the community to define what restoration means for each habitat, ecosystem, landform or landscape and only proceed once they have a community approval in each case.	Reject
S150.005	Mangaroa Peatland Focus Group_Anna Brodie & Mark Leckie			S150.005	Mangaroa Peatland Focus Group_Anna Brodie & Mark Leckie	Restoration	Oppose in part	The process of restoration as outlined in the definition is so wide sweeping that it needs to be redefined. It should not be undertaken without extensive community consultation and support. The perspective - whose desired former state is - needs to be defined, as does the time at which that former state existed. Some reference to expert opinion needs to be included. The assessment of what is needed to restore a habitat etc. should not come down to the subjective opinion of a council official, given that GWRC has strongly stated environmental goals. Balancing perspectives are needed from expert advisors and from people directly affected in the local community. The perspectives of people indirectly affected may also be relevant but should be given less weight than those directly affected.	Insert a clause requiring GWRC to engage with the community to define what restoration means for each habitat, ecosystem, landform or landscape and only proceed once they have a community approval in each case.	Reject

S42A Appendix 2 - HS6 Indigenous Ecosystems - Summary Recommendation Table

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
S156.005	Mangaroa Peatland Focus Group_Tim Rothwell			S156.005	Mangaroa Peatland Focus Group_Tim Rothwell	Restoration	Oppose in part	The process of restoration as outlined in the definition is so wide sweeping that it needs to be redefined. It should not be undertaken without extensive community consultation and support. The perspective - whose desired former state is - needs to be defined, as does the time at which that former state existed. Some reference to expert opinion needs to be included. Balancing perspectives are needed from expert advisors and from people directly affected in the local community. The perspectives of people indirectly affected may also be relevant but should be given less weight than those directly affected.	Insert a clause requiring GWRC to engage with the community to define what restoration means for each habitat, ecosystem, landform or landscape and only proceed once they have a community approval in each case.	Reject
S159.005	Mangaroa Peatland Focus Group_Antony & Jemma Ragg			S159.005	Mangaroa Peatland Focus Group_Antony & Jemma Ragg	Restoration	Oppose in part	The process of restoration as outlined in the definition is so wide sweeping that it needs to be redefined. It should not be undertaken without extensive community consultation and support. The perspective - whose desired former state is - needs to be defined, as does the time at which that former state existed. Some reference to expert opinion needs to be included. Balancing perspectives are needed from expert advisors and from people directly affected in the local community. The perspectives of people indirectly affected may also be relevant but should be given less weight than those directly affected.	Insert a clause requiring GWRC to engage with the community to define what restoration means for each habitat, ecosystem, landform or landscape and only proceed once they have a community approval in each case.	Reject
S160.005	Mangaroa Peatland Focus Group_Jen & Chris Priest			S160.005	Mangaroa Peatland Focus Group_Jen & Chris Priest	Restoration	Oppose in part	The process of restoration as outlined in the definition is so wide sweeping that it needs to be redefined. It should not be undertaken without extensive community consultation and support. The perspective - whose desired former state is - needs to be defined, as does the time at which that former state existed. Some reference to expert opinion needs to be included. Balancing perspectives are needed from expert advisors and from people directly affected in the local community. The perspectives of people indirectly affected may also be relevant but should be given less weight than those directly affected.	Insert a clause requiring GWRC to engage with the community to define what restoration means for each habitat, ecosystem, landform or landscape and only proceed once they have a community approval in each case.	Reject
S161.005	Grant O'Brien			S161.005	Grant O'Brien	Restoration	Oppose in part	Supportive of restoration in principal, however there are concerns about adequate engagement with affected communities and impacts on people's mental health and basic human rights. Concerns about previous incorrect interpretations of parts of Whitemans Valley being an 'inland wetland' and the impacts on the community of subsequent court	Insert text to require GWRC to adequately map out areas requiring restoration and engage with the affected community.	Reject

S42A Appendix 2 - HS6 Indigenous Ecosystems - Summary Recommendation Table

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
								proceedings when the area was not mapped as being significant or requiring protection.		
S162.032	Winstone Aggregates			S162.032	Winstone Aggregates	Restoration	Oppose	<p>Winstone is opposed/ neutral to the inclusion of the listed new definitions. It is unclear where some of these defined terms have come from or what the basis is for defining these terms in this way. Some do not appear to reflect up to date caselaw, the RMA or even the draft NPS-IB. Others appear to reflect NRP definitions but it is unclear how these change the interpretation of the RPS policies.</p> <p>Winstone is concerned about seeking to adopt the draft NPS-IB definitions in advance of these being settled. There is insufficient information contained in the s32 evaluation to understand how the impact of these definitions or how they will impact original wording and policies as well as proposed objectives, policies and methods. Further information and evidence as to how these have been developed is requested.</p> <p>Winstone is concerned that the definitions take an overly restrictive approach, may have unintended consequences and seeks amendments be made to ensure that the definitions are in line with the NPS and RMA caselaw and ensure that there is a viable and workable pathway to continue to undertake /consent quarrying activities.</p>	Any amendments required to address the submitters concerns set out above or consequential amendments required to the policies, objectives and methods than refer to these definitions.	Reject
S162.032	Winstone Aggregates	FS10.033	BP Oil NZ Ltd Mobil Oil NZ Ltd and Z Energy Ltd (the Fuel Companies)	FS10.033	BP Oil NZ Ltd Mobil Oil NZ Ltd and Z Energy Ltd (the Fuel Companies)	Restoration	Support	Agree that the basis for the definition is unclear and potential pre-empts the NPS-IB.	Allow the submission and amend the definition of restoration as sought.	Reject
S162.032	Winstone Aggregates	FS24.029	Powerco Limited	FS24.029	Powerco Limited	Restoration	Support	Agree that the basis for the definition of 'restoration' is unclear and potential pre-empts the NPS-IB.	Allow the submission and amend the definition of restoration as sought.	Reject
S162.032	Winstone Aggregates	FS20.300	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	FS20.300	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	Restoration	Oppose	<p>Ātiawa oppose the submissions from Aggregate and Quarry Association and Winstone Aggregates to the extent that the relief sought is inconsistent with national direction, particularly the NPS-FM.</p> <p>Ātiawa are particularly sensitive to aggregate extraction from awa, it is mana whenua who are guaranteed tino rangatiratanga over the land, waterways and all other taonga (including aggregate) through Te Tiriti o Waitangi. Historically aggregate extraction industry has failed to uphold the articles</p>	Disallow	Accept

S42A Appendix 2 - HS6 Indigenous Ecosystems - Summary Recommendation Table

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
								and the principles of Te Tiriti. Additionally, aggregate extraction has adverse effects on te taiao and mana whenua values. On the matter of 'balancing' national policy statements', recent case law states that the NPS-FM 2020 and NPS-UD 2020 are to be read together and reconciled under the regional policy statement and the district plans. It goes on to say, development capacity does not outweigh (trump) Te Mana o te Wai. Te Mana o te Wai is the fundamental concept of freshwater management: any thinking to the converse would not give effect to either national policy statement. Therefore, to reconcile national direction, it is not a balancing act, or even a compromise, the NPS-FM must be given effect to while achieving the purpose of the NPS-UD for example. This can be applied to aggregate extraction, the activity must be consistent with Te Mana o te Wai and the NPS-FM. The need for housing capacity is not license to forgo the requirements of the NPS-FM.		
S168.094	Rangitāne O Wairarapa Inc			S168.094	Rangitāne O Wairarapa Inc	Restoration	Support	Rangitāne o Wairarapa supports the inclusion of this definition and the clarification it provides.	Retain as notified.	Accept
S168.094		FS31.204	Sustainable Wairarapa Inc	FS31.204	Sustainable Wairarapa Inc	Restoration	Support	Kia ora koutou, My name is Ian Gunn, Secretary Sustainable Wairarapa inc. contact # 021567134, address 4B McKay Street, Paraparaumu Beach 5032. Firstly we'd like to state the time frame provided to peruse over 900 pages of submissions is in our opinion an abuse of process. The benefit of further submissions is for you the council to listen and hear the views of its ratepayers. The timeframe in our case does not allow a rigorous review of the original submissions to council. On top of this we are a week before Christmas- a very busy and chaotic time for most members of the community. It is highly likely that the majority of staff will take leave over the Christmas break so analysis of any further submissions will not occur until late January 2023-so why the short period to respond. While there is due process there is also good practise your management of the further submissions fails the good practise model. As a consequence we would like you to note Sustainable Wairarapa's strong support of the original submissions lodged with council by the two Wairarapa Iwi-Ngati Kahungunu and Rangitane. Its clear that there is a poor understanding of nature based solutions this	Not stated	Accept

S42A Appendix 2 - HS6 Indigenous Ecosystems - Summary Recommendation Table

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
								term needs further explanation. Sustainable Wairarapa acknowledges that while nature based solutions offer a wide variety of options its not the only solution. We are heartened by the widespread support for the original document. Thanks for an opportunity to make a further submission. Nga mihi nui lan Gun		
S147.0109	Wellington Fish and Game Council			S147.0109	Wellington Fish and Game Council	Restoration	Oppose in part	Re-wording this definition to include valued ecosystem properties and species, whether indigenous or introduced, captures a wider range of important physical and ecological attributes for protection and restoration.	Amend. The active intervention and management of modified or degraded habitats, ecosystems, landforms and landscapes in order to reinstate indigenous natural character, indigenous and valued ecological and physical processes, and cultural and visual qualities. The aim of restoration actions is to return the environment, either wholly or in part, to a desired former state, including reinstating the supporting ecological processes.	Reject
S147.0109	Wellington Fish and Game Council	FS20.121	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	FS20.121	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	Restoration	Oppose	Ātiawa do not support the relief sought where it relates to protecting habitats of trout and salmon without any proviso. Ātiawa refer to Policy 9 and Policy 10 of the NPS-FM to support this statement, which affords indigenous freshwater species greater protection than trout and salmon. Additionally, Ātiawa do not support the protection of trout and salmon which have adverse impacts on indigenous ecosystems. Generally the management and decision making in regards to trout and salmon species has not been undertaken within a Treaty Partnership with mana whenua. To accept the relief sought by the submitter would be contrary to Te Tiriti o Waitangi and the national resource management direction.	Disallow the relief sought in so far as it relates to the protection of trout and salmon	Accept
S147.0109	Wellington Fish and Game Council	FS19.173	Wellington Water Ltd ("Wellington Water")	FS19.173	Wellington Water Ltd ("Wellington Water")	Restoration	Oppose	It is unnecessary and redundant to recreate NPSFM policies within the RPS. Most of the amendments sought do not in any event properly reflect the NPSFM. In particular, they do not accurately reflect the proviso to Policy 7, the requirements of clause 3.22, the limitation of Policy 10 to trout and salmon only, and the subservience of	Disallow	Accept

S42A Appendix 2 - HS6 Indigenous Ecosystems - Summary Recommendation Table

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
								Policy 10 to Policy 9. Some of the amendments attempt to address matters that are already adequately covered by extant provisions or PC1 as notified. Some of the amendments undermine the more detailed content of PC1.		
S147.0109	Wellington Fish and Game Council	FS30.278	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Ltd	FS30.278	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Ltd	Restoration	Oppose	B+LNZ generally oppose the submission on the grounds that's B+LNZ are seeking changes of the plan change are restricted to those necessary to give effect to the National Policy Statement for Urban Development and that any other matters should be subject to proper review in the Schedule full review of the RPS in 2024 and in the scheduled reviews of the Natural Resources Plan in 2023 and 2024. This is because the changes materially impact on communities, including rural communities and we do not consider that the necessary engagement has been undertaken to adequately inform these provisions or to meet the requirements of Part 3.2 of the NPS-FM. Furthermore, there is a risk that including matters relating to climate change and indigenous biodiversity before key national legislation is gazetted is premature and will lead to the inefficient implementation and confusion amongst those who it impacts materially.	Disallow That the submission be disallowed with the exception of 147.007	Accept in part
S165.0149	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society (Forest & Bird)			S165.0149	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society (Forest & Bird)	Restoration	Support in part	Drafting improvement	Add "or improve" after "reinstate"	Reject
S165.0149	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society (Forest & Bird)	FS30.319	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Ltd	FS30.319	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Ltd	Restoration	Oppose	B+LNZ generally oppose the submission on the grounds that's B+LNZ are seeking changes of the plan change are restricted to those necessary to give effect to the National Policy Statement for Urban Development and that any other matters should be subject to proper review in the Schedule full review of the RPS in 2024 and in the scheduled reviews of the Natural Resources Plan in 2023 and 2024. This is because the changes materially impact on communities, including rural communities and we do not consider that the necessary engagement has been undertaken to adequately inform these provisions or to meet the requirements of Part 3.2 of the NPS-FM. Furthermore, there is a risk that including matters relating to climate change and indigenous biodiversity	Disallow	Accept

S42A Appendix 2 - HS6 Indigenous Ecosystems - Summary Recommendation Table

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
								before key national legislation is gazetted or implemented is premature and will lead to the inefficient implementation and confusion amongst those who it impacts materially.		
S31.032	Robert Anker			S31.032	Robert Anker	Te Rito o te Harakeke	Oppose in part	Te Rito is not about indigenous biodiversity but is about the importance of family in its widest sense. You ask me - what is the most important thing - it is people, it is people, it is people. The concept is that if you take out the young then the family will disintegrate and scatter asunder. Te Rito has been hijacked by ecologists who have made up 6 factors to suit their own agenda.	Delete reference to Ti Rito in connection with biodiversity.	Reject
S168.095	Rangitāne O Wairarapa Inc			S168.095	Rangitāne O Wairarapa Inc	Te Rito o te Harakeke	Support	The definition of Te Rito o te Harekeke is supported, noting that a process is requested to develop a local expression of Te Rito o Te Harekeke.	Retain as notified.	Accept in part
S168.095	Rangitāne O Wairarapa Inc	FS31.205	Sustainable Wairarapa Inc	FS31.205	Sustainable Wairarapa Inc	Te Rito o te Harakeke	Support	Kia ora koutou, My name is Ian Gunn, Secretary Sustainable Wairarapa inc. contact # 021567134, address 4B McKay Street, Paraparaumu Beach 5032. Firstly we'd like to state the time frame provided to peruse over 900 pages of submissions is in our opinion an abuse of process. The benefit of further submissions is for you the council to listen and hear the views of its ratepayers. The timeframe in our case does not allow a rigorous review of the original submissions to council. On top of this we are a week before Christmas- a very busy and chaotic time for most members of the community. It is highly likely that the majority of staff will take leave over the Christmas break so analysis of any further submissions will not occur until late January 2023-so why the short period to respond. While there is due process there is also good practise your management of the further submissions fails the good practise model. As a consequence we would like you to note Sustainable Wairarapa's strong support of the original submissions lodged with council by the two Wairarapa Iwi-Ngati Kahungunu and Rangitane. Its clear that there is a poor understanding of nature based solutions this term needs further explanation. Sustainable Wairarapa acknowledges that while nature based solutions offer a wide variety of options its not the only solution. We are heartened by the widespread support for the original document. Thanks for an opportunity to make a further submission. Nga mihi nui Ian Gun	Not stated	Awaiting recommendation

S42A Appendix 2 - HS6 Indigenous Ecosystems - Summary Recommendation Table

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
S131.0163	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust			S131.0163	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	Te Rito o te Harakeke	Support	Ātiawa support the inclusion of the definition of Te Rito o te Harakeke	Retain as notified.	Accept in part
S131.0163	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	FS29.284	Ngā Hapu o Otaki	FS29.284	Ngā Hapu o Otaki	Te Rito o te Harakeke	Support	<p>Co-design under a treaty house model is about shaping plans and resource management avenues alongside manawhenua that appropriately recognise the intergenerational prosperity of the uri of Ngā Hapu o Otaki and the wider community. There are ongoing concerns Ngā Hapu o Otaki maintain with GWRC in regard to the policies addressing Co-governance, Co-management, Co-leadership and Co-collabroative operational processes.</p> <p>This submission goes to great length to define where and how further considerations can be made recognising the interconnected nature of matauranga maori, the inequitable impact environmental decline will have on mana whenua/tangata whenua and offers insight to the intuitive and inherent awareness manawhenua need to maintain to ensure our intergenerational survival and prosperity.</p> <p>3.4 Freshwater including Public Access – Support in Principal</p> <p>3.6 Indigenous Ecosystems – Support in Principal</p> <p>3.9 Regional Form, Design and Function – Support in Principal</p> <p>Ātiawa views regarding Freshwater, indigenous ecosystems and Regional design and function resonate with insights Ngā Hapu o Otaki maintain. Ngā Hapu o Otaki would like opportunity to speak further to such views during the hearing process. We share Ātiawas concerns for Mātauranga Māori as a foundation for equitable interchange of decision making. Their concerns regarding intensification and the further degradation of taonga across our coastline rings true to the ongoing journey we are on as manawhenua facing intense growth for the coming generation. We seek to join the conversation and endorse provisions that will see our whanaunga and other manawhenua groups recognise their environmental resilience and the cultural agility our shared whakapapa offers.</p>	Not stated	Awaiting recommendation
S147.0110	Wellington Fish and Game Council			S147.0110	Wellington Fish and Game Council	Te Rito o te Harakeke	Support	Values, supports, and acknowledges the web of interconnectedness between indigenous species,	Retain as notified.	Accept in part

S42A Appendix 2 - HS6 Indigenous Ecosystems - Summary Recommendation Table

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
								ecosystems, the wider environment, and the community.		
S147.0110	Wellington Fish and Game Council	FS19.174	Wellington Water Ltd ("Wellington Water")	FS19.174	Wellington Water Ltd ("Wellington Water")	Te Rito o te Harakeke	Oppose	It is unnecessary and redundant to recreate NPSFM policies within the RPS. Most of the amendments sought do not in any event properly reflect the NPSFM. In particular, they do not accurately reflect the proviso to Policy 7, the requirements of clause 3.22, the limitation of Policy 10 to trout and salmon only, and the subservience of Policy 10 to Policy 9. Some of the amendments attempt to address matters that are already adequately covered by extant provisions or PC1 as notified. Some of the amendments undermine the more detailed content of PC1.	Disallow	Awaiting recommendation
S147.0110	Wellington Fish and Game Council	FS30.279	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Ltd	FS30.279	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Ltd	Te Rito o te Harakeke	Oppose	B+LNZ generally oppose the submission on the grounds that's B+LNZ are seeking changes of the plan change are restricted to those necessary to give effect to the National Policy Statement for Urban Development and that any other matters should be subject to proper review in the Schedule full review of the RPS in 2024 and in the scheduled reviews of the Natural Resources Plan in 2023 and 2024. This is because the changes materially impact on communities, including rural communities and we do not consider that the necessary engagement has been undertaken to adequately inform these provisions or to meet the requirements of Part 3.2 of the NPS-FM. Furthermore, there is a risk that including matters relating to climate change and indigenous biodiversity before key national legislation is gazetted is premature and will lead to the inefficient implementation and confusion amongst those who it impacts materially.	Disallow That the submission be disallowed with the exception of 147.007	Awaiting recommendation
S163.0114	Wairarapa Federated Farmers			S163.0114	Wairarapa Federated Farmers	Te Rito o te Harakeke	Oppose	Defer to the 2024 RPS review.	Delete the new definition	Reject
S163.0114	Wairarapa Federated Farmers	FS7.055	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society (Forest & Bird)	FS7.055	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society (Forest & Bird)	Te Rito o te Harakeke	Oppose	It is completely appropriate to include climate change, biodiversity and freshwater provisions in the plan change. This plan change creates efficiency by considering multiple policy directives from central government. The amendments sought by Federated Farmers fail to give effect to the NPSFM, the NPS for Indigenous Biodiversity, for which there is an exposure draft and the final version is due out this	Disallow whole submission	Awaiting recommendation

S42A Appendix 2 - HS6 Indigenous Ecosystems - Summary Recommendation Table

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
								month, and do not achieve the purpose of the RMA or the Climate Change Response (Zero Carbon) Amendment Act 2019.		
S163.0114	Wairarapa Federated Farmers	FS20.177	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	FS20.177	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	Te Rito o te Harakeke	Oppose	Ātiawa oppose the entire submission by Wairarapa Federated Farmers. The relief sought by Federated Farmers is to effectively delete the entire proposed plan change (except for submission points S163.083, S163.084). The basis for deleting the proposed plan change is to delay decision-making. Ātiawa do not accept that delaying responding to national direction is an appropriate course of action, and will further compound environmental and resource management issues.	Disallow the entire submission by Wairarapa Federated Farmers.	Awaiting recommendation
S163.0114	Wairarapa Federated Farmers	FS29.028	Ngā Hapu o Otaki	FS29.028	Ngā Hapu o Otaki	Te Rito o te Harakeke	Oppose	Section 18, page 4: General Comments – OPPOSE Section 25, Page 5 Going Forward – OPPOSE It is disheartening to see that Wairarapa Federated Farmers aren't capable of recognizing the obligations GWRC must maintain with Treaty Partners. It must be understood that Manawhenua are not simply 'groups of people' but a representation of the signatories that signed the Treaty of Waitangi and the original kaitiaki and custodians of the taonga in question when considering how these plan changes are implemented. Wairarapa Federated Farmers indicate a lack of awareness to the value of manawhenua engagement. Their stated 'aspirations of delivering environmental improvements alongside a thriving bio-economy' aren't feasible without considering the intergenerational insight and technical direction that only Mātauranga Māori can offer.	Not stated	Awaiting recommendation
S163.0114	Wairarapa Federated Farmers	FS30.084	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Ltd	FS30.084	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Ltd	Te Rito o te Harakeke	Support	B+LNZ agree that the scope of RPS PC1 should be restricted to those changes necessary to give effect to the National Policy Statement for Urban Development and that any other matters should be subject to proper review in the Schedule full review of the RPS in 2024 and in the scheduled reviews of the Natural Resources Plan in 2023 and 2024. Where alternative relief is provided, B+LNZ generally support this relief.	Allow	Awaiting recommendation
S165.0141	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society (Forest & Bird)			S165.0141	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society (Forest & Bird)	Te Rito o te Harakeke	Support in part	This definition reflects the proposed National Policy Statement on Indigenous Biodiversity. Te Rito o te Harakeke is supported in principle. It recognises the reciprocity of the human-nature relationship, rather than viewing the natural environment and social or economic outcomes as opposites to be weighed against each other. It also	Amend as follows: • Replace "elements" in para 3 to refer to "principles" consistent with the approach in the NPSFM. • Insert a new para underneath the principles as	Reject

S42A Appendix 2 - HS6 Indigenous Ecosystems - Summary Recommendation Table

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
								<p>does this is a way that recognises the additional whakapapa aspect of the human-nature relationship for Māori.</p> <p>Te Rito o te Harakeke also recognises the interconnected relationship between terrestrial indigenous biodiversity and the wider environment. However, the way in which Te Rito o te Harakeke has been included means that it risks being interpreted to introducing a balancing of human use against maintenance of indigenous biodiversity. This was not the intention of the Biodiversity Collaborative Group. Its version of the concept was carefully drafted to put maintenance of indigenous biodiversity first, on the basis this was essential for human wellbeing of all types.</p> <p>The exposure NPSIB's (and therefore RPS's) balancing approach also conflicts with that of Te Mana o Te Wai in the NPSFM. There is no clear reason for a different approach. Te Mana o Te Wai expressly contains a hierarchy of obligations, with the first being the health and well-being of water bodies and freshwater ecosystems. Te Rito o Te Harakeke should include a similarly clear hierarchy of obligations, consistent with the statutory obligations underpinning the exposure NPSIB.</p>	<p>follows, and consistent with the approach in the NPSFM: "There is a hierarchy of obligations in Te Rito o te Harakeke that prioritises: (a) First, te hauora o nga koiora (the health of indigenous biodiversity), recognising the connections between this and: (i) Te hauora o te taonga (the health of taonga); and (ii) Te hauora o te Taiao (the health of the wider natural environment): Second, the ability for people and communities to use natural and physical resources to provide for their social, economic, and cultural well-being, now and in the future.</p>	
S165.0141	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society (Forest & Bird)	FS26.080	Meridian Energy Limited	FS26.080	Meridian Energy Limited	Te Rito o te Harakeke	Oppose	<p>Forest & Bird supports the definition in principle and requests extensive amendments. Meridian opposes the proposed extensive amendments in the absence of a gazetted NPS-IB.</p>	Disallow	Awaiting recommendation
S165.0141	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society (Forest & Bird)	FS30.319	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Ltd	FS30.319	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Ltd	Indigenous ecosystems introductory text	Oppose	<p>B+LNZ generally oppose the submission on the grounds that's B+LNZ are seeking changes of the plan change are restricted to those necessary to give effect to the National Policy Statement for Urban Development and that any other matters should be subject to proper review in the Schedule full review of the RPS in 2024 and in the scheduled reviews of the Natural Resources Plan in 2023 and 2024. This is because the changes materially impact on communities, including rural communities and we do not consider that the necessary engagement has been undertaken to adequately inform these provisions or to meet the requirements of Part 3.2 of the NPS-FM. Furthermore, there is a risk that including matters relating to climate change and indigenous biodiversity</p>	Disallow	Awaiting recommendation

S42A Appendix 2 - HS6 Indigenous Ecosystems - Summary Recommendation Table

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
								before key national legislation is gazetted or implemented is premature and will lead to the inefficient implementation and confusion amongst those who it impacts materially.		
S32.039	Director-General of Conservation			S32.039	Director-General of Conservation	Threatened ecosystems or species	Support in part	The definition applies to ecosystems and species, but the content only addresses ecosystems. In order to be effective the definition needs to include species as well, and the New Zealand Threat Classification System is the appropriate standard for this.	Amend the definition as follows, or words to like effect (or provide separate definitions for threatened ecosystems and threatened species): "These ecosystems which are described by the IUCN Red List categories as Critically Endangered, Endangered and or Vulnerable; or species which are classified by the New Zealand Threat Classification System as Nationally Critical, Nationally Endangered, Nationally Vulnerable or Nationally Increasing. "	Accept
S32.039	Director-General of Conservation	FS30.317	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Ltd	FS30.317	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Ltd	Threatened ecosystems or species	Oppose	B+LNZ generally oppose the submission on the grounds that's B+LNZ are seeking changes of the plan change are restricted to those necessary to give effect to the National Policy Statement for Urban Development and that any other matters should be subject to proper review in the Schedule full review of the RPS in 2024 and in the scheduled reviews of the Natural Resources Plan in 2023 and 2024. This is because the changes materially impact on communities, including rural communities and B+LNZ do not consider that the necessary engagement has been undertaken to adequately inform these provisions or to meet the requirements of Part 3.2 of the NPS-FM. Furthermore, there is a risk that including matters relating to climate change and indigenous biodiversity before key national legislation is gazetted or implemented is premature and will lead to the inefficient implementation and confusion amongst those who it impacts materially.	Disallow	Awaiting recommendation
S162.033	Winstone Aggregates			S162.033	Winstone Aggregates	Threatened ecosystems or species	Oppose	Winstone is opposed/ neutral to the inclusion of the listed new definitions. It is unclear where some of these defined terms have come from or what the basis is for defining these terms in this way. Some do not appear to reflect up to date caselaw, the RMA or	Any amendments required to address the submitters concerns set out above or consequential amendments required to the policies,	Reject

S42A Appendix 2 - HS6 Indigenous Ecosystems - Summary Recommendation Table

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
								<p>even the draft NPS-IB. Others appear to reflect NRP definitions but it is unclear how these change the interpretation of the RPS policies.</p> <p>Winstone is concerned about seeking to adopt the draft NPS-IB definitions in advance of these being settled. There is insufficient information contained in the s32 evaluation to understand how the impact of these definitions or how they will impact original wording and policies as well as proposed objectives, policies and methods. Further information and evidence as to how these have been developed is requested.</p> <p>Winstone is concerned that the definitions take an overly restrictive approach, may have unintended consequences and seeks amendments be made to ensure that the definitions are in line with the NPS and RMA caselaw and ensure that there is a viable and workable pathway to continue to undertake /consent quarrying activities.</p>	objectives and methods than refer to these definitions.	
S162.033	Winstone Aggregates	FS20.301	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	FS20.301	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	Threatened ecosystems or species	Oppose	<p>Ātiawa oppose the submissions from Aggregate and Quarry Association and Winstone Aggregates to the extent that the relief sought is inconsistent with national direction, particularly the NPS-FM.</p> <p>Ātiawa are particularly sensitive to aggregate extraction from awa, it is mana whenua who are guaranteed tino rangatiratanga over the land, waterways and all other taonga (including aggregate) through Te Tiriti o Waitangi. Historically aggregate extraction industry has failed to uphold the articles and the principles of Te Tiriti. Additionally, aggregate extraction has adverse effects on te taiao and mana whenua values.</p> <p>On the matter of 'balancing' national policy statements', recent case law states that the NPS-FM 2020 and NPS-UD 2020 are to be read together and reconciled under the regional policy statement and the district plans. It goes on to say, development capacity does not outweigh (trump) Te Mana o te Wai. Te Mana o te Wai is the fundamental concept of freshwater management: any thinking to the converse would not give effect to either national policy statement. Therefore, to reconcile national direction, it is not a balancing act, or even a compromise, the NPS-FM must be given effect to while achieving the purpose of the NPS-UD for example. This can be applied to aggregate extraction, the activity must be consistent with Te Mana o te Wai and the NPS-FM.</p>	Disallow	Awaiting recommendation

S42A Appendix 2 - HS6 Indigenous Ecosystems - Summary Recommendation Table

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
								The need for housing capacity is not license to forgo the requirements of the NPS-FM.		
S168.096	Rangitāne O Wairarapa Inc			S168.096	Rangitāne O Wairarapa Inc	Threatened ecosystems or species	Support	Rangitāne o Wairarapa supports the inclusion of this definition and the clarification it provides.	Retain as notified.	Accept in part
S168.096	Rangitāne O Wairarapa Inc	FS31.206	Sustainable Wairarapa Inc	FS31.206	Sustainable Wairarapa Inc	Threatened ecosystems or species	Support	Kia ora koutou, My name is Ian Gunn, Secretary Sustainable Wairarapa inc. contact # 021567134, address 4B McKay Street, Paraparaumu Beach 5032. Firstly we'd like to state the time frame provided to peruse over 900 pages of submissions is in our opinion an abuse of process. The benefit of further submissions is for you the council to listen and hear the views of its ratepayers. The timeframe in our case does not allow a rigorous review of the original submissions to council. On top of this we are a week before Christmas- a very busy and chaotic time for most members of the community. It is highly likely that the majority of staff will take leave over the Christmas break so analysis of any further submissions will not occur until late January 2023-so why the short period to respond. While there is due process there is also good practise your management of the further submissions fails the good practise model. As a consequence we would like you to note Sustainable Wairarapa's strong support of the original submissions lodged with council by the two Wairarapa Iwi-Ngati Kahungunu and Rangitane. Its clear that there is a poor understanding of nature based solutions this term needs further explanation. Sustainable Wairarapa acknowledges that while nature based solutions offer a wide variety of options its not the only solution. We are heartened by the widespread support for the original document. Thanks for an opportunity to make a further submission. Nga mihi nui Ian Gun	Not stated	Awaiting recommendation
S165.0142	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society (Forest & Bird)			S165.0142	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society (Forest & Bird)	Threatened ecosystems or species	Support in part	The definition only refers to ecosystems not species. In terms of species the proper reference is the New Zealand Threat Classification System.	Amend to includes reference to species, in particular, the NZTCS with the classification of "threatened" and "at risk" declining	Accept
S165.0142	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	FS30.319	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Ltd	FS30.319	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Ltd	Indigenous ecosystems introductory text	Oppose	B+LNZ generally oppose the submission on the grounds that's B+LNZ are seeking changes of the plan change are restricted to those necessary to give effect to the National Policy Statement for Urban	Disallow	Awaiting recommendation

S42A Appendix 2 - HS6 Indigenous Ecosystems - Summary Recommendation Table

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
	(Forest & Bird)							Development and that any other matters should be subject to proper review in the Schedule full review of the RPS in 2024 and in the scheduled reviews of the Natural Resources Plan in 2023 and 2024. This is because the changes materially impact on communities, including rural communities and we do not consider that the necessary engagement has been undertaken to adequately inform these provisions or to meet the requirements of Part 3.2 of the NPS-FM. Furthermore, there is a risk that including matters relating to climate change and indigenous biodiversity before key national legislation is gazetted or implemented is premature and will lead to the inefficient implementation and confusion amongst those who it impacts materially.		
S63.005	Mary Beth Taylor			S63.005	Mary Beth Taylor	General comments - definitions	Support in part	UHCC Plan Change 47 includes the Mangaroa Peatland as unstable for development. This should be reflected in Plan Change 1 to the RPS. By adopting the RAMSAR definition of a wetlands, the Mangaroa Peatland would qualify for protection and restoration.	Use the RAMSAR Convention definition to define wetlands (Article 1) as this incorporates peatlands as follows: "areas of marsh, fen, peatland or water, whether natural or artificial, permanent or temporary, with water that is static or flowing, fresh, brackish or salt, including areas of marine water the depth of which at low tide does not exceed six metres."	Reject
S95.005	Tony Chad			S95.005	Tony Chad	General comments - definitions	Support in part	UHCC Plan Change 47 includes the Mangaroa Peatland as unstable for development. This should be reflected in Plan Change 1 to the RPS. By adopting the RAMSAR definition of a wetlands, the Mangaroa Peatland would qualify for protection and restoration.	Use the RAMSAR Convention definition to define wetlands (Article 1) as this incorporates peatlands as follows: "areas of marsh, fen, peatland or water, whether natural or artificial, permanent or temporary, with water that is static or flowing, fresh, brackish or salt, including areas of marine water the depth of which at low tide does not exceed six metres."	Reject
S140.0128	Wellington City Council (WCC)			S140.0128	Wellington City Council (WCC)	General comments - definitions	Not Stated / Neutral	For greater clarity, add a definition of 'Natural Ecosystem'.	Add: Definition of Natural Ecosystem	Accept in part

S42A Appendix 2 - HS6 Indigenous Ecosystems - Summary Recommendation Table

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
S163.027	Wairarapa Federated Farmers			S163.027	Wairarapa Federated Farmers	General comments - indigenous ecosystems	Oppose	Do not agree that any of the proposed indigenous ecosystem provisions are freshwater instruments, refer to submission for further information about relevant case law.	Delete FW icons	Accept
S163.027	Wairarapa Federated Farmers	FS7.071	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society (Forest & Bird)	FS7.071	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society (Forest & Bird)	General comments - indigenous ecosystems	Oppose	It is completely appropriate to include climate change, biodiversity and freshwater provisions in the plan change. This plan change creates efficiency by considering multiple policy directives from central government. The amendments sought by Federated Farmers fail to give effect to the NPSFM, the NPS for Indigenous Biodiversity, for which there is an exposure draft and the final version is due out this month, and do not achieve the purpose of the RMA or the Climate Change Response (Zero Carbon) Amendment Act 2019.	Disallow whole submission	Accept in part
S163.027	Wairarapa Federated Farmers	FS20.193	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	FS20.193	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	General comments - indigenous ecosystems	Oppose	Ātiawa oppose the entire submission by Wairarapa Federated Farmers. The relief sought by Federated Farmers is to effectively delete the entire proposed plan change (except for submission points S163.083, S163.084). The basis for deleting the proposed plan change is to delay decision-making. Ātiawa do not accept that delaying responding to national direction is an appropriate course of action, and will further compound environmental and resource management issues.	Disallow the entire submission by Wairarapa Federated Farmers.	Accept in part
S163.027	Wairarapa Federated Farmers	FS29.044	Ngā Hapu o Otaki	FS29.044	Ngā Hapu o Otaki	General comments - indigenous ecosystems	Oppose	Section 18, page 4: General Comments – OPPOSE Section 25, Page 5 Going Forward – OPPOSE It is disheartening to see that Wairarapa Federated Farmers aren't capable of recognizing the obligations GWRC must maintain with Treaty Partners. It must be understood that Manawhenua are not simply 'groups of people' but a representation of the signatories that signed the Treaty of Waitangi and the original kaitiaki and custodians of the taonga in question when considering how these plan changes are implemented. Wairarapa Federated Farmers indicate a lack of awareness to the value of manawhenua engagement. Their stated 'aspirations of delivering environmental improvements alongside a thriving bio-economy' aren't feasible without considering the intergenerational insight and technical direction that only Mātauranga Māori can offer.	Not stated	Accept in part
S163.027	Wairarapa Federated Farmers	FS30.100	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Ltd	FS30.100	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Ltd	General comments -	Support	B+LNZ agree that the scope of RPS PC1 should be restricted to those changes necessary to give effect to the National Policy Statement for Urban Development	Allow	Reject

S42A Appendix 2 - HS6 Indigenous Ecosystems - Summary Recommendation Table

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
						indigenous ecosystems		and that any other matters should be subject to proper review in the Schedule full review of the RPS in 2024 and in the scheduled reviews of the Natural Resources Plan in 2023 and 2024. Where alternative relief is provided, B+LNZ generally support this relief.		
S16.060	Kāpiti Coast District Council			S16.060	Kāpiti Coast District Council	Objective 16B	Support in part	Council requests the objective refer to mana whenua values rather than tangata whenua values. The practical application of seeking to identify tangata whenua values of those who are not represented by the relevant mana whenua iwi authorities would be an impossible task for city and district councils. Council requests the use of the terms mana whenua/tangata whenua/iwi/hapū and Māori are carefully considered and applied appropriately throughout RPS Change 1 with respect to the practical implications for resource management processes and the requirements of the RMA and relevant higher level statutory planning documents.	Amend Objective 16B by deleting reference to tangata whenua as follows: Objective 16B Mana whenua / tangata whenua values relating to indigenous biodiversity, particularly taonga species, and the important relationship between indigenous ecosystem health and well-being, are given effect to in decision-making, and mana whenua / tangata whenua are supported to exercise their kaitiakitanga for indigenous biodiversity.	Reject
S16.060	Kāpiti Coast District Council	FS20.051	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	FS20.051	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	Objective 16B	Support in part	Ātiawa note that Council should consult with mana whenua/tangata whenua, iwi and hapū to determine the most appropriate term. Ātiawa note that the term should refer to the group that hold undisturbed collective whakapapa relationship to the whenua.	Disallow the relief sought, mana whenua/tangata whenua, iwi and hapū should first have the opportunity to wānanga this together and with Greater Wellington Regional Council.	Awaiting recommendation
S133.020	Muaūpoko Tribal Authority			S133.020	Muaūpoko Tribal Authority	Policy 23: Identifying indigenous ecosystems and habitats with significant indigenous biodiversity values - district and regional plans	Support in part	Supports the inclusion of a deadline for completion of indigenous biodiversity identification. However, we request consultation with Muaūpoko be included.	Include process for consultation with Muaūpoko.	Reject
S133.020	Muaūpoko Tribal Authority	FS6.0010	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira on behalf of Ngāti Toa Rangatira	FS6.0010	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira on behalf of Ngāti Toa Rangatira	Policy 23: Identifying indigenous ecosystems and habitats with significant	Oppose	We oppose this submission because Muaūpoko is not Tangata Whenua in Te Whanganui a Tara.	Disallow	Accept in part

S42A Appendix 2 - HS6 Indigenous Ecosystems - Summary Recommendation Table

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
						indigenous biodiversity values - district and regional plans				
S133.020	Muaūpoko Tribal Authority	FS20.367	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	FS20.367	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	Policy 23: Identifying indigenous ecosystems and habitats with significant indigenous biodiversity values - district and regional plans	Oppose	<p>Ātiawa vehemently oppose the submission and claims made by Muaūpoko Tribal Authority. The assertions made by Muāupoko Tribal Authority are categorically incorrect and highly offensive to Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai. While Muaūpoko may have historical associations with Te Whanganui-a-Tara and Kāpiti. These associations are recognised as historical only. Ātiawa refer to the evidence provided by Ngārongo Iwikatea Nicholson in support of Ngāti Toarangatira's claims which were upheld and settled by the Crown. Pages 26-34 sets out the extinguishment of Muaūpoko rights in our rohe. From both a tikanga Māori perspective and a Crown law perspective, Muaūpoko do not hold mana whenua (including for the purposes of the Resource Management Act). There is therefore no basis for Muaūpoko Tribal Authority to be recognised as being kaitiaki in the rohe; to do so would be incomprehensible and irreconcilable to Ātiawa, and more generally an affront to tikanga Māori. Muaūpoko Tribal Authority have cited Te Kāhui Māngai mapping as evidence of the spatial extent that they exercise kaitiakitanga. This in itself evidences the lack of basis to their claims, in that Te Kāhui Māngai map simply reflects claims made by Māori groups, and from our previous inquiry to Te Puni Kōkiri who are responsible for this map, we learned that Muaūpoko Tribal Authority included that spatial extent in their Agreement in Principle. Agreements in Principle provide claimants the opportunity to set out everything that a claimant wants from the Crown. They have no legal effect and are therefore not legally recognised. We strongly advise the Council to remain conscious that it is not appropriate for regional planning processes to be exploited in the manner suggested by the Muaūpoko Tribal Authority, that dealing with the false claims of groups like these must be left to the Crown, and that settlements must not pre-empted. Whilst Muaūpoko Tribal Authority may wish to seek out new territories through online maps, this is not of course how mana whenua is gained or held. We remain as ahi kā and mana whenua on the land, as we have undisturbed for over 198 years.</p>	Disallow the whole submission	Accept in part

S42A Appendix 2 - HS6 Indigenous Ecosystems - Summary Recommendation Table

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
S133.024	Muaūpoko Tribal Authority			S133.024	Muaūpoko Tribal Authority	Policy IE.3: Maintaining, enhancing and restoring indigenous ecosystem health - non-regulatory	Support in part	Supports the requirement to partner with mana whenua/tangata whenua, but request that Muaūpoko are also recognised.	Recognise Muaūpoko as also having connection to indigenous biodiversity in Te Whanganui-a-Tara. OR Alternative relief that may be necessary or appropriate to ensure Muaūpoko connection to Te Whanganui-a-Tara is recognised.	Reject
S133.024	Muaūpoko Tribal Authority	FS6.054	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira on behalf of Ngāti Toa Rangatira	FS6.054	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira on behalf of Ngāti Toa Rangatira	Policy IE.3: Maintaining, enhancing and restoring indigenous ecosystem health - non-regulatory	Oppose	We oppose this submission because as Muaūpoko claims are inappropriate. This not only causes confusion around which iwi are Tangata Whenua in Te Whanganui a Tara rohe and which iwi to engage with, but also portrays a false perception of who the mana whenua are, which is also inappropriate.	Disallow We seek that this part of the submission is disallowed.	Accept
S133.024	Muaūpoko Tribal Authority	FS20.371	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	FS20.371	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	Policy IE.3: Maintaining, enhancing and restoring indigenous ecosystem health - non-regulatory	Oppose	Ātiawa vehemently oppose the submission and claims made by Muaūpoko Tribal Authority. The assertions made by Muaūpoko Tribal Authority are categorically incorrect and highly offensive to Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai. While Muaūpoko may have historical associations with Te Whanganui-a-Tara and Kāpiti. These associations are recognised as historical only. Ātiawa refer to the evidence provided by Ngārongo Iwikatea Nicholson in support of Ngāti Toarangatira's claims which were upheld and settled by the Crown. Pages 26-34 sets out the extinguishment of Muaūpoko rights in our rohe. From both a tikanga Māori perspective and a Crown law perspective, Muaūpoko do not hold mana whenua (including for the purposes of the Resource Management Act). There is therefore no basis for Muaūpoko Tribal Authority to be recognised as being kaitiaki in the rohe; to do so would be incomprehensible and irreconcilable to Ātiawa, and more generally an affront to tikanga Māori. Muaūpoko Tribal Authority have cited Te Kāhui Māngai mapping as evidence of the spatial extent that they exercise kaitiakitanga. This in itself evidences the lack of basis to their claims, in that Te Kāhui Māngai map simply reflects claims made by Māori groups, and from our previous inquiry to Te Puni Kōkiri who are responsible for this map, we learned that Muaūpoko Tribal Authority included that spatial extent in their Agreement in Principle. Agreements in Principle provide claimants the opportunity to set out	Disallow the whole submission	Accept in part

S42A Appendix 2 - HS6 Indigenous Ecosystems - Summary Recommendation Table

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
								everything that a claimant wants from the Crown. They have no legal effect and are therefore not legally recognised. We strongly advise the Council to remain conscious that it is not appropriate for regional planning processes to be exploited in the manner suggested by the Muaūpoko Tribal Authority, that dealing with the false claims of groups like these must be left to the Crown, and that settlements must not pre-empted. Whilst Muaūpoko Tribal Authority may wish to seek out new territories through online maps, this is not of course how mana whenua is gained or held. We remain as ahi kā and mana whenua on the land, as we have undisturbed for over 198 years.		
S133.023	Muaūpoko Tribal Authority			S133.023	Muaūpoko Tribal Authority	Policy IE.2: Maintaining, enhancing, and restoring indigenous ecosystem health - consideration	Support in part	Supports the requirement to partner with mana whenua/tangata whenua, but request that Muaūpoko are also recognised.	Recognise Muaūpoko as also having connection to indigenous biodiversity in Te Whanganui-a-Tara. OR Alternative relief that may be necessary or appropriate to ensure Muaūpoko connection to Te Whanganui-a-Tara is recognised.	Reject
S133.023	Muaūpoko Tribal Authority	FS6.053	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira on behalf of Ngāti Toa Rangatira	FS6.053	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira on behalf of Ngāti Toa Rangatira	Policy IE.2: Maintaining, enhancing, and restoring indigenous ecosystem health - consideration	Oppose	We oppose this submission because as Muaūpoko claims are inappropriate. This not only causes confusion around which iwi are Tangata Whenua in Te Whanganui a Tara rohe and which iwi to engage with, but also portrays a false perception of who the mana whenua are, which is also inappropriate.	Disallow We seek that this part of the submission is disallowed.	Accept in part
S133.023	Muaūpoko Tribal Authority	FS20.370	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	FS20.370	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	Policy IE.2: Maintaining, enhancing, and restoring indigenous ecosystem health - consideration	Oppose	Ātiawa vehemently oppose the submission and claims made by Muaūpoko Tribal Authority. The assertions made by Muaūpoko Tribal Authority are categorically incorrect and highly offensive to Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai. While Muaūpoko may have historical associations with Te Whanganui-a-Tara and Kāpiti. These associations are recognised as historical only. Ātiawa refer to the evidence provided by Ngārongo Iwikatea Nicholson in support of Ngāti Toarangatira's claims which were upheld and settled by the Crown. Pages 26-34 sets out the extinguishment of Muaūpoko rights in our rohe. From both a tikanga Māori perspective and a Crown law perspective, Muaūpoko do not hold mana whenua (including for the purposes of the Resource Management Act). There is therefore no basis for Muaūpoko Tribal Authority to be	Disallow the whole submission	Accept in part

S42A Appendix 2 - HS6 Indigenous Ecosystems - Summary Recommendation Table

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
								recognised as being kaitiaki in the rohe; to do so would be incomprehensible and irreconcilable to Ātiawa, and more generally an affront to tikanga Māori. Muaūpoko Tribal Authority have cited Te Kāhui Māngai mapping as evidence of the spatial extent that they exercise kaitiakitanga. This in itself evidences the lack of basis to their claims, in that Te Kāhui Māngai map simply reflects claims made by Māori groups, and from our previous inquiry to Te Puni Kōkiri who are responsible for this map, we learned that Muaūpoko Tribal Authority included that spatial extent in their Agreement in Principle. Agreements in Principle provide claimants the opportunity to set out everything that a claimant wants from the Crown. They have no legal effect and are therefore not legally recognised. We strongly advise the Council to remain conscious that it is not appropriate for regional planning processes to be exploited in the manner suggested by the Muaūpoko Tribal Authority, that dealing with the false claims of groups like these must be left to the Crown, and that settlements must not pre-empted. Whilst Muaūpoko Tribal Authority may wish to seek out new territories through online maps, this is not of course how mana whenua is gained or held. We remain as ahi kā and mana whenua on the land, as we have undisturbed for over 198 years.		
S11.023	Outdoor Bliss Heather Blissett			S11.023	Outdoor Bliss Heather Blissett	General comments - overall	Support in part	Can we remove all the words information, promote, support and encourage to an action. We have been doing this for years and now is time for action. Still too passive. My local Council have been ignoring your information, promotion, support and encouragement to date. The document is far too passive.	Use stronger language throughout the document: Replace "information", "promote", "support" and "encourage" with "implement" or "incentivize" (or better word), Replace "consideration" with "essential". Replace "non-regulatory" with "regulatory".	Reject
S16.097	Kāpiti Coast District Council			S16.097	Kāpiti Coast District Council	General comments - overall	Support in part	Objectives : Many objectives are not drafted clearly with regard to what outcome is sought, and some do not appear to be achievable within the scope of a regional policy statement.	Ensure all objectives are specific, state what is to be achieved where and when, clearly relate to (or state) an issue, and can be determined through implementation and monitoring whether the objectives have been met. Delete all objectives that are not achievable within the	Reject

S42A Appendix 2 - HS6 Indigenous Ecosystems - Summary Recommendation Table

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
									scope of a regional policy statement (with respect to legal justification, and the effectiveness and efficiency in light of alternative methods outside of the regional policy statement).	
S16.0100	Kāpiti Coast District Council			S16.0100	Kāpiti Coast District Council	General comments - overall	Oppose	Inappropriate use of verbs within objectives and policies: There are a number of examples throughout RPS Change 1 that proposes the use of verbs within objectives and policies that do not align with the RMA or relevant higher-level statutory planning documents. Council submits that the use of the correct verb in each instance is of critical importance due to their specific meaning and requirements for implementation that have been determined through case law. Council has not identified all instances of the use of inappropriate verbs, but this submission requests all verbs are reviewed and replaced where appropriate.	All verbs used in objectives and policies are reviewed and replaced with the appropriate verb in accordance with the RMA and relevant higher-level statutory planning documents.	Accept in part
S16.0102	Kāpiti Coast District Council			S16.0102	Kāpiti Coast District Council	General comments - overall	Oppose	Use of 'and/or' throughout RPS Change 1: We note the use of and/or generally means a choice can be made. This is an issue across RPS Change 1 where it appears there is uncertainty as to whether there should be a choice or not. We request all instances of 'and / or' are reviewed and 'and' or 'or' are specifically used where appropriate.	All instances of and/or are reviewed and 'and' or 'or' are specifically used where appropriate.	Accept in part
S16.0103	Kāpiti Coast District Council			S16.0103	Kāpiti Coast District Council	General comments - overall	Oppose	Plan-wide provisions that are based on the misconception that district plan content, decision making on resource consents or notices of requirement by the Council are not limited by legislation: There are many examples in the plan change where there is a misconception that a district plan can require certain actions or require specific changes in behaviour. There are many free-market factors that district plans cannot regulate, and therefore should be pursued by the regional council via non-regulatory methods. Examples include but are not limited to: • Emission of greenhouse gases. • Transportation mode choice. • Restoration and enhancement activities. Nature based solutions	Delete all district plan requirements where the proposed methods (including the consideration of RPS policies, district plan making, resource consents, and notices of requirement) attempt to regulate free-market activities and behaviours of individuals that are not clearly supported by the RMA or a higher-level statutory planning document.	Reject

S42A Appendix 2 - HS6 Indigenous Ecosystems - Summary Recommendation Table

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
S16.0104	Kāpiti Coast District Council			S16.0104	Kāpiti Coast District Council	General comments - overall	Oppose	Explanations to objectives and policies: There are many examples where explanations to objectives and policies either contain information that is unnecessary, or content that should be included in the relevant objective or policy itself. Explanations can provide useful context in some situations, but as they have no legal status under the RMA they should be used sparingly and appropriately.	Review and amend all explanations to objectives and policies to: a. Delete those that are unnecessary; and b) Delete text that should have been included in the relevant objective or policy	Reject
S16.0106	Kāpiti Coast District Council			S16.0106	Kāpiti Coast District Council	General comments - overall	Oppose	Provisions that are not supported by the RMA, statutory planning documents, or an evidence base that supports and justifies the proposed provisions: We have been unable to find an evidence base supporting and justifying a number of provisions in the plan change. The section 32 evaluation does not assist us in understanding the resource management basis or evidence base for many of the proposed provisions - particularly where a regulatory method is proposed.	Delete all provisions that are not supported by the RMA, statutory planning documents, or a robust evidence base that supports and justifies their inclusion in a regional policy statement.	Reject
S30.0116	Porirua City Council			S30.0116	Porirua City Council	General comments - overall	Not Stated / Neutral	The real value of regional policy statements is to provide policy direction that either does not exist at a national level or exists at a national level but needs to be articulated at a regional level. Council is concerned about the many provisions in Proposed Change 1 that either duplicate or are inconsistent with matters now comprehensively addressed by national direction. In some instances, they duplicate national direction without giving specific guidance in a Wellington Region context.	Greater alignment with National Direction	Accept in part
S30.0116	Porirua City Council	FS25.033	Peka Peka Farm Limited	FS25.033	Peka Peka Farm Limited	General comments - overall	Support	The submission provides a comprehensive analysis of the proposed change including in relation to matters of scope and jurisdiction. It is supported without prejudice to the specific relief sought in the primary submission or this further submission by Peka Peka Farm Ltd.	Allow	Accept in part
S30.0117	Porirua City Council			S30.0117	Porirua City Council	General comments - overall	Not Stated / Neutral	Council has concerns over jurisdictional issues, particularly in relation to the discharge of contaminants to air, land and water; and the management of fresh waterbodies. We consider that various provisions are ultra vires in terms of our respective functions under sections 30 and 31 of the RMA. Further, territorial authorities do not have the capacity or capability to undertake these functions. Many of the provisions as required would require a transfer of powers from regional councils to territorial authorities.	Query in relation to s30 and s31 functions, RMA, 1991	Reject

S42A Appendix 2 - HS6 Indigenous Ecosystems - Summary Recommendation Table

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
S30.0117	Porirua City Council	FS25.034	Peka Peka Farm Limited	FS25.034	Peka Peka Farm Limited	General comments - overall	Support	The submission provides a comprehensive analysis of the proposed change including in relation to matters of scope and jurisdiction. It is supported without prejudice to the specific relief sought in the primary submission or this further submission by Peka Peka Farm Ltd.	Allow	Reject
S30.0120	Porirua City Council			S30.0120	Porirua City Council	General comments - overall	Not Stated / Neutral	Not stated	In addition to the relief sought as set out in our submission, as outlined above Council considers that the best course of action would be to withdraw much of Proposed Change 1, or otherwise work with councils on a variation to significantly amend most of its contents.	Reject
S30.0120	Porirua City Council	FS25.038	Peka Peka Farm Limited	FS25.038	Peka Peka Farm Limited	General comments - overall	Support	The submission provides a comprehensive analysis of the proposed change including in relation to matters of scope and jurisdiction. It is supported without prejudice to the specific relief sought in the primary submission or this further submission by Peka Peka Farm Ltd.	Allow	Reject
S34.0111	Te Kaunihera o Te Awa Kairangi ki Uta, Upper Hutt City Council			S34.0111	Te Kaunihera o Te Awa Kairangi ki Uta, Upper Hutt City Council	General comments - overall	Oppose in part	Council has not: • undertaken a complete check of whether detailed relief sought in this submission, could be/are partly or fully addressed by other provisions in RPS PC1 • undertaken a full review of background documents and higher order documents supporting or relating to these provisions • identified all consequential amendments needed in response to relief sought on specific provisions or that might address our concerns	Seeks any and all other amendments that will address the relief sought.	Reject
S34.0113	Te Kaunihera o Te Awa Kairangi ki Uta, Upper Hutt City Council			S34.0113	Te Kaunihera o Te Awa Kairangi ki Uta, Upper Hutt City Council	General comments - overall	Oppose in part	Use of negative rather than neutral language in issue statements: Council is concerned the issues are worded in strong negative language in the absence of any evidence, that Council is aware of, to support this negatively framed position, and these set a negative presumption and tone for the proposed cascading provisions.	Council requests the issues are amended to be written in neutral language with a balanced approach to the issue.	Reject
S34.0115	Te Kaunihera o Te Awa Kairangi ki Uta, Upper Hutt City Council			S34.0115	Te Kaunihera o Te Awa Kairangi ki Uta, Upper Hutt City Council	General comments - overall	Oppose	Requirements for district plans to include provisions for regional council functions or that extend beyond the ability of regional council to direct: Council has significant concerns that many of the proposed provisions attempt to require city and district councils to carry out some of the functions of regional councils or require Council to address resource management	Council opposes the provisions and seeks that the RPS is reviewed and amended to more appropriately and accurately reflect the powers, functions and duties of the	Reject

S42A Appendix 2 - HS6 Indigenous Ecosystems - Summary Recommendation Table

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
								issues in its district plan that are beyond its statutory functions, powers and duties under the RMA. GWRC is not able to legitimately direct these outcomes. Council considers these provisions ultra vires.	regional, district and city councils.	
S34.0116	Te Kaunihera o Te Awa Kairangi ki Uta, Upper Hutt City Council			S34.0116	Te Kaunihera o Te Awa Kairangi ki Uta, Upper Hutt City Council	General comments - overall	Oppose	Lack of higher order document or evidentiary support for provisions, and policies which duplicate national direction: Many of the proposed provisions do not appear to be adequately supported within the Section 32 Assessment by robust evidence, including any existing legislation or higher-level strategic planning document such as a national policy statement. This is particularly evident for the proposed climate change and indigenous biodiversity provisions.	Council submits that a full legal and planning review is undertaken to address these inconsistencies and seeks relief to specific provisions as identified in Table 1 below.	Reject
S34.0117	Te Kaunihera o Te Awa Kairangi ki Uta, Upper Hutt City Council			S34.0117	Te Kaunihera o Te Awa Kairangi ki Uta, Upper Hutt City Council	General comments - overall	Oppose	Lack of consideration of scale of provisions: The requirements and evidence base to develop the thresholds require significant effort and resourcing, which Council is not in a position to undertake, and in some cases, thresholds may not be an appropriate mechanism to address effects	Council contends that GWRC should further consider the practicalities associated with threshold-based provisions, to determine if this is the most appropriate method to achieve an objective or policy or develop guidance jointly with territorial authorities to support the development of provisions and decision-making process. Council seeks relief to specific provisions as identified in Table 1 below.	Reject
S34.0118	Te Kaunihera o Te Awa Kairangi ki Uta, Upper Hutt City Council			S34.0118	Te Kaunihera o Te Awa Kairangi ki Uta, Upper Hutt City Council	General comments - overall	Oppose	Inadequacy of Section 32 Assessment: Council is concerned that the Section 32 assessment is not sufficiently evidenced and does not fully evaluate whether many of the regulatory provisions are practical / can be achieved and are the best method of achieving the outcomes sought.	These provisions should be deleted and considered in a later plan change.	Reject
S34.0120	Te Kaunihera o Te Awa Kairangi ki Uta, Upper Hutt City Council			S34.0120	Te Kaunihera o Te Awa Kairangi ki Uta, Upper Hutt City Council	General comments - overall	Oppose	Council considers that there are fundamental issues with the proposed provisions that require significant revision or deletion to ensure the RPSPC1 is legally robust and practical to implement. Thus, Council seeks that GWRC undertake a full legal and planning review of the proposed provisions and amend the RPSPC1 to address these concerns, including detailed submission points on individual provisions included in Table 1.	Council also seeks any other consequential amendments to remedy errors and address relief sought.	Reject
S30.0123	Porirua City Council			S30.0123	Porirua City Council	General comments - consideration policies	Oppose	Council opposes all "consideration" policies since they often duplicate or conflict with "regulatory" policies, and represent regulatory overreach without sufficient s32 evaluation or other evidence. We consider that	Not stated.	Reject

S42A Appendix 2 - HS6 Indigenous Ecosystems - Summary Recommendation Table

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
								they will create unnecessary regulatory costs due to the way they are drafted. They assume a level of knowledge and expertise on a range of matters generally not available to consent authorities, and in some cases represent a transfer of s31 functions to territorial authorities.		
S30.0123	Porirua City Council	FS25.041	Peka Peka Farm Limited	FS25.041	Peka Peka Farm Limited	General comments - consideration policies	Support	The submission provides a comprehensive analysis of the proposed change including in relation to matters of scope and jurisdiction. It is supported without prejudice to the specific relief sought in the primary submission or this further submission by Peka Peka Farm Ltd.	Allow	Awaiting recommendation
S30.099	Porirua City Council			S30.099	Porirua City Council	General comments - definitions	Oppose	Clear and concise definitions are critical to assist in interpretation and implementation of the RPS.	Add any further definitions for any terms that are unclear and where a definition would assist in interpretation and implementation, including any relevant terms proposed to be introduced in response to submissions.	Accept
S30.099	Porirua City Council	FS25.132	Peka Peka Farm Limited	FS25.132	Peka Peka Farm Limited	General comments - definitions	Support	The submission provides a comprehensive analysis of the proposed change including in relation to matters of scope and jurisdiction. It is supported without prejudice to the specific relief sought in the primary submission or this further submission by Peka Peka Farm Ltd.	Allow	Accept
S140.002	Wellington City Council (WCC)			S140.002	Wellington City Council (WCC)	General comments - consideration policies	Support in part	The title of the regulatory policies as 'consideration' policies set out in chapter 4.2 creates confusion for their statutory weighting and should be amended.	Amend the wording of the title of the regulatory policies as outlined in Chapter 4.2 from 'Consideration' to 'Give particular regard'.	Reject
S158.001	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities			S158.001	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	General comments - consideration policies	Oppose	Considers that all of the policies in Chapter 4.2 have been worded to read as assessment criteria for consideration within other resource management approval processes such as resource consents. Notes that regional policy statements are to contain methods, but not rules (or the associated assessment criteria). Seek that all policies directing matters of consideration for resource consent are deleted from the regional policy statement in full.	That Chapter 4.2 is deleted from the regional policy statement in full. OR In the alternative that this relief is not granted, seek that the policies are reworded to state the intended outcome such that regional and district plans giving effect to the regional policy statement are suitably informed of the desired outcomes to address identified resource management issues.	Reject

S42A Appendix 2 - HS6 Indigenous Ecosystems - Summary Recommendation Table

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
S158.001	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	FS6.013	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira on behalf of Ngāti Toa Rangatira	FS6.013	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira on behalf of Ngāti Toa Rangatira	General comments - consideration policies	Oppose	We oppose this submission because this chapter gives effect to the National Policy Statement on Urban Development and the National Policy Statement for Freshwater Management. This chapter has important provisions in relation to Te Mana o te Wai, mana whenua/ tangata whenua roles and values and mātauranga Māori.	Disallow	Accept
S158.001	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	FS3.032	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	FS3.032	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	General comments - consideration policies	Support in part	WK supports submission in part and also seeks clarification as to the intent and implementation of this policy.	Not stated	Reject
S158.001	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	FS20.031	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	FS20.031	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust	General comments - consideration policies	Oppose	Ātiawa strongly oppose the submission point, it would be inappropriate to delete Chapter 4.2, the chapter contains important strategic policy direction to plan users on how te taiao must be managed, in accordance with Te Tiriti o Waitangi, the RMA, national policy and other statutory direction.	Disallow	Accept
S158.044	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities			S158.044	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	General comments - consideration policies	Not Stated / Neutral	Considers that a number of policies have been worded within the chapter to read as assessment criteria for consideration within other resource management approval processes such as resource consents. Notes that regional policy statements are to contain methods, but not rules (or the associated assessment criteria).	Seek that Chapter 4.2 is deleted from the regional policy statement in full, however seeks that Policy UD.3 is retained with amendments and relocated to Chapter 4.1.	Reject
S158.044	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	FS6.014	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira on behalf of Ngāti Toa Rangatira	FS6.014	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira on behalf of Ngāti Toa Rangatira	General comments - consideration policies	Oppose	We oppose this submission because this chapter gives effect to the National Policy Statement on Urban Development and the National Policy Statement for Freshwater Management. This chapter has important provisions in relation to Te Mana o te Wai, mana whenua/ tangata whenua roles and values and mātauranga Māori.	Disallow	Accept
S165.060	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society (Forest & Bird)			S165.060	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society (Forest & Bird)	General comments - consideration policies	Oppose in part	Submission in reference to Chapter Introduction and Table of Contents Chapter 4.2. The introduction (above the table) incorrectly states the weight to be given to the chapter's policies when changing or varying regional and district plans. Those plans must give effect to the RPS, not have particular regard to the RPS' provisions.	This section contains the policies that need to be given particular regard, where relevant, when assessing and deciding on resource consents or notices of requirement. The policies must be given effect to when changing, or varying district or regional plans. Within this section, policies are presented in numeric order, although the summary	Accept in part

S42A Appendix 2 - HS6 Indigenous Ecosystems - Summary Recommendation Table

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
									table below lists the policy titles by topic headings.	
S165.060	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society (Forest & Bird)	FS30.319	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Ltd	FS30.319	Beef + Lamb New Zealand Ltd	General comments - consideration policies	Oppose	B+LNZ generally oppose the submission on the grounds that's B+LNZ are seeking changes of the plan change are restricted to those necessary to give effect to the National Policy Statement for Urban Development and that any other matters should be subject to proper review in the Schedule full review of the RPS in 2024 and in the scheduled reviews of the Natural Resources Plan in 2023 and 2024. This is because the changes materially impact on communities, including rural communities and we do not consider that the necessary engagement has been undertaken to adequately inform these provisions or to meet the requirements of Part 3.2 of the NPS-FM. Furthermore, there is a risk that including matters relating to climate change and indigenous biodiversity before key national legislation is gazetted or implemented is premature and will lead to the inefficient implementation and confusion amongst those who it impacts materially.	Disallow	Reject
S100.029	Meridian Energy Limited			S100.029	Meridian Energy Limited	General comments - overall	Not Stated / Neutral	Tables 1A, 3, 4, 6 (a) and 9. Some amendments may be necessary where changes are made to the titles of policies and methods.	Amend the titles of the policies and methods referred to in Tables 1A, 3, 4, 6(a) and 9 where necessary to reflect any amendments made as a result of the foregoing submission points 1 to 28.	Accept
S140.001	Wellington City Council (WCC)			S140.001	Wellington City Council (WCC)	General comments - overall	Support in part	Concerns with adding short timeframes when the reasoning cannot be found in the s32 report. Councils will likely be in the middle of transitioning to a new Resource Management legislative system which may not align with the proposed changes or be feasible to implement so many changes at once.	Remove or update all references to "30 June 2025" in the Regional Policy Statement.	Accept in part
S140.001	Wellington City Council (WCC)	FS2.133	Rangitāne o Wairarapa Inc	FS2.133	Rangitāne o Wairarapa Inc	General comments - overall	Oppose	While we appreciate the submitters concerns, we need ambitious timelines to ensure that we don't suffer permanent impacts of climate change and that our mokopuna are not left with the impacts of the bad decisions and actions of this generation.	Disallow	Accept in part
S25.046	Carterton District Council			S25.046	Carterton District Council	General comments - regulatory methods	Oppose	Submission point relates to Method 21. As stated in the submission on Policy 23, the timeframe proposed to identify and include SNAs in the Wairarapa Combined District Plan is very short given the lack of available resource, long term planning cycle and any consequential amendments required to the Wairarapa	Remove this method.	Accept in part

S42A Appendix 2 - HS6 Indigenous Ecosystems - Summary Recommendation Table

Main Submission Point	Main Submitter (S)	Further Submission Point	Further Submitter (FS)	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested	Summary Recommendation
								Combined District Plan as a result of the identification process. CDC opposes the inclusion of these dates, for the same reasons outlined in its submission on Policy 23. CDC supports the inclusion of alternative options where the timeframe is not able to be met.		