

Purpose

This report provides the Ngāti Kahungunu Ki Wairarapa Tamaki Nui A Rua Trust with feedback on key issues to inform the settlement negotiations strategy for the resolution of its Treaty of Waitangi claim Wai 429.

It sets out the key principles which the Hapu seeks to achieve through the resolution of its Treaty Of Waitangi Claim (Wai 429).

This report outlines how these principles translate into specific interests/requirements as they relate to key aspects of the settlement specifically:

- Hapu specific issues
- Negotiators
- Post Settlement Governance Entity
- Overlapping Claims

Caveats

It should be noted that the Rūnanga reserves the right to amend the recommendations outlined in this paper subject to changes in the settlement process as commercial, cultural and relationship redress information is made available by the Crown

The Rohe of Ngai Tumapuhiarangi

The Rohe – Hapū Boundaries as set out in the Hapū Statement of Claim

- From the mouth of the Whareama River, inland to Taueru and the Maungaraki Range.
- South along the Maungaraki towards the Awhea River and to the Awhea River mouth
- Returning along the coastal area northwards to the Whareama River.

High Level Principles or Tikanga

The following high level principles are proposed to guide Ngai Tumapuhiarangi in it's discussions with the Crown and NK and NR claimant groups. These principles provide a flexible framework not only engage with the Crown and the wider NKCG and NRCG, but also, provide the wider hapu membership with a clear understanding of the outcomes which the Rūnanga is seeking to achieve through the settlement. Each principle is based upon our historical practices and customs as a hapu. Their application to a potential settlement issue is also discussed.

Whakawhanaungatanga

Historically, disputes and disagreements often arose between and within Iwi/Hapu groupings. These disputes often involved territorial rights or natural resources. However, traditional means existing to

resolve these disputes which involved the recognition of shared interests and shared whakapapa connections as a basis to resolve resource disputes. Where overlapping interests within and between claimants groups arise as part of the settlement negotiations the Rūnanga continues to recognise traditional whakapapa relationships as a means to resolve disputes. We continue to affirm this tikanga in the discussions within and between the NK and NR claimant groups.

Comment

The Wairarapa ki Tararua claim will involve significant overlapping or cross claim issues within the NK claimant group, and also, with NR. This principle recognises that while the hapu will have strong interests which need to be safeguarded there are historical processes based upon customary practices which provide a basis for resolving differences for the benefit of all. Where financial, Cultural and commercial redress issues are involved this principle provides a basis for the agreement of “relative interests” expressed in financial values.

Rangatiratanga

The exercise of rangatiratanga or chieftainship (mana) authority by Iwi /Hapu pre-existed the signing of the Treaty of Waitangi / Te Tiriti O Waitangi. The exercise of rangatiratanga continues to remain of paramount importance to the hapu ensuring rights of self-regulation, management of its own resources, and processes for self-governance are maintained for the benefit of current and future generations. The exercise of rangatiratanga ensures the unique identity of Ngāi Tumapuhiarangi as a Hapu is protected.

Comment

In any negotiations involving settlement redress (including the management of commercial and financial redress within a post settlement entity), the Rūnanga is committed to outcomes which uphold and support the rangatiratanga of the hapu. This includes but is not limited to redress instruments which support provide for autonomous decision making processes as it relates to independent incomes streams, autonomous ownership of assets including shares, cash, property and accumulated forest rentals.

Manawhenua

The exercise of absolute authority over lands as manawhenua at the signing of the Treaty / Te Tiriti recognised the legitimate and exclusive rights Iwi/Hapu held over specific territorial areas on the basis of genealogy (whakapapa), conquest (raupatu), occupation (ahi kaa) or as a gift (tuku whenua).

Comment

Therefore in any discussions involving financial and commercial redress, the Rūnanga will support redress options which preserve and contribute to the on-going manawhenua status of the hapu. Where areas of exclusive interest are identified the Rūnanga will support the retention of these rights and any financial and commercial benefits which flow accordingly. Where there is a conflict with the claims of other claimant groups the tikanga of whakawhanaunga shall be encouraged. Ngāi Tumapuhiarangi supports the Waitangi Tribunal view that the Crown perpetuated a flawed

interpretation of manawhenua and offers three possible accounts in Volume III (see page1032 for a commentary).

Manamoana

The exercise of authority over freshwater and deep sea coastal environments at the time of the signing of the Treaty/Te Tiriti recognised the legitimate and exclusive customary rights Iwi/Hapu held over specific territorial areas. Over time these customary rights created a relationship with the natural environs which shaped the unique and distinct identity of hapu/Iwi. It is therefore important that the settlement supports the restoration and retention of these discrete identities.

Manamoana rights were held on the basis of genealogy (whakapapa), conquest (raupatu), occupation or on-going use (ahi kaa) or arose as from a gift (tuku whenua). Therefore in any discussions involving settlement redress (including cultural and commercial redress) the Rūnanga will support redress options which preserve and contribute to the on-going exercise of manamoana rights by Iwi/hapu.

Comment

Redress options for Ngāi Tumapuhiarangi involving the freshwater and the deep water/coastal environs are of immense importance to the hapu and will be a critical settlement issue for the hapu. Potential redress mechanisms which are currently available include (but are not limited to) nohoanga, taiapure, protection and regulation of customary fishing rights and statutory acknowledgements. However, these mechanisms do not provide for the recognition of commercial interests which the Rūnanga may seek to have recognised. The Maori Fisheries Bill 2002 provided full and final settlement to mandated Iwi organisations for commercial fisheries claims.

Innovative settlement options will need to be developed which create direct or defacto commercial interests (i.e.: Cultural redress rights which create management and control rights to the allocation of marine water rights for aquaculture, solar and wind power, hydro energy or for new technology purposes under the RMA) or direct property rights through the sale of resources from the freshwater and coastal/deep sea environs.

He Pataka

In traditional times Iwi/Hapu sought to store, maintain and increase their resources to provide for the needs of future generations. Simile, in any discussions involving post settlement structures, the Rūnanga wishes to balance the need for a collective Ngāti Kahungunu post settlement entity approach to build wealth with the independent economic interests of individual Hapu/Marae entities.

Comment

Ultimately, decisions involving the post settlement entity involve three types of settlement models. Firstly, a settlement structure which distributes all assets to individual Hapu/Marae based upon some proxy formula. Secondly, a settlement structure which retains all assets within a single Iwi entity. Thirdly, a combination of both. The risks and disadvantages for each model will need to be considered before the Rūnanga decides what structure it will support with the wider NKCG. This

analysis will involve a careful analysis of a range of issue including autonomous hapu dividend streams and short term benefit distribution rights balanced with long term capitalisation needs.

Kaitiakitanga

In traditional times Iwi/Hapu exercised the role of kaitiaki or guardians too protect Te Ao Maori and the natural environment. Our role was cemented through a reciprocal relationship of rights and responsibilities based upon our whakapapa to our atua. This philosophy remains the same in today's modern world. The settlement negotiations should actively provide for the exercise of hapu

Comment

Cultural/Environmental and Commercial Redress Options should actively support redress mechanisms which give substance to the exercise of kaitiakitanga. This could involve environmental restoration funding, co-governance arrangements, statutory recognition of the kaitiaki of Hapu and the development of natural resource decision making processes in cooperation with the Crown.

Hapu Specific Issues

Land Loss – We seek the return of land or financial compensation for the loss of these lands into Crown ownership.

The rohe of Wairarapa consisted 2,421,543 acres. Of this the rohe of Ngāi Tumapuhiarangi originally comprised 503,234 acres. From 1865 - 1900, the Crown through actions took 78% of the remaining 532,593 acres. By 2002, a total of 34,710 acres remained in Maori hands. Of the 360,000 acres transacted by the Crown within the Wairarapa Inquiry district, Ngāi Tumapuhiarangi were provided with 7,635 acres of reserves. The “Barton incident” led the Crown to undermine the authority of Ngāi Tumapuhiarangi rangatira, Wereta Kawekairangi led to the loss of 80,000 acres of Wairarapa land undermining the authority of the rangatira

Ngāi Tumapuhiarangi had interests in the following blocks prior to the Mclean Purchases;

- (a) Pahaoa
- (b) Whareama No.2 (South);
- (c) Whareama (Coastal);
- (d) Whareama (Inland)
- (e) Kaiwhata
- (f) Te Awaiti & Pahaua
- (g) Tupurupuru
- (h) Wairaka
- (i) Tupapakura (Whareama, Te Aruhe o Pohatu);
- (j) Ngāpuketuru; and
- (k) Te Maipi

Where discussions occur involving these specific blocks whether this is concerns commercial, relationship or cultural redress the Hapu has a legitimate expectation that their interest are significantly if not exclusively provided for. This may include but is not limited to:

- Right of First Refusal for Crown properties in these areas
- Own and lease back requirements
- Return of ownership
- Any sub allocation of financial and commercial interests based upon land loss in the post settlement governance entity

Public Works Takings

Kaiwhata Native School (Okautete School)

Lands taken under the Public Works Act for the Kaiwhata Native School which were not returned when those lands were no longer used for their original purpose.

Ngāumu

The Ngāumu Forests occupy blocks of land which Ngāi Tumapuhiarangi have part or whole interests in these include (but are not limited to):

- Whareama
- Waikaraka
- Tupapakuraa
- Te Maipi

Te Awaiti

Crown grants were issued for Te Awaiti and road lines were provide but these road lines were later excluded from subsequent titles resulting in lands being landlocked. Access to the Te Awaiti blocks was therefore not provided for Maori owners.

Where discussions occur involving these lands taken for public works purposes whether this is concerns commercial (as in the case of Ngāumu forestry), relationship or cultural redress the Hapu has a legitimate expectation that their interests will be actively provided for. This may include but is not limited to:

- license holder rights to the trees and the right to occupy the land to harvest the trees.
- Licensor rights
- the accumulated rentals. In addition to the redress quantum.
- the future rentals until the license is extinguished
- the settlement legislation recognising the interests of Ngāi Tumapuhiarangi in the transfer of ownership

Te Taio – the Natural Environment including Biodiversity and Forest Degradation

Wai 429 affirms the right of Ngāi Tumapuhiarangi to exercise its right as kaitiaki within its rohe. This includes the management of forests, plants, birds and fisheries and all flora and fauna. Wai 429 also

identifies the significant breaches of the Crown which severely eroded, valleys, caused infill and flooding. In addition that actions and omissions of the Crown devastated indigenous plant, fish and bird life, traditional food gathering sources and land resources.

Accordingly, commercial, cultural and relationship redress options should actively support the role of Ngāi Tumapuhiarangi as kaitiaki. This will include but is not limited to:

- co-management governance structures, statutory vestings for sites of outstanding significance, statutory vesting of riverbeds (i.e the Kaihoata, the Whareama etc), statutory vesting of reserves, overlay classifications, statutory acknowledgements and joint advisory or management committees
- the provision of Camping Entitlements (Nohoanga or Ukaipo) for customary fisheries purposes,
- place name changes,
- any relationship redress agreements with the relevant local and central government and international agencies moving forward
- Conservation protocols for and a Fisheries / Freshwater
- where possible the recognition of commercial interests in the natural and physical environment through innovative redress mechanisms

Waterways

Wai 429 affirms the right of Ngāi Tumapuhiarangi to be key decision makers in all processes regarding waterways within their rohe. This includes ownership of and access to inland waterways and associated taonga, including freshwater fisheries, flora and fauna.

Accordingly, commercial, cultural and relationship redress options should actively provide for the exercise of kaitiakitanga and tino rangatiratanga in all waterways matters. This will include but is not limited to:

- co-management governance structures, statutory vestings for sites of outstanding significance, statutory vesting of riverbeds (i.e. the Kaihoata, the Whareama etc), statutory vesting of reserves, overlay classifications, statutory acknowledgements and joint advisory or management committee;
- the provision of Camping Entitlements (Nohoanga or Ukaipo) for customary fisheries purposes;
- Ownership of waterways (including but not limited to all major tributaries within the rohe)
- Conservation protocols for and a Fisheries / Freshwater;
- where possible the recognition of commercial interests in the natural and physical environment through innovative redress mechanisms

Waahi Tapu

Wai 429 affirms the right of Ngāi Tumapuhiarangi to retain its spiritual and cultural relationship and whakapapa connections to the natural environment, including waahi tapu, forests, fresh and sea waters, indigenous plants, birds, insects, fish and other taonga. This includes all waahi tapu and sites of significance within the rohe of Ngai Tumapuhia including but not limited:

- Urupa pa such as Waipuna, Mangapiu, Ahirara, Wainuioru
- Waahi tapu and urupa on Te Maipi
- Kainga and ancestral sites at Waikekeno, Ngāpuketurua, Ngā Mahanga and Whakawhiti

Accordingly, commercial, cultural and relationship redress options should actively provide for the protection of these wahi tapu.

Foreshore and Seabed and Fisheries

Wai 429 affirms the right of Ngāi Tumapuhiarangi to exercise its rangatiratanga and kaitiakitanga over traditional mahinga kai, the foreshore and seabed. This includes the mahinga kai, foreshore and seabed within the rohe of Ngāi Tumapuhiarangi including but not limited to:

- Traditional fishing areas such as Waikare, Waikohi and Rangipo reef
- The restoration of the marine habitat for traditional food gathering sources including crayfish, fish, paua, karengo, inanga, shellfish and other traditional kai moana
- Fishing reserves between the mouth of the Whareama river and the Awhea River
- Mahinga kai, Turanga waka, Moana Ika, kainga and waahi tapu between the mouth of the Whareama river and the Awhea River
- The restoration or access to sites of importance along the coastline such as Te Ununu, Ahirara, Waikekeno, Waikaraka, Kaihoata and Waimimiha (including mahinga kai and waahi tapu

Accordingly, commercial, cultural and relationship redress options should actively provide for the protection of the Foreshore and Seabed and Fisheries interests of Ngai Tumapuhia and may include but are not limited to:

- Ownership and/or co management arrangements
- statutory vesting of riverbeds (i.e the Kaihoata, the Whareama etc), statutory vesting of reserves, overlay classifications, statutory acknowledgements and joint advisory or management committees
- Funding for environmental restoration projects
- where possible the recognition of commercial interests in the Foreshore and Seabed and Fisheries through new and innovative redress mechanisms.

Socio-Economic Impact

Wai 429 affirms the right of Ngāi Tumapuhiarangi to exercise of its rangatiratanga through the restoration and support of te reo Māori me ona tikanga, health, housing and economic initiatives.

Accordingly, Maori commercial, cultural and relationship redress options should actively provide for soci-economic development and may include but are not limited to:

- Funding for health, education, housing and economic initiatives
- Relationship Redress mechanisms with the relevant central and local government agencies of the Crown including Housing, the Ministry of Economic Development, Treasury, Education, Local Authorities etc
- Employment and customary land based opportunities.

Negotiators

Experience, qualifications and knowledge of the relevant

Ngāi Tumapuhiarangi have an expectation that they will be represented in the negotiations team. We recognise that the limitations in the size of the negotiations team will require careful consideration of how our interests are to be represented within this forum.

The role of negotiators will be critical to the successful resolution of the claims. Ngāi Tumapuhiarangi requests that negotiators have the necessary experience, qualifications and knowledge of the relevant hapu and Marae based claims they are representing. In addition, there is a need to ensure that the rights of all Marae / Hapu of Ngāti Kahungunu in the claimant area are supported.

Negotiations Structure

We are yet to determine an optimum negotiations structure which best represents Ngai Tumapuhia interest but expect the following fundamentals to be achieved:

- Strong and on-going communication between the claimant community and negotiators.
- Two or three tier structured negotiation teams where sub committees are formed for Cultural, Commercial, Environmental and Relationship Redress with oversight by the first tier negotiations team led by the Chief Negotiator
- Negotiators need to be in place asap to establish the claims strategy moving forward and analyse the pro's and con's of the Terms of Negotiations
- Opportunities should be considered for the role of rangatahi, koroua/kuia, pakeke appropriate to negotiations situation

Post Settlement Governance Entity

At this stage in the negotiations process it is not possible to provide a definitive view upon the PSGE. Instead here we articulate the key design criteria underpinning the PSGE. These are:

- *Financial Viability* – the cost to implement the PSGE should be minimised and that sufficient funds are provided for each hapu/marae for their own economic development while ensuring the PSGE is well capitalised for the needs of future generations
- *Consistent with Tikanga Maori* – the governance entity of the PSGE should reflect our tikanga as a people. This includes the provision of hapu and marae representation within the governance board
- *Capable of Delivering long term benefits* – ultimately the PSGE should deliver benefits in terms of economic wealth creation, social development and environmental protection
- *Politically sustainable* – In determining an appropriate PSGE the Trust should strike a reasonable balance between the autonomous rights of individual Hapu/Marae and the need to collectivise assets to ensure the PSGE is capitalised for the needs of future generations. This includes the timing of discrete revenue streams to Hapu/Marae and the retention of a portion of the commercial settlement within the PSGE to create economic leverage.
- *Economies of scale* – the ability to achieve economies of scale where possible.

Observes Best Practice Good Governance Processes – Standard good governance processes are to apply which separate the political issues of the Iwi from robust commercial decision making implemented through the commercial or believe the best approach is to “park” this aspect of the

Overlapping Claims

We have articulated our view that the principle of whakawhanaunga is key to resolving overlapping claims with Rangitaane.

This has been outlined previously. We recognise the importance of ensuring that the final agreements on overlapping claim issues must be respectful to both parties. We also recognise the importance of ensuring that commercial elements of the settlement must be cognisant of the relative population sizes of both groups.

Water Aspirations / Issues

We have articulated our aspirations with respect to waterways above. The key decision remains whether the Trust will park the water ownership claim or accept the MOShares on offer. We are yet to form a clear view on this matter and therefore believe the best approach is to “park” this aspect of the claim.

Cultural Redress Te Ahi Kā¹ (A concept and framework for Ngāi Tumapuhiarangi)

In the Wairapapa ki Tararua report 2010² it points out that although much disruption resulted from the conflict and migrations (both) of the 1820s and 1830s Native Land Court records give a reasonable indication of where different hapu were located.

The claimant rohe of Ngāi Tumapuhiarangi is defined in the hapū Statement of Claim (see Wai 429) as covering the area from the mouth of the Whareama river, inland to Taueru. The boundary continues along the Maungarake³ ridge and eastwards to the Awhea river mouth. It follows the coastline returning to Whareama.

Within the claimant area are a number of key land marks, land sites, traditional garden sources, fruit and vegetable sources, natural food sources such as karaka, fern root (Pikau) and natural sources within the local forests, access and harvesting of freshwater sources tuna, inanga, kanae and the large and accessible sea (mōana based) sources.

Ngāi Tumapuhiarangi traces descent through Tūkoroua and Hinematua, this give lineage both through Ngāti Rangitāne and the Ngāti Kahungunu lines. This does not mean Ngāti Kahungunu but a recognition of whakapapa lines from the early explorers and settler groups from the two main tupuna, Rongomaiwahine and Kahungunu.

¹ Ahi - to burn, fire, W Williams Ahi karoa – title to land by occupation, page 3

² Volume 1, page 4 para 1.2.3

³ Also spelt as Maungaraki

In fact from a cultural perspective, Ngāi Tumapuhiarangi could be seen as a recognised individual and autonomous hapū in the Wairarapa region.⁴This could include development of rights relating to waahi tapu, fisheries and other development opportunities.

The interaction between the coastal Ngāi Tumapuhiarangi and inland peoples is well documented. Tākirangi Smith details both in his reports and as an expert (kōrero tawhito) researcher has painted a broad and consistent picture of coastal Ngāi Tumapuhiarangi⁵ moving between coastal settlements and inland areas according to seasonal need in response to change in climate and harvesting opportunities⁶.

For Ngāi Tumapuhiarangi key areas such as sites for pa tuna, hīnaki sites, locations of inanga (kokopū and other species), tuna and freshwater koura, burial sites (e.g. Te Maipi, Kaihōata, Mangapiu, Ōkautete, Waikaraka, Horewai, and others) all contribute to the understanding of

- a) Place of understanding - mātaurangi a hapu
- b) A place of where the tipuna walked, worked, and produced whanau/off spring and were buried
- c) Exchanged ideas and conversed with other related whanau or hapu outside their traditional area, land
- d) Expanded their understanding of the world of disasters, feasts and famine, use of new technologies and new peoples entering their area.

Ahi kaa for Ngāi Tumapuhiarangi comprises all of these points.

In general terms then ahi kā and ahi kaaroa refers to title to land by occupation, Ngāi Tumapuhiarangi has not relinquished rangatiratanga to its lands.

In a word the cultural content is a common and broad term often includes te reo and the mita⁷ ō Ngāi Tumapuhiarangi. While the hapū recognises the strong Kahugunu association, particularly as coastal peoples the efforts of Ngāi Tumapuhiarangi in the teaching and development of te reo (Kōhanga Reo and Kura Kaupapa) is an excellent start in the area of cultural revival⁸.

The reo or language is the means of conveying key information, exchange conversation, but important a vision of belonging and understanding of matters of the hapū and Māori in general.

The revitalisation supports the concept promoted by the kōhanga and kura kaupapa movements and later articulated by Patricia Bolstad, to ensure the survival of te reo ō Ngāi Tumapuhiarangi and Ngāi Tumapuhiarangi as people.

Marae

Marae in the Ngāi Tumapuhiarangi was generally in the late 1800s and well into the late 1900s supplemented by kāinga. The concept of Marae can be associated with the traditional kāinga as

⁴ See Goldsmith and his statements about autonomous hapu in the Wairarapa

⁵ Volume 1 uses the term peoples, see p6.

⁶

⁷ Regional dialect

⁸ See the evidence of Patricia Aroha Bolstad to the Waitangi Tribunal on reo in the Wairarapa and within Ngāi Tumapuhiarangi.

servicing the needs of its peoples. The lack of a more modern and eloquently carved whare was generally associated with other regions, Ngāi Tumapuhiarangi utilised other mechanisms to facilitate meetings and special celebrations and gatherings.

Whare karakia are generally seen as associated with the arrival and the influence of the missionary and while there are a number of whare karakia in the region, Whareama, Taueru, Maungamoria (Okautete) and others; these are predominantly utilised for religious occasions. The kāinga served as an important site for local meetings, as did the local hall and school.

As the area saw a population decline, much of this was associated with greater technology in the rural sector, increased employment opportunities in Masterton, Wellington and Palmerston North.

As people migrated to the cities and the use of urban based Marae became the norm with ongoing connections to the Wairarapa coast maintained for other key occasions.

This along with the decline in te reo – population decline, impact of education, employment and the need to be able to communicate with local farming sector and in general low skill work has contributed to this. In reality the major contributor to the survival of te reo has been the impact of the policy and practices of the then Department of Education. Records for Okautete School indicate an intent not to support the te reo or a bilingual learning programme.⁹

Cultural redress

Going back over cultural matters for Ngāi Tumapuhiarangi these might now consider

- The Crown's acknowledgement of the cultural significance of certain statutory areas for the hapu
- The issuing of Protocols by appropriate responsible Ministers. These Protocols might be a Conservation Protocol; and a Fisheries and Freshwater Protocol.
- A Crown Minerals Protocol as the mining industry is set to engage in exploratory work along the eastern sea board.
- One key issue should be the protocol enabling Ngāi Tumapuhiarangi and the development of te mita and te reo and aligned to the appropriate education and tertiary agency.
- Early notification relating to any potential changes to the status of schools such as Whareama, Te Wharau, Wainuioru.
- A set of functions relating to Local Leadership Body (LLB) to articulate where we have cultural matters and interests within the regional / local body relating to Ngai Tumapuhiarangi
- The provisions of the above-mentioned Protocols, statutory acknowledgements and provision for the vesting in Ngāi Tumapuhiarangi aspects of commercial and cultural redress relating to the use and investment of the forestry division within the Ngāi Tumapuhiarangi including the Ngāumu Forestry Camp and Headquarters.
- Local leadership in setting up new Ngāi Tumapuhiarangi wāhi tapu provisions through the Historic Places Trust (HPT) and the Department of Conservation (DoC)

Appendix 1: Examples - Cultural Settlement Redress

⁹ See the evidence of Patricia Arohanui Bolstad (WAI 429) Thursday 24 June 2004 at Okautete School

Summary of Statutory Instruments for Cultural Redress	
Statutory vesting Provides ownership (title)	Rights to use and manage may of fee simple estate vary according to type of site.
Statutory vesting and Ownership of site of outstanding significance	gifting back of sites is vested in the claimant group who then (after a specified interval) of outstanding significance return it unconditionally to the Crown for all New Zealanders.
Statutory vesting of riverbed or lakebed	May be available for beds of rivers or lakes of great significance to the claimant group – where it is also legally possible. Vests the riverbed or lakebed only, not water, and involves protection of existing property, use and access rights.
Statutory vesting as reserve.	Site is vested in the claimant group as a reserve under s26 of the as reserve Reserves Act 1977, and the claimant group holds and administers the site subject to the Reserves Act.
Overlay classifications Tōpuni, Taki Poipoia or Kirihipi)	Applies to highly significant sites on land administered by the Department of Conservation (DoC) recognises a statement of the claimant group’s associations, describes their values and principles, and identifies actions to avoid harm to these.
Statutory Acknowledgements	Applies to sites of significance (including rivers, lakes, mountains, wetlands and coastal areas) where land is owned by the Crown: acknowledges a statement of the claimant group’s associations, and enhances the claimant group’s ability to participate in specified Resource Management Act 1991 processes.
Advisory Committee appointments	Provides for the claimant group to advise a Minister directly on specified matters – for instance, advice to the Minister of Fisheries in relation to a taonga fish species.
Deeds of Recognition	May follow from Statutory Acknowledgement (SA). The Minister responsible for managing the land subject to SA acknowledges a statement of the claimant group’s associations, and agrees to consult and have regard to the claimant group’s views on specified matters.
Protocols	Issued by a Minister (e.g. Minister of Conservation). Sets out how the relevant department will exercise its functions, powers and duties in relation to specified matters in the claimant group’s area of interest, interact with the claimant group and provide for its input into decision-making.
Camping entitlements (Nohoanga or Ukaipo)	Entitlement to camp temporarily on specified Crown-owned land, for the purpose of lawful gathering of traditional foods and other natural resources.
Place-name changes	Usually to a dual Māori/English name. Provides visible recognition for the claimant group.
Joint Advisory or Management Committee	Can be established under s9 of the Reserves Act 1977 or s56 of the Conservation Act 1987 to advise on or manage a site or area of importance to both the claimant group and the Crown. Such committees will usually be made up of representatives of both a claimant group (or groups – if the site or area is important to more than one claimant group) and DOC.