

Trust Deed Review Report

November 2022



Dr Meri Haami

Senior Researcher

Te Atawhai o Te Ao



Image: The Whanganui River taken from Kauika Campsite, Rānana (Taken by Meri Haami, March, 2019).

Table of contents

Executive summary	3
1. Introduction	4
1.1 The independent review team	4
1.2 Structure of the Trust Deed Review hui	5
1.3 Table of Trust Deed Review hui series (Phase 2)	6
1.4 Submission forms	7
1.5 Hapū representation	7
1.6 Weighting of the report	8
1.7 Trust Deed Review hui engagement	9
1.7.1 Distanced uri	10
1.7.2 Ahi kā	11
1.7.3 Online hui	11
1.7.4 Intersections between distanced uri and ahi kā	12
1.8 Recommendations for the Trust Deed Review engagement	13
1.8.1 Education on NTT and its relationships	13
1.8.2 Support for distanced uri	14
1.8.3 Accessibility	14
2. Review of the Deed of Trust	14
2.1 Ngā Tāngata Tiaki o Whanganui Trustee composition and election process	15
2.1.1 Do you think the number of elected Trustees is suitable? (1.a)	15
2.1.2 Do you think the way in which the Trustees are elected works? (1.b)	15
2.1.3 Hui views on Trustee composition and election process	15
2.1.4 Ngā Tāngata Tiaki o Whanganui Trustee composition and election recommendations	17
2.2 Advisory Trustees composition and selection process	18
2.2.1 Do you think the two (2) Advisory Trustee roles should remain in the Trust Deed or be removed? (2.a)	18
2.2.2 Do you think the number of Advisory Trustees is currently suitable? (2.b)	18
2.2.3 Hui views on Advisory Trustee composition and selection process	18
2.2.4 Advisory Trustees composition and election recommendations	19
2.3 The structural inter-relationships between the Trust, Te Matua a Rohe, Te Rūnanga o Te Awa Tupua, and Te Pae Matua	19
2.3.1 Are you familiar with the role of Te Matua a Rohe? (3.a)	19
2.3.2 If you answer yes, in your opinion would you keep or remove the requirement for this relationship in the Trust Deed?	19
2.3.3 Are you familiar with the role of Te Rūnanga o Te Awa Tupua? (3.b)	20
2.3.4 If you answer yes, in your opinion would you keep or remove the requirement for this relationship in the Trust Deed?	20
2.3.5 Are you familiar with the role of Te Pae Matua? (3.c)	21
2.3.6 If you answer yes, in your opinion would you keep or remove the requirement for this relationship in the Trust Deed?	21
2.3.7 Hui views on structural inter-relationships between the Trust, Te Matua a Rohe, Te Rūnanga o Te Awa Tupua, and Te Pae Matua	21
2.3.8 The structural inter-relationships between the Trust, Te Matua a Rohe, Te Rūnanga o Te Awa Tupua, and Te Pae Matua recommendations	23
2.4 Rangatahi Representatives	24
2.4.1 Would you keep or remove the provision for Rangatahi Representatives?	24
2.4.2 Hui views on Rangatahi Representatives	24
2.4.3 Recommendations for Rangatahi Representatives	25
3. Conclusion	25
References	26

Executive summary

This report outlines the Trust Deed Review for Ngā Tāngata Tiaki o Whanganui (NTT). NTT was established by the Trust Deed of Settlement on the 5th of August 2014, which was signed in principle through two documents at Rānana Marae. These documents include; *Ruruku Whakatupua Te Mana o Te Awa Tupua*, and *Ruruku Whakatupua Te Mana o Te Iwi o Whanganui*, at Rānana Marae (Ngā Tāngata Tiaki o Whanganui, 2021). According to the *Tuia Te Taurahere: Trust Deed Review Information Booklet*, NTT was established as the new governance entity for Whanganui Iwi to be:

... the post-settlement governance entity for the purpose of the settlement of the historical Treaty of Waitangi claims of Whanganui Iwi relating to the Whanganui River (Ngā Tāngata Tiaki o Whanganui, 2022a, p. 2).

Further, the role of NTT includes being the mandated iwi organisation and iwi aqua culture organisation for Whanganui Iwi while holding and managing the lands as well as buildings associated with the Whanganui Courthouse at Pākaitore. The role of the mandated iwi organisation aims to:

... advance the cultural, social, environmental and economic aspirations of Whanganui Iwi; uphold and protect the mana of Te Awa Tupua; and empower the mana of Whanganui Iwi (Ngā Tāngata Tiaki o Whanganui, 2022a, p. 2).

In conjunction with the establishment of NTT, clause 33 of the *Deed of Trust* (Ngā Tāngata Tiaki o Whanganui, 2014) requires that the Deed of Trust be reviewed within five years of Te Awa Tupua (Whanganui River Claims Settlement) Act 2017. The review was integrated into the Deed of Trust due to the untested nature of the NTT arrangements, related trustee election processes, and the inter-relationships between NTT with the following groups:

- Te Matua a Rohe;
- Te Pae Matua; and
- Te Rūnanga o Te Awa Tupua.

The Trust Deed Review Report aims to provide the findings and recommendations from the series of hui that engaged and consulted with Whanganui Iwi across Aotearoa, New Zealand.

This report has three sections, which will include the following:

1. Introduction;
2. Review of the Deed of Trust; and
3. Conclusion.

The perspectives captured during the Trust Deed Review that are in this report reflect solely those who participated and engaged with the Trust Deed Review and does not reflect Whanganui Iwi as a whole. Throughout each section of the report, recommendations will be presented after its associated sections.

1. Introduction

This section of the report will introduce the Trust Deed Review process through its independent review team, the logistics surrounding the series of hui that took place between August to September 2022, discuss other matters that were raised through the review as well as recommendations for the next potential review cycle in the future to optimise Whanganui Iwi engagement more meaningfully.

1.1 The independent review team

The independent review team consisted of the following:

- Lead facilitator: Sam Bishara (Ngāti Tūwharetoa; Whanganui Iwi);
- Researcher: Dr Meri Haami (Te Āti Haunui-a-Pāpārangi; Ngāti Rangī; Ngā Rauru Kītahi; Ngāti Tūwharetoa; South East Asian); and
- Administrator: Piki-te-ora Manuel (Ngāti Whatua).

The Trust Deed Review took place all over Aotearoa, New Zealand and was a follow up to Phase 1, where the Trustees of NTT, along with Sam Bishara and Piki-te-ora Manuel attended to socialise and educate the governance structure of NTT, the election process, and the inter-relationships between the Trust, Te Matua a Rohe, Te Rūnanga o Te Awa Tupua, and Te Pae Matua. The purpose of Phase 1 was to prepare Whanganui Iwi for the eventual Trust Deed Review that would take place in Phase 2. Phase 1 occurred between June and July, 2022 and Phase 2 happened between August and September, 2022. All three members of the independent review attended a majority of the kanohi ki te kanohi hui but two online hui were cancelled due to tangihanga, sickness, and unexpected unavailability of

the review team. Sam Bishara stated prior that he would not be able to attend some hui or would be late to certain hui due to other work commitments. These included hui with Te Kaumātua Kaunihera o Whanganui, New Plymouth, and the final Whanganui hui.

1.2 Structure of the Trust Deed Review hui

The structure of the Trust Deed Review hui included: karakia; mihi mihi, whakawhanaungatanga; asking uri¹ to fill in an attendance register; discussing the questions set out by *Feedback/Submission Form* (Ngā Tāngata Tiaki o Whanganui, 2022b); summary of notes taken by the researcher and any amendments; and then a karakia to close.

Prior to every Trust Deed Review hui during the mihi mihi and whakawhanaungatanga process, the independent review team would discuss the following:

- The meaning of ‘independence’: For Sam and I, we explained that although we have whakapapa to Whanganui Iwi, that we have no structural influence, power, or hold no responsibilities within NTT or within Whanganui Iwi generally. Piki discussed that although she works as an operational staff member with NTT that she has whakapapa elsewhere that would make her impartial;
- The scope of the review: We would explain what was being reviewed according to the Trust Deed Review and what was not, which was supplied through *Te Taurahere: Trust Deed Review Information Booklet* (Ngā Tāngata Tiaki o Whanganui, 2022a, p. 9-10). However, we would state that we welcomed discussions on Whanganui Iwi due to it being difficult to delineate within hui as there was often overlapping issues or an iwi context needed to be added to form someone’s opinion on the Trust Deed Review;
- Informed consents: We did not have a consent form, but through the supplied *Te Taurahere: Trust Deed Review Information Booklet* (Ngā Tāngata Tiaki o Whanganui, 2022a) and the *Feedback/Submission Form* (Ngā Tāngata Tiaki o Whanganui, 2022b), information regarding the ethical structure of the review including, who would have access to their feedback, that their feedback either through the hui or through the

¹ The term ‘uri’ is used interchangeably with ‘Whanganui Iwi’ throughout this report and refers to descendants of Whanganui Iwi who participated either Trust Deed review through the submission forms or through the Trust Deed Review hui.

form would go towards the report, and that those submitting or giving feedback throughout the hui would be doing so in the strictest of confidence. As a further layer of protection for uri, I have chosen to supply the feedback either through the form or hui as anonymous. I discussed the anonymity for uri during the hui series; and,

- The report: We would explain the culmination of the report, where this would go, and what the report would discuss.

These prior discussions acted as our overall ethical process to protect uri, be transparent about our positionalities as the independent review team, and give uri an indication of what would happen to their feedback regarding the final report.

1.3 Table of Trust Deed Review hui series (Phase 2)

The table listed below shows the Trust Deed Review hui series for Phase 2 in chronological order, the regions they were held in, the cities or specific places, the dates, and lastly, the attendance numbers:

Number	Region	City or place	Date	Attendance numbers
1.	Online hui (1)	Zoom	17/08/22	3
2.	Auckland (1)	Auckland (Te Atatū Peninsula)	20/08/22	1
3.	Auckland (2)	Auckland (Ōtara)	20/08/22	2
4.	Wellington (1)	Wellington (Porirua)	21/08/22	3
5.	Wellington (2)	Wellington (Wellington Central)	21/08/22	2
6.	Whanganui (1)	Te Kaumātua Kaunihera o Whanganui	22/08/22	23
7.	Canterbury	Christchurch	27/08/22	6
8.	Southland	Invercargill	28/08/22	9
9.	Online (2)	Zoom	07/09/22	4
10.	Taranaki	New Plymouth	08/09/22	3
11.	Whanganui (2)	Taumarunui	09/09/22	6
12.	Online (3)	Zoom	14/09/22	4
13.	Whanganui (3)	Rānana	18/09/22	0
14.	Whanganui (4)	Raetihi	18/09/22	5
15.	Whanganui (5)	Ngā Tāngata Tiaki o Whanganui	19/09/22	15
Total:				86

A total of 15 hui were held for the Trust Deed Review, Phase 2 with approximately 86 participants. The table shows that attendance was generally low and that a few participants

did not feel comfortable to write their names on the attendance register, hence the approximation in the total number of attendees. Whanganui was the most concentrated region having 5 hui with each place targeting a specific tūpuna rohe comprising of Tamahaki, Uenuku, Hinengākau, Tamaupoko, and Tūpoho. The two hui held on the same dates within Auckland and Wellington may be due to its high population generally, but also a high population of those registered with NTT. However, this is a presumption as this hui structure was chosen prior to my commencement on the independent review team (Stats NZ, 2020; EHINZ, n.d.).

1.4 Submission forms

Coinciding with the Trust Deed Review hui series Phase 2, the *Feedback/Submission Form* (Ngā Tāngata Tiaki o Whanganui, 2022b) was distributed to uri both in paper and digital form. The following table shows how many submission forms were received:

Paper submission forms	Online submission forms	Total
11	14	25

There was one online submission form used to test the website being used and one paper submission form received from a person who does not whakapapa to Whanganui Iwi. These two forms were excluded from this report and from the total number of submission forms received.

1.5 Hapū representation

The following word cloud shows the hapū that were written in the attendance registers. There were two hapū that were illegible and another three hapū or iwi that were written from those in attendance who only have whakapapa elsewhere and beyond Whanganui but are connected amongst Whanganui Iwi socially. Further, there were hapū written that were not associated with Whanganui Iwi. Since self-identification was used when participating with the Trust Deed Review hui, delineating who was or wasn't a part of Whanganui Iwi was beyond the control of the independent review team. This consideration should be factored into the attendance numbers previously discussed, in that some who participated may not have been Whanganui Iwi, but since self-identification was used, it became difficult to control this during the hui. The bigger the word, the higher the frequency in attendance from that particular hapū:

registered members. Due to the small sample size, I would suggest that all of the recommendations be taken lightly within this report. However, some uri who attended the hui did express their views passionately, particularly those who knew the intricacies of the Deed of Trust and who cared deeply for the betterment of iwi. Therefore, I do not want to diminish the concise and valid recommendations of uri that are contained within the latter parts of this report. While the data surrounding the attendance, submission forms, and hapū representation would undermine the weighting, legitimacy, and robustness of this report, there were uri views captured that are significant for the Deed of Trust. Further, I will leave this decision involving the balance and weighting of this report to the Trustees to discuss but I will do my best to illustrate all parts of the Trust Deed Review honestly. This report could perhaps represent the preliminary stages for the Trust Deed Review.

1.7 Trust Deed Review hui engagement

During engagement with uri, new terms were derived and are important contextually for understanding the many perspectives that were shared. There are two terms that were used by uri to self-identify or by other uri participating during the hui series and these included “distanced uri”, which denotes to those living away or outside of the Whanganui region and “ahi kā” used to refer to those living at home who are aware of the ‘on the ground’ intricacies regarding their respective marae and hapū. This definition of ahi kā also included those who regularly participated or engaged with their marae and hapū, often used interchangeably with ‘kanohi kitea’ or ‘kanohi ki te kanohi’. While ahi kā has other definitions that may not be suitable (Tinirau & Gillies, 2009), this term was given by distanced uri and also by those living within the Whanganui region and are only applicable to the confines of this report. These two differentiations of Whanganui Iwi identifiers became particularly important for how uri engaged with the Trust Deed Review or understood the inter-relationships between the Trust, the groups being reviewed, iwi more generally, hapū, and marae. These two identifiers also became a metric for measuring connection and disconnection for uri living within Whanganui and beyond. Overall, these self-identifiers created themes for the Trust Deed Review, how uri engaged with the process, and emerged recommendations for future review cycles of the review.

1.7.1 Distanced uri

In regions outside of Whanganui but in the North Island, particularly Auckland and Wellington, showed that distanced uri were struggling with reconnecting. Despite having done so in the past, uri remained eager to contribute back more regularly to Whanganui Iwi. However, they felt unequipped in their knowledge base or their pathway in reconnection has been fraught with life disruptions, causing distanced uri not being able to understand the Trust Deed Review. Often, distanced uri that attended in Auckland and Wellington would discuss their struggles and would at times, place the onus on Whanganui Iwi to provide pathways of reconnection. The facilitator would point out in these discussions that there is still relevance and significance in returning to their respective marae and hapū for knowledge. These discussions highlighted that distanced uri are turning to digital forums for knowledge of their iwi, hapū, marae, and more generally, their whakapapa. However, this conflicts with notions of Whanganui kaiponu and has been recognised within previous reports for NTT (Haami, 2017; Tinirau et al., 2020). These factors made it hard for distanced uri in Auckland and Wellington to engage with the intricacies of the Trust Deed Review, as they were looking at these series of hui as a way to reconnect and participate with Whanganui Iwi. These struggles facing distanced uri overshadowed the Trust Deed Review itself and did not enable meaningful engagement. However, these clusters of distanced uri wanted to reciprocate through offering their skills and expertise in a range of sectors, which included business and governance.

In places such as Christchurch, Invercargill, and New Plymouth, there were instances of distanced uri feeling disconnected. However, these clusters of distanced uri had a love, respect, and appreciation for those at 'home' on the marae and for their respective hapū who are actively engaged. These uri felt that their distance meant that they must have faith in ahi kā to act in accordance with tikanga with regards to their marae or hapū since they were physically located 'on the ground'. For New Plymouth, these distanced uri were more aware of the intricacies of the Trust Deed Review and could engage meaningfully, although there were gaps in understanding the purposes of some groups being reviewed. For distanced uri living in Invercargill, rangatahi and their mātua were creating their own initiatives around wānanga on their hapū, marae, and whakapapa. Distanced uri explained

that in order for them to return 'home' to the marae, that they needed to be ready themselves and decided to start creating wānanga hubs within Te Wai Pounamu for Whanganui Iwi. This contrasted to distanced uri located in Auckland and Wellington, illustrating that the further away from the Whanganui region that we travelled, the faith, respect, and love from distanced uri for ahi kā grew. Further, they have tried to problem solve in elevating their learnings of iwi, hapū, and marae knowledge without burdening ahi kā. Initiatives that are adjacent to this could include revitalising Taura Here and a way of re-capturing distanced uri and this was suggested by distanced uri (Haami, 2017).

1.7.2 Ahi kā

For those living at home, and despite living within the Whanganui region as well as being relatively engaged at a hapū and marae level, there were issues with understanding the Trust Deed Review. Overall, those living within the Whanganui region were more critical about the Trust Deed Review and did engage as meaningfully as possible but recognised the gaps in their understandings as they spoke. These gaps included the inter-relationships, and the purposes of the groups being reviewed, which became their overall critiques. However, those considered ahi kā engaged more meaningfully with the election process as a majority of uri have voted through both the hapū and general election forum. Despite the review team discussing Phase 1 in our introductions, and even though most of the uri stated that they attended those series of hui, the general consensus was that these were not sufficient and that further long-form education or wānanga was needed to continually educate and re-educate Whanganui Iwi on all facets of NTT, to enable them to be well prepared for the Trust Deed Review. Based on hui within the Whanganui region and beyond, all uri were unsure of NTT, its various arms, funding streams, but also the groups being circulated for review. These issues caused a barrier for not just the independent review team in taking up the timeframe to explain some mechanisms when asked but also for uri, as they felt unsure of how to provide critique.

1.7.3 Online hui

These consisted of both distanced uri and those considered ahi kā, who lived in the Whanganui region. Throughout the online hui, there were similar discourses echoed, that distanced uri were looking to reconnect and that those living in the Whanganui region felt

as though they did not understand the Trust Deed Review, NTT, and the inter-relationships of the groups being reviewed enough to give a proper critique.

1.7.4 Intersections between distanced uri and ahi kā

Throughout all of the hui across different regions, there were issues around accessibility. Accessibility included the language and terminology used within *Te Taurahere: Trust Deed Review Information Booklet* (Ngā Tāngata Tiaki o Whanganui, 2022a) and the *Feedback/Submission Form* (Ngā Tāngata Tiaki o Whanganui, 2022b). Further issues around accessibility surrounded communications through pānui in both digital and paper forms.

The language for both of the documents used terms that were not understandable for some uri. One uri in the Whanganui² hui said that the term ‘inter-relationships’, was an example of the terminology being difficult and inaccessible. This view was also shared by a distanced uri from Invercargill, citing that many uri do not want to participate out of being whakamā, afraid of not understanding everything, or being perceived as unintelligent but that they still wanted to engage. They discussed their anxiety in attending the hui and even speaking up during the hui due to these feelings. These were reinforced when reading the documents that they were given. Another uri in Taumarunui also reiterated this sentiment, but felt as though their education level may be the issue and that younger uri had the opportunity to be educated that their generation otherwise didn’t receive. In terms of communications through pānui in both digital and paper forms, uri from the Whanganui region felt that pānui that was solely digital alienated koroheke, kuia, and pāhake who traditionally used paper documents. NTT changing their pānui to being digital was discussed during the Whanganui hui, however the suggestion was made that paper documents be continued but that these be sent to marae for hapū to then distribute to koroheke, kuia, and pāhake. These sentiments were also discussed and supported during the hui with Te Kaumātua Kaunihera o Whanganui. The Whanganui hui also recommended that all documents relating to the Trust Deed or NTT more widely be able available in te reo Māori as well as having te

² This hui refers to the Whanganui (5) hui that was located at NTT and unless stated, the ‘Whanganui hui’ means this particular one. Another hui was held in Whanganui town, but this will be referred to with their other names, such as Te Kaumātua Kaunihera o Whanganui. The other hui that were held in the Whanganui region, will be referred to in terms of their town rather than region. Please refer to the Table of Trust Deed Review hui series (Phase 2).

mita o Whanganui. This would increase accessibility for Whanganui Iwi to engage more meaningfully and showcase the dialect of Whanganui.

These discussions surrounding literacy levels under the umbrella of accessibility from uri are supported through Kaupapa Māori research. Colonisation has had an intergenerational and disruptive effect on the socio-economic mobility of Māori and has therefore shaped accessibility to education and the skills required to read, write, and analyse information, particularly in English (Smith, 1990; Walker, 2004; Smith, 2021). Smith (1990) advocates for socio-economic mediation called 'kia piki ake i ngā raruraru o te kāinga' as a principle to be aware of when conducting research alongside Māori communities and in turn, making the process and output beneficial as well as accessible to their needs. This principle from Kaupapa Māori research could be beneficial for approaching Whanganui Iwi in the future through documentation in that they need access to key information using plain language that is understandable in order for uri to make meaningful decisions.

1.8 Recommendations for the Trust Deed Review engagement

The following recommendations are for the possibility of a future Trust Deed Review cycle based on the series of hui discussed above. These include the following:

1.8.1 Education on NTT and its relationships

That there be long form content regarding NTT and its relationships to educate Whanganui Iwi. This would be in essence, akin to Phase 1 of the Trust Deed Review, but accessible as permanent content for Whanganui Iwi. This could include one or more of the following:

- Video content made available online;
- Having a series of wānanga on this topic located within Whanganui marae and at NTT; and
- Speaking regularly at Te Kaumātua Kaunihera o Whanganui regarding NTT, and its relationships.

Having these options available could enable Whanganui Iwi to engage more meaningfully with the Trust Deed Review.

1.8.2 Support for distanced uri

That there are possible supports for distanced uri who are wanting to reconnect. This could include:

- Funding opportunities for wānanga costs that support Whanganui Iwi knowledge transmission for distanced uri;
- Support through intertwining wānanga both local to Whanganui and distanced that are organised or funded through NTT for the purposes of Whanganui Iwi knowledge transmission through exchanges; and
- Beginning discussions around the efficacy of revitalising Taura Here for Whanganui Iwi.

These considerations are made with Whanganui kaiponu in mind while being aware that these initiatives may already exist and that I'm not fully aware of.

1.8.3 Accessibility

That documents pertaining to the Trust Deed Review be readable to a wide spectrum of Whanganui Iwi that considers varying education and literacy levels. I would also recommend that this be considered for documents in both te reo Māori and English. These accessibility recommendations could include the following:

- Ensuring that plain language is used for documents pertaining to the Trust Deed Review that considers the varying literacy levels within Whanganui Iwi;
- That paper or physical forms of the Trust Deed Review documents be sent to hapū and marae for distribution as well as Te Kaumātua Kaunihera o Whanganui; and
- That all documents be available in te reo Māori, te mita o Whanganui, and te reo o Whanganui.

2. Review of the Deed of Trust

Despite issues surrounding low attendance and meaningful engagement during Phase 2 of the Trust Deed Review hui, there were uri who made recommendations to the Deed of Trust. This section of the report will go through each of the questions outlined in the *Feedback/Submission Form* (Ngā Tāngata Tiaki o Whanganui, 2022b) and state the

recommendations that were made during the Trust Deed Review through both the submission forms and through the Phase 2 hui series. The paper and online submission form total will be combined in the following sections. The following sections do not reflect the views of the independent review team and solely represent the uri who attended the Trust Deed Review hui or who submitted a form. However, there are recommendations that I believe could be potentially harmful to future election cycles for Whanganui Iwi, as this could cause discord between distanced uri and ahi kā, or could potentially impact on the health and well-being of Whanganui Iwi. Therefore, all of the recommendations that were submitted will be listed but those that may need more considerations around its impacts will be noted in the following sections.

2.1 Ngā Tāngata Tiaki o Whanganui Trustee composition and election process

2.1.1 Do you think the number of elected Trustees is suitable? (1.a)

The submission forms indicate:

Answer	Total
Yes	17
No	6
Don't know	1
Not answered	1

2.1.2 Do you think the way in which the Trustees are elected works? (1.b)

The submission forms show:

Answer	Total
Yes	18
No	4
Don't know	1
Not answered	2

2.1.3 Hui views on Trustee composition and election process

During the hui, a number of recommendations were made to the elected Trustee composition and quantity, expressing an overall change to these. However, there were no exact commonalities regarding the composition and quantity. This was reflected within the submission forms as well. While a specific number of elected Trustees and composition

elements could not be agreed upon, there were three different options that were most common. These three options included:

1. Uri wanted the elected trustee composition to be more weighted towards hapū elected Trustees and wanted to increase this number;
2. Uri wanted to balance between hapū elected trustees and general election Trustees by making these the same quantity and composition; or
3. Uri wanted the elected Trustee composition to be more weighted towards the general elected Trustees and wanted to increase this number.

The most popular option was the first, meaning that uri wanted an increase in hapū elected Trustees and a decrease in number of general elected Trustees and this was predominantly supported during the Whanganui hui and through the submission forms.

The general opinions outside of Whanganui was that they did not feel that the quantity or composition were issues. However, there was a general consensus that the number of elected Trustees were suitable but that it was not about quantity, but rather revolved around the Trustee skill base that was potentially lacking and could be fulfilled through the election. During the Whanganui hui, this was also discussed and expanded upon with recommendations to increase the hapū elected Trustees to the current size of the general election quantity, meaning that four (4) are voted through Te Rūnanga o Te Awa Tupua and three (3) are elected through the general election. Further, they recommended that the general election is held a year before the hapū election with Te Rūnanga o Te Awa Tupua. This staggered process would allow hapū to make decisions based on the skills or expertise that needed fulfilling within the Trustee composition and ensured that new Trustees were being elected alongside older Trustees, creating a potential line of succession.

Some uri during the Whanganui hui wanted to completely remove the general election voting system, citing that distanced uri needed to engage as well as participate with their hapū and marae and that having the vote rest solely with hapū, meant that distanced uri would be incentivised to return. The facilitator reminded uri that this could potentially alienate distanced uri, who although may create difficulties for those who are active within their hapū and marae, are already facing disconnection issues. This may cause further discord between distanced uri and those who are considered ahi kā. Further

recommendations from the Taumarunui hui queried the relevancy of clause *4.3 Functions of the Initial Trustees* on page 16 since this has been completed.

2.1.4 Ngā Tāngata Tiaki o Whanganui Trustee composition and election recommendations

The following recommendations emerging from the submission forms and hui include:

- i. Increasing the number of Trustees elected through Te Rūnanga o Te Awa Tupua and decreasing the number of Trustees elected by those people over the age of 18 years on the Whanganui Iwi Register.
- ii. Balancing the number of Trustees elected through Te Rūnanga o Te Awa Tupua and the number of Trustees elected by those people over the age of 18 years on the Whanganui Iwi Register.
- iii. That the election process of the Trustees to Ngā Tāngata Tiaki o Whanganui have people over the age of 18 years on the Whanganui Iwi Register vote first and then a year or some time later, have the elections through Te Rūnanga o Te Awa Tupua to see what skill base is required for the Trustee composition.
- iv. Remove clause *4.3 Functions of the Initial Trustees* from the Deed of Trust as it is no longer relevant.

The following recommendations are from the submission forms and hui but may need further considerations surrounding its potential impact since the hui noted that there was discord between those who are distanced uri and those who are considered ahi kā:

- v. Decreasing the number of Trustees elected through Te Rūnanga o Te Awa Tupua and increasing the number of Trustees elected by those people over the age of 18 years on the Whanganui Iwi Register.
- vi. Removing the number of Trustees elected by those people over the age of 18 years on the Whanganui Iwi Register.

2.2 Advisory Trustees composition and selection process

2.2.1 Do you think the two (2) Advisory Trustee roles should remain in the Trust Deed or be removed? (2.a)

The submission forms indicate:

Answer	Total
Keep	18
Remove	3
Don't know	3
Not answered	1

2.2.2 Do you think the number of Advisory Trustees is currently suitable? (2.b)

The submission forms show:

Answer	Total
Yes	16
No	6
Don't know	1
Not answered	2

2.2.3 Hui views on Advisory Trustee composition and selection process

These questions followed a similar discussion from the previous section, where skill base of the Trustees was of more importance rather than composition or quantity. Therefore, uri prioritised Advisory Trustees that fulfilled a particular skill base that was lacking on the current Trustees. There was a general concern surrounding the selection process of the Advisory Trustees in that it needs to be transparent and ethical, which was discussed during the New Plymouth, Raetihi, and Wellington³ hui. This hui in Wellington put forward recommendations looking to ensure a transparent process while creating accountabilities to the wider iwi regarding those selected as Advisory Trustees and that there should be an 18-month period of where the Advisory Trustees are reviewed by the other Trustees and the wider iwi through forums such as, the Annual General Meeting.

A majority of uri throughout the hui felt that two Advisory Trustees were sufficient. A minority of uri wanted a few more Advisory Trustees. Throughout the hui, uri did not connect the Advisory Trustees as being a part of Te Matua a Rohe and who are the group

³ This hui refers to Wellington (1) located in Porirua. Please refer to the Table of Trust Deed Review hui series (Phase 2).

that selects the two Advisory Trustees. While this is stated on the *Feedback/Submission Form* (Ngā Tāngata Tiaki o Whanganui, 2022b) and was discussed as being a part of Te Matua a Rohe by the facilitator, I think the way in which the submission form was structured regarding the Advisory Trustee composition and selection process, followed by the structural inter-relationships in the next section, created some confusion and disconnect. Therefore, while a majority of uri stated that they wanted the two Advisory Trustees to remain, this will directly contrast with the recommendations in the next section regarding the structural inter-relationships and specifically with Te Matua a Rohe.

2.2.4 Advisory Trustees composition and election recommendations

The following recommendations emerging from the submission forms and hui include:

- i. That a review system be established for the Advisory Trustees by the other Trustees elected through Te Rūnanga o Te Awa Tupua and those elected by those people over the age of 18 years on the Whanganui Iwi Register.
 - a. That this review system is also a part of the Annual General Meeting or included within a Te Rūnanga o Te Awa Tupua meeting.

2.3 The structural inter-relationships between the Trust, Te Matua a Rohe, Te Rūnanga o Te Awa Tupua, and Te Pae Matua

2.3.1 Are you familiar with the role of Te Matua a Rohe? (3.a)

The submission forms indicate:

Answer	Total
Yes	17
No	3
Don't know	1
Not answered	4

2.3.2 If you answer yes, in your opinion would you keep or remove the requirement for this relationship in the Trust Deed?

Answer	Total
Yes	10
No	7
Don't know	3
Not answered	5

2.3.3 Are you familiar with the role of Te Rūnanga o Te Awa Tupua? (3.b)

The submission forms illustrate:

Answer	Total
Yes	20
No	4
Don't know	0
Not answered	1

2.3.4 If you answer yes, in your opinion would you keep or remove the requirement for this relationship in the Trust Deed?

Answer	Total
Keep/Yes	11
Remove/No	1
Don't know	3
Not answered	2

At this point, the survey started using a different question formula despite the survey asking essentially the same questions for the inter-relationships of three separate groups. For example, the previous question around Te Matua a Rohe being kept, removed or unanswered by participants was asked as a 'yes', 'no' or 'don't know' question formula, but from Te Rūnanga o Te Awa Tupua and Te Pae Matua onwards, these questions are posed using 'keep', 'remove' or 'don't know'. Possibly due to this inconsistency, when the online submission form answers were placed on an Excel spreadsheet for the purposes of this report, the answers regarding Te Rūnanga o Te Awa Tupua and Te Pae Matua being kept or removed were transferred as a 'yes', 'no' or 'don't know' question formula. This has been difficult to decipher and does not match the paper submission form that was also disseminated to uri. In keeping with the structure of the paper submission forms and their question formula that was disseminated, I have changed the question formula for Te Rūnanga o Te Awa Tupua and Te Pae Matua as 'keep', 'remove' or 'don't know' and assumed that the 'yes' means 'keep' and 'no' means 'remove'. If this is not how it was disseminated online, then these numbers from the submission forms can be taken lightly for these two groups. From a research perspective, it is important to design a survey that is in plain language but also has consistency in question formula.

2.3.5 Are you familiar with the role of Te Pae Matua? (3.c)

The submission forms state:

Answer	Total
Yes	17
No	3
Don't know	2
Not answered	3

2.3.6 If you answer yes, in your opinion would you keep or remove the requirement for this relationship in the Trust Deed?

Answer	Total
Keep/Yes	17
Remove/No	1
Don't know	5
Not answered	2

2.3.7 Hui views on structural inter-relationships between the Trust, Te Matua a Rohe, Te Rūnanga o Te Awa Tupua, and Te Pae Matua

Throughout the hui, distanced uri were mostly unsure of the structural inter-relationships of the Trust, Te Matua a Rohe, Te Rūnanga o Te Awa Tupua and Te Pae Matua. Closer to the Whanganui region, uri considered ahi kā were unsure around the purpose and functionalities of Te Matua a Rohe as well as Te Pae Matua. However, uri considered ahi kā living within the Whanganui region and who were active within their marae and hapū, were very familiar with Te Rūnanga o Te Awa Tupua. Therefore, distanced uri left those considered ahi kā and living within the Whanganui region to make decisions, having a lot of faith, with regards to Te Rūnanga o Te Awa Tupua.

There were recommendations made from the Taumarunui hui surrounding Te Matua a Rohe in that this group should be removed or changed to an advisory capacity and be in a similar position as Te Rūnanga o Te Awa Tupua or Te Pae Matua that do not produce or elect two Advisory Trustees. Uri from Taumarunui raised several concerns regarding Te Matua a Rohe while stating that the importance of this group is relevant for Hinengākau. Their concerns revolved around their hui being infrequent, that Hinengākau may be excluded due to inter-personal issues of those within the group, and that it was an avenue to avoid critique from

Whanganui Iwi while enabling a way to circumnavigate onto the Trustees without the ethical processes and accountabilities found within the hapū election or the general election. Uri from Taumarunui described Te Matua a Rohe and its process of electing Advisory Trustees as a “shortcut”.

During an online hui, a previous member of Te Matua a Rohe discussed their experiences of being a part of this group, stating that there was a rotation mechanic used for the Advisory Trustees, which was unknown to a lot of uri who were there participating and even to the independent review team. While this uri may have posed a conflict of interest for other uri participating, it highlighted a general consensus that resonated throughout all of the hui: that uri had no familiarity with Te Matua a Rohe, its purpose or functionalities. While this was explained by the facilitator and the submission form, uri throughout all of the hui were generally not familiar with Te Matua a Rohe but felt that it held an important status in signifying the importance of tūpuna rohe; Tamahaki, Uenuku, Hinengākau, Tamaupoko, and Tupoho. However, what emerged from the hui is that the current mechanisms of Te Matua a Rohe that allow for Advisory Trustees is not transparent or consistent with the election process for the other Trustees.

Throughout the hui, most uri were very familiar with Te Rūnanga o Te Awa Tupua, its purpose, its function and also, they praised that it was a collective hapū forum. There were many questions and concerns from distanced uri who wanted more insight and who wanted to contribute to Te Rūnanga o Te Awa Tupua, but who had issues with their hapū not communicating or that their hapū representatives were not giving reports to their respective hapū for it to be distributed out to each whānau. These issues were discussed in Christchurch and Invercargill, but they took responsibility for living far away, which would contribute to potential miscommunications with hapū representatives and their respective hapū. A prominent feature for distanced uri in Christchurch, Invercargill, and New Plymouth was that there was a particular whānau member who stayed closely in touch with their respective hapū, and then they would be the person to pānui to not just their whānau, but also other whānau who lived in their city. While this is a self-nominated role, it has been effective but when the hapū representatives do not give regular reports, this can create potential miscommunications. Further queries were raised from both distanced uri and

those considered ahi kā about the number of hapū that can vote and participate within Te Rūnanga o Te Awa Tupua. The independent review team relayed that the terms of reference for Te Rūnanga o Te Awa Tupua would undergo change to distinguish hapū definitions and that a working party will re-examine this. Overall, uri considered Te Rūnanga o Te Awa Tupua to be an important component to the Deed of Trust and for it not to be removed.

Te Pae Matua was considered a very significant component within the Deed of Trust in that it helped create a line of succession while integrating koroheke, kuia, and pāhake oversight with regards to tikanga involving Te Awa Tupua. Most consistently, all uri felt that Te Pae Matua was important and should not be removed. However, during the Te Kaumātua Kaunihera o Whanganui hui, which comprises of koroheke, kuia, and pāhake, they were not sure of their purpose, functionality, and sometimes mixed up Te Rūnanga o Te Awa Tupua hui with Te Pae Matua hui. During this hui, they expressed that Te Pae Matua needed more structure, direction, and purpose.

2.3.8 The structural inter-relationships between the Trust, Te Matua a Rohe, Te Rūnanga o Te Awa Tupua, and Te Pae Matua recommendations

The following recommendations emerging from the submission forms and hui and include:

- i. Te Matua a Rohe be removed from the Deed of Trust.
- ii. Te Matua a Rohe remain on the Deed of Trust but not have the ability to nominate and elect Advisory Trustees alongside the other Trustees.
- iii. Te Matua a Rohe remain on the Deed of Trust but their Advisory Trustee nominations must be endorsed by Te Rūnanga o Te Awa Tupua and by those on the Whanganui Iwi Register.
- iv. Te Rūnanga o Te Awa Tupua remain on the Deed of Trust.
- v. Te Pae Matua remain on the Deed of Trust.
 - a. Te Pae Matua have guidance or education from the other Trustees around its purpose, structure, and functionality.

2.4 Rangatahi Representatives

2.4.1 *Would you keep or remove the provision for Rangatahi Representatives?*

The submission forms show:

Answer	Total
Keep	21
Remove	1
Don't know	0
Not answered	3

2.4.2 Hui views on Rangatahi Representatives

Consistently throughout every hui and in tandem with Te Pae Matua, Rangatahi Representatives were important and overwhelmingly, uri did not want this component removed from the Deed of Trust. Te Pae Matua and Rangatahi Representatives were discussed within the context of succession, which was a highly significant area for uri throughout all of the hui and that both of these groups represented a clear intergenerational succession line. One online submission form wanted this provision removed from the Deed of Trust and instead wanted rangatahi to fulfil roles within their hapū committee first before serving on NTT.

Recommendations were made for improvement for the Rangatahi Representatives from the Whanganui hui and from the hui with Te Kaumātua Kaunihera o Whanganui. Some of the uri attending the Whanganui hui were previous Rangatahi Representatives and stated that they felt unsupported by both the Trustees and operations. They discussed how they sometimes would not know of the Trustee hui until the day, and due to this inconvenience, would not be able to attend and fulfil their role as a Rangatahi Representative due to other commitments, such as school or extra curriculums. Further, the previous Rangatahi Representatives felt as though their voices were not heard when they served. There was a discussion that perhaps, the provision of Rangatahi Representatives was merely a criterion, but was not meaningfully honoured previously. Te Kaumātua Kaunihera o Whanganui stated that they are concerned that the Rangatahi Representatives are not being well supported and felt that they were very important for succession, stating that Te Pae Matua could be the supporting bridge for rangatahi in providing supervision and guidance.

The Whanganui hui suggested re-examining the national age bracket or using Whanganui concepts of succession with regards to achievement, rather than this being centered on age. Uri discussed that with regards to succession that rangatākapu and even mātua felt as though they were excluded from valuable governance training, opportunities, or ways to elevate their knowledge base in order to contribute meaningfully to Whanganui Iwi more broadly. This can show that the young and older generations feel as though they have opportunities within the Deed of Trust for representation and recognition, but that generations within this middle ground, are not sure of how they fit. This gap could be mitigated through long form content regarding NTT and its relationships to educate Whanganui Iwi, which was suggested earlier within this report. Having this content available could enable uri to discover where they could contribute but they must first understand current systems to then take initiative in creating solutions for the betterment of Whanganui Iwi.

2.4.3 Recommendations for Rangatahi Representatives

The following recommendations emerging from the submission forms and hui and include:

- i. Rangatahi Representatives are not removed from the Deed of Trust.
- ii. Rangatahi Representatives are supported and honoured as a part of the Deed of Trust.
- iii. That opportunities and relationships for succession planning between Te Pae Matua and Rangatahi Representatives be considered for the future.

3. Conclusion

This report has three sections that capture the series of hui for Phase 2 regarding the Trust Deed Review undertaken by the independent review team. This series of hui had limitations and challenges, which included a low turnout generally, a lack of education surrounding the wider mechanisms within the Deed of Trust, and accessibility issues to the supporting documents. However, uri that attended the hui gave insight into their concerns with each component of the review and did so as meaningfully as possible. This report shows a number of recommendations for each component being reviewed as well as raise significant suggestions discussed by uri that are outside of the review but that are important for future considerations.

References

- EHINZ. (n.d.). *Population size and change*. Environmental Health and Intelligence New Zealand Rapu Mātauranga Hauora mō te Taiao. Massey University.
<https://www.ehinz.ac.nz/indicators/population-vulnerability/population-size-and-change/>
- Haami, M. (2017). *Whanganui Kaiponu: Ngāti Ruakā Methodologies for the preservation of Hapū waiata and oral taonga*. Te Herenga Waka—Victoria University of Wellington.
- H T Whatahoro Jury. (1897). *Notebook about land tenure and ownership in Wanganui district*. [Manuscript]. The National Library of New Zealand.
https://natlib.govt.nz/records/23083709?search%5Bi%5D%5Biwihapu_authority_id%5D=-336153&search%5Bpath%5D=items
- Māori Maps. (n.d.). *Te Poti Kāinga*. <https://maorimaps.com/marae/te-poti-kāinga>
- Ngā Tāngata Tiaki o Whanganui. (2014). *Deed of Trust*.
<https://www.ngatangatatiaki.co.nz/assets/6.-Nga-Tangata-Tiaki-o-Whanganui-Trust-Deed.pdf>
- Ngā Tāngata Tiaki o Whanganui. (2021). *Ruruku Whakatupua*.
<https://www.ngatangatatiaki.co.nz/our-story/ruruku-whakatupua/>
- Ngā Tāngata Tiaki o Whanganui. (2022a). *Tuia Te Taurahere: Trust Deed Review Information Booklet*. <https://www.ngatangatatiaki.co.nz/assets/Information-Booklet-Phase-2-Engagement.pdf>
- Ngā Tāngata Tiaki o Whanganui. (2022b). *Feedback/Submission Form*. [Unpublished document]. Ngā Tāngata Tiaki o Whanganui: Trust Deed Review.
- Smith, G. H. (1990) *Research Issues Related to Maori Education*, paper presented to NZARE Special Interest Conference, Massey University, reprinted in 1992. *The Issue of Research and Maori*. Research Unit for Maori Education: The University of Auckland.
- Smith, T. (2021). *Decolonising Methodologies: Research and Indigenous Peoples*. Third Edition. Zed Books.
- Stats NZ. (2020). *National population estimates: At 31 March 2020 - Infoshare tables*.
<https://www.stats.govt.nz/information-releases/national-population-estimates-at-31-march-2020-infoshare-tables>
- Tinirau, R., & Gillies, A. (2009). 'Ahikā: An Ancient Custom Re-ignited to Guide Decision-making in Māori Research'. *He Pukenga Kōrero*. 9(1).

Tinirau, R., Smith, C., Haami, M. A., & Rattray-Te Mana, H. (2020). *Te Oranga o Te Awa Tupua: A report prepared for Ngā Tāngata Tiaki o Whanganui Trust*. Te Atawhai o Te Ao Charitable Trust.

Walker, R. (2004). *Ka Whawhai Tonu Matou: Struggle without end*. Second Edition. Penguin Books.