

Looking back...thinking forward: Dialogic space, indigenous leadership, and integrated catchment management in New Zealand.

Dr. Giles Dodson

Department of Communication Studies

Unitec Institute of Technology

gdodson@unitec.ac.nz

Abstract

This paper analyses the processes community engagement and dialogue which are part of an ongoing collaborative stakeholder partnership in Northland, New Zealand.

This project - the Integrated Kaipara Harbour Management Group – is a multi-stakeholder partnership, led by indigenous (Māori) groups. The project seeks to bridge several divides; adopting a large-scale ‘whole of ecosystem’ conceptual approach to understanding; addressing the environmental pressures on the Kaipara Harbour catchment; and integrating indigenous and western environmental management practices.

As a partnership, the IKHMG is centrally concerned with the creation of deliberative and dialogic spaces through which community partnership and collaboration is formed. Primary among these dialogic spaces has been the IKHMG’s ‘flagship farm’ initiative and the community symposium, *Kaipara Moana: Looking back...thinking forward*, held in 2014.

The central research questions that this paper addresses is:

How can community dialogue support the development of community driven integrated environmental management and bridge divides between community members, landowners, indigenous groups and environmental managers? What processes of dialogue are effective in achieving these aims and how can community-based dialogue contribute to catchment management frameworks?

The research paper is based on ethnographic engagement with the IKHMG over a six month period in 2014, including during the Community Symposium and on in-depth interviews conducted with key members of the IKHMG, including project coordinators, indigenous leaders, farmer, and environmental managers.

The project critically examines this project using concepts of participatory dialogue and community participation in environmental initiatives, including the use of mātauranga Māori within environmental

management and environmental policy development. The paper argues that initiatives such as community symposia are effective dialogic tools in engaging community in integrated management approaches. However, translating support into integrated environmental management practices continues to pose a serious challenge, exposing the limits to community participatory communication.

Introduction

This paper analyses the processes community engagement and dialogue which are part of an ongoing collaborative stakeholder partnership project to ‘restore the health and productivity of the Kaipara Harbour’ in Northland, New Zealand.

This project - the Integrated Kaipara Harbour Management Group – is a multi-stakeholder partnership, led by indigenous (Māori) groups. The project seeks to bridge several divides; adopting a large-scale ‘whole of ecosystem’ conceptual approach to understanding and addressing the environmental pressures on the Kaipara Harbour and catchment; pursuing the integration of Western science and mātauranga Māori (traditional indigenous knowledge) into their environmental and social analysis; and between community, indigenous, landowners and environmental managers through participatory community engagement concerning the environmental pressures on the Kaipara Harbour; lastly, the project seeks to draw attention to gaps existing in management framework, limiting the potential for integrated management.

As a partnership, the IKHMG is centrally concerned with the creation of deliberative and dialogic spaces through which community partnership and collaboration is formed, cultivated and expanded, and through which integrated management is instituted. Primary among these dialogic spaces has been the IKHMG’s ‘flagship farm’ initiative and the community symposium, *Kaipara Moana: Looking back...thinking forward*, held in 2014.

The central research questions that this paper addresses is:

How can community dialogue support the development of community driven integrated environmental management and bridge divides between community members, landowners, indigenous groups and environmental managers? What processes of dialogue are effective in achieving these aims and how can community-based dialogue contribute to catchment management frameworks?

The research paper is based on substantial ethnographic engagement with the Integrated Kaipara Harbour Management Group over a six month period in 2014, including during the Community Symposium and on in-depth interviews conducted with key members of the IKHMG, including project coordinators, indigenous leaders, farmer and landowners, and environmental managers and policy makers.

The project critically examines this project using concepts of participatory dialogue and community participation in environmental initiatives, including the use of mātauranga Māori within environmental management and environmental policy development. The paper argues that initiatives such as community symposia are effective dialogic tools in engaging community in integrated management approaches. However, although environmental awareness among community members may be substantial, and involvement in environmental initiatives may be well-supported as a result of community-based dialogue, translating support into integrated environmental management practices

continues to pose a serious challenge, exposing the limits to community participatory communication. Significant policy and regulatory barriers continue limit the capacity of the community to institute these practices and here the practical, action-oriented theory articulated by Flyvbjerg (2001) is useful in illuminating the shortcomings of normative participatory communication approaches. The paper concludes by identifying the need for detailed inquiry into policy development processes with which community participatory efforts must engage.

Participation, dialogue and communication

As many authors have recently done, Walker (2007) recognises, participation has become increasingly institutionalised in recent decades, both as ‘context and processes’ or as ‘rights and principles’, in different settings. The ‘paradigm shift’ (Jenkins and Henley, 2013) in NRM and its contextualising communicative practices must be seen in this context, however substantive questions over the possibilities of such institutionalised processes and the nature of public participation within decision-making processes remain (Dodson, 2014; Senecah, 2004). The deliberative (Walker, 2007) or dialogic (Phillips, 2011) turn however, highlights the necessity of high quality public participation in environmental decision making and policy setting processes.

A dialogic mode of engagement implies a shift from professionalised communications and mass communication approaches towards democratic and participatory engagement in decision-making. As Brulle (2010) argues, environmental communication should be directed towards supporting civic engagement and ‘scientific citizenship’, in which publics become involved in science and policy processes, including decision-making, particularly through articulating alternative discourses of community values in relation to environmental management.

Participation implies a dialogic form of communication and respect for the perspectives and culture of the project participants and the processes of meaning-making in which these community members engage (Dutta, 2011, pp. 37-38). Dialogue is a dynamic, transformative process through which participatory relations are constituted and positive outcomes enabled (Singhal, 2001). Dialogic engagement is an authentic, reflexive process focused on creating spaces in which the voices of social change participants can be activated and through which structural impediments to change may be overcome.

Phillips (2011) articulates a useful notion of dialogue in her discussion of community. The discourse of ‘dialogue and participation’ (and partnership) connotes equitable, democratic relations, in which dialogue and action are directed towards social equity (Phillips, 2011; 59). Phillips’ (2011; 61) notion, in which dialogue possesses a relational quality, rather than a normative meaning associated with ‘discourses of participation and empowerment’, brings us to a concept of dialogue familiar to the field of communication for social change – and alerts us to the potential structuring of ‘partnership’ by elite interests. Here, dialogue and communication are understood as “horizontal processes of information exchange and interaction” (Morris, in Phillips, 2011; 65), as opposed to hierarchical or linear communication, controlled by elites yet promoted as open and participatory.

As Walker (2007) and others (Phillips, 2011; Senecah, 2004) have made clear, conventional formal 'participatory' processes have become widely institutionalised over recent decades, however whether these processes yield better quality and more durable environmental outcomes remains uncertain. Indeed, the limitations of formal processes, such as consultations, submissions, public hearings necessitate the foregrounding of communicative processes which enable public deliberation, transparency and negotiation (Walker, 2010; Senecah, 2004).

Clearly, there is a tension between technical democracy and participatory democracy (Senecah, 2004). Here, 'effective' participatory process is a slippery term and ultimately known through its outcomes, rather than the establishment of normative principles for engagement. 'Effective participation' should be grounded in the straightforward, practical considerations of trust-building between participants; providing access to involvement and recognition and inclusivity towards participants in deliberative and dialogic processes (Senecah, 2004).

The question of normative categories of participation and inclusion however remains and ultimately the quest for principles of participation, deliberation, effective dialogic process and sound policy outcomes is confounded by circumstances, contexts and frequently highly localised configurations of power, interests and resources - as Senecah (2004) suggests participation can achieve the trinity of voice – the question for practically oriented environmental communicators is therefore obviously, does it?

Environmental participation and resource management in Aotearoa/New Zealand

The theme of 'participation' is highly visible feature of contemporary environmental management and communication fields, and discussed in a variety of contexts, including developing country issues (Twyman, 2000); globalisation (Berkes, 2007); policy and decision-making (Walker, 2007); fisheries management and marine reserve establishment (Granek et al, 2008; Uunila, 2003); and cross-cultural engagement and partnership (Stephenson and Moller, 2009; McLean and Cullen, 2009; Cinner and Aswani, 2007). The move toward collaborative, participative management has been described as a paradigm shift (Jenkins and Henley, 2013) in which the politics of resource management and conservation are moderated through stakeholder involvement.

In New Zealand there exist high profile examples for 'partnership' and 'stakeholder' groups and forums wielding significant authority and influence in resource management, particularly in areas of fraught and competitive resource competition, such as fresh water (Waikato River Authority, 2013; Land and Water Forum, 2010; 2012a; 2012b; Canterbury Water Management Strategy, 2009¹) and marine protected areas (DOC, 2005b), although these institutions provide examples of institutionalised

¹ Within in this strategic framework for water management, the legislative implications are still being considered and the need for legislative ammendment is not yet resolved. The Canterbury Water Management Strategy has been develeoped to address emerging issues of resource allocation and water quality, under conditions of use intensification and declining water quality (CWMS, 2009)

stakeholder participation, they typically sit outside the mainstream statutory approaches to resource management in New Zealand. The statutory framework in New Zealand is centred on the *Resource Management Act 1991*, which requires the articulation of national policy statements and environmental standards at a national level, with land use planning and regulation devolved to local and city councils. Environmental standards are monitored and enforced by regional councils, which are primary environmental regulators. Although this resource management framework does provide for the inclusion of community, Māori and other stakeholder perspectives (*RMA*, 1991²), existing modes of engagement are consultative, rather than collaborative or participatory (Berkett and Sinner, 2013). Indeed, as noted above, where collaborative approaches are being pioneered, as in relation to the management of Canterbury fresh water, the legislative framework in which to locate these initiatives is uncertain. Other key resource management agencies include the Environmental Protection Agency, the Department of Conservation (administering the *Conservation Act 1987*), and the Ministry for Primary Industries (administering the *Fisheries Act 1996* and related regulations).

For Berkes (2009a) the logical result of ‘partnership’ is a administrative and institutional framework of shared authority, in which adaptive, flexible and mutually negotiated processes of resource management are played out and, importantly, where indigenous ‘ways of knowing’ are complementary to ‘conservation science’ (Berkes, 2009b; Jacobson & Stephens, 2009; Robson et al., 2009). Here we can approach a definition of ‘integrated management’ that resonates with the current case. Integrated [water] management, as Warner (2007, p. 2) suggests is a – “holy trinity of three almost unassailable [water] governance ideals: integration³, participation and catchment management within hydrological, rather than political boundaries”. In the present case, ‘integrated management’ includes these qualities, in order to develop an holistic approach to catchment and harbour health and the health and well-being of its communities (IKHMG, 2010). Additionally, the IKHMG is concerned with the integration of governance processes relating to the harbour and its catchment, and to the integration of ‘Western science’ and Maori knowledge and values – mātauranga Māori

Māori and environmental participation

Furthermore, mātauranga Maori is becoming increasingly recognised as an important component in both the management of natural resources (Moller et al, 2009) and the politics of natural resource and environmental management (Mutu, 2010). Mātauranga Māori is concerned with Maori worldviews, values and systems of knowledge and spirituality. In an environmental context can be understood as traditional ecological knowledge (TEK) (Moller, 2009). As Berkes (2008) describes TEK is the body of knowledge, practice and belief, handed down through generations by cultural transmission, concerning the environment and the human place within it. A mātauranga Māori framework is applicable to all areas of human activity and knowledge (Harmsworth and Awatere, 2013), providing an ethics which governs the responsibilities and relationships inherent in decision-making.

² RMA 1991 Sec. 36B provides for ‘joint management agreements’ between local governments, statutory authorities, the Crown and iwi.

³ Integrated water resource management: decoupling water management, respecting the interactions and internalising the externalities that come with a sectorial approach [to water management] (Warner 2007, 2).

Mātauranga Māori is especially applicable with respect to environmental management (Marsden, 1992; Kawharu, 2000; Rotorangi and Russell, 2009; Lyver, 2009; Harmsworth and Awatere, 2013). Key environmental concepts cover not only the use or protection of the natural world, but the genealogical, cosmological and philosophical underpinnings of resource management (Durie, 1998; Kawharu, 2000; Harmsworth and Awatere, 2013). Clearly there are tensions between western scientific models of values-free empirical and hypothesis focused methods and qualitative, context-specific and values-driven mātauranga Māori. However, while the ‘traditional’ may point to knowledge of ‘the past’, mātauranga Maori is held to be dynamic, and evolving knowledge complimentary to western scientific knowledge (Tipa, 2010; Mutu, 2010; Mulholland, 2010; Harmsworth and Awatere, 2013).

Nonetheless productive explorations and partnerships in which mātauranga Māori and western science are brought together to address pressing environmental issues are apparent across the gamut of socio-environmental contexts, from the rights and responsibilities of environmental guardianship – *kaitiakitanga* (Marsden, 1992; Kawharu, 2000; Mutu, 2010); to assessments of traditional food stocks (seabirds) (Moller, et al, 2009); to the health of waterways (Mullholland, 2010); wet lands (Forster, 2010); the protection of Māori heritage assets (Kawharu, 2010); and river health (Tipa, 2010). Harmsworth and Awatere (2013) outline a series of mātauranga Māori tools for measuring ecosystem health based on cultural values and epistemologies which are held to compliment western scientific approaches.

Obviously, in this context analysis of participatory environmental communication must pay attention to the inclusion of indigenous perspectives and traditional authority in order to advance collaborative environmental management. In the present case the management challenge addressed by the Integrated Kaipara Harbour Management Group is therefore threefold; to promote the understanding of the Kaipara Harbour as a single socio-ecological system (catchment level); to promote the integrated management of this system and to do so by using western scientific, participatory and mātauranaga Māori tools to guide management decision-making and policy setting.

As our case also demonstrates indigenous leadership is also important for providing the authority and *mana* under which this dialogic engagement is facilitated and our attention should be drawn to the political realities that underlie resource management, notwithstanding the ethic of participation, partnership and collaboration that may prevail.

Environmental communication revisited

In this context following normative prescriptions in relation to environmental decision-making too closely however runs the risk of producing overly mechanistic or formalised process, not least when participatory process are riven with the constitutional complexities of post-coloniality and of competing epistemological approaches to environmentalism. Normative questions abound in NRM and environmental communication – not least, in the question of what is environmental communication ‘about’ (Cox, 2007). On a practical level, and as a crisis discipline (Cox, 2007), environmental communication should be concerned with the practical experience and outcomes of participation,

rather than idealising process or concepts. Indeed seeking to generate generalised, theoretical knowledge about reflexively constituted, normatively defined and values-dependent socio-ecological system is likely an unattainable objective (Cox, 2007; Flyvbjerg, 2001).

Central therefore to bridging the spaces between theory and practice is the deployment of practical theory, helping to describe, and evaluate what is happening *in practice* in a given environmental communication context. Here, a phronetic approach (Flyvberg, 2001; 1998), which is sensitive to the practical, value-based and context-dependent production of environmental knowledge and ‘participation’, is useful. As method and practical philosophy (Flyvberg, 2001; pp. 55-60), *phronesis* is concerned with the ethics of action – in essence a practical, values-based rationality guiding social action. In Flyvberg’s (2001) contemporary conceptualisation concerns not only the practicalities of social action, but is centrally concerned with both values-based rationalities and the operation of *power* and its influence on determining the direction social action takes, particularly in the arena of policy and planning (Flyvberg, 1998). Flyvberg (2001; 1998) points cogently to the modern incongruity between intentions and implementation, between the ideal and reality.

Centrally, this approach is concerned to answer the questions, *where are we going?; is this desirable?; what should be done? And, who gains and who loses, by which mechanism of power?* (Flyvberg, 2001). This practical focus on examining the lived experience of participants has the potential to be both emancipatory – in line with the normative tenets of environmental communication (Cox, 2007) – and dialogic/deliberative, as its practical focus is predicated on the inclusion of diverse interests. In asking *what should be done?* attention is focused on the importance of deliberating diverse values when dealing with complex NRM issues, in which all values and knowledges involved tend to be perspective-dependent, incomplete and contested, technical rationality included (Palliser, 2015). In analysing participatory communication concerning environmental management therefore, attention is drawn to practical questions of how voices⁴ are enabled within deliberative process and with what effect? The question of how this combination of voices shapes knowledge of the environment, and provides guidance for future decision-making, echoes the phronetic interest in the question *what should be done?* The legitimacy of values-rationality, alongside other forms of rationality, within this mode of inquiry illuminates both the difficulties of resolving complex resource-management and environmental issues with conventional, administrative and objective scientific methods, to the exclusion of non-technical, practical and indigenous knowledge.

Phronesis also draws attention to the structuring role played by *power* in the constitution of both the participatory or collaborative process under examination, and the broader policy context in which these ultimately reside (Flyvbjerg, 2001). Finally then, this approach permits analysis of the practical outcomes of participation, moving beyond normative conceptions of deliberative processes, locating the values-rational, contextual and diverse production of environmental knowledge within the context of ever-present relations of power (Flyvbjerg, 2001, p. 117).

⁴ Voices here taken to mean voice, perspective, knowledge, values, worldview (Senecah, 2004; Flyvbjerg, 2001)

Looking back...thinking forward – participatory communication and the Kaipara Harbour

The Integrated Kaipara Harbour Management Group (IKHMG) is a multi-stakeholder partnership (Warner, 2007) established in 2005 with the central aim to promote inter-agency coordination and management, and *kaitiakitanga* of Kaipara Harbour and its catchment. The Kaipara harbour is New Zealand's largest harbour and largest estuarine ecosystem. The Kaipara harbour catchment extends from the northwestern reaches of Auckland city (NZ's largest metropolitan area) to the north of Whangarei and encompasses a 640000ha catchment. Within this catchment it is also the central *taonga* (treasured possession) of Ngāti Whatua, the confederation of Māori hapu who maintain *mana whenua mana moana* (traditional authority over land and sea) over this region.

The IKHMG is led by Ngāti Whātua hapu, Ngati Whātua ki Kaipara and Te Uri O Hau, and draws together stakeholders from across the governance and policy, industrial, community and non-governmental sectors. Initially the IKHMG was formed in response to perceived shortcomings within existing resource management approaches towards the harbour and catchment (Wright, 2014; IKHMG 2012). Having successfully constituted the stakeholder group, the IKHMG has articulated the guiding, common vision to create a *healthy and productive Kaipara Harbour* (IKHMG 2011).

Central to the epistemological foundation, practice and operation of the IKHMG is the integration of Western environmental, conservation and agricultural sciences with *mātauranga Māori*, the holistic Māori system of philosophy, knowledge and practice that underpins Māori world views (Durie, 1998; Kawharu, 2000; Harmsworth and Awatere, 2013). As a collaborative, multi-stakeholder partnership the central aims of the groups are to gather information and knowledge; to develop innovative approaches to catchment management and support community action; and to seek to influence policy and regulation that affects the Kaipara Harbour, across the IKHMG's priority areas.⁵

Since 2005 the IKHMG has been successful in building the 'stakeholder partnership' model, using the impetus gained from recent regional 'treaty settlements'⁶ and associated negotiations with the Crown to build engagement with regional political, regulatory and scientific stakeholders. Central to 'integrated management' is the bringing together of disparate and disconnected regulatory tools in relation to the holistic view of the harbour and catchment as a continuous social-ecological system (IKHMG, 2011). And to date the engagement and participation of these stakeholders has been a notable success of the IKHMG. Most notably, since 2012 a Kaipara Harbour Joint Political Committee has been established bringing together the region territorial authorities (councils) to work towards the integration of the management of the harbour and its catchment⁷.

⁵ These priority areas are; biodiversity; sustainable fisheries; restoring and protecting the *mauri* (lifeforce); addressing climate change; socio-economic issues; and integrated management.

⁶ See for instance, *Te Uri o Hau Settlement Act, 2002*;

⁷ At present regulatory authority for the harbour is spread across two district councils, one regional council, one unitary authority and several central government agencies.

A key operational initiative of the IKHMG has been the “Flagship Farms” programme (IKHMG, 2011). “Flagship Farms” are agricultural and industrial sites, located in priority sub-catchments, where farmers, business owners and landusers are demonstrating ‘best-practice’ land use. Flagship farms are a ‘flax-roots’ initiative designed to engage and communicate directly with community members in practical, workshop-style events where diverse environmental stewardship is demonstrated in conjunction with economic business (farm) operation.

Communication, engagement and participation

Although the IKHMG is a high-level stakeholder partnership, and engaged directly with governance, regulatory and scientific partners, the Group is also centrally concerned with community participation and participatory communication. In 2014 an extended campaign was undertaken to engage with the Kaipara community and IKHMG stakeholder to drive community awareness about the pressures the Kaipara is facing, the work of the IKHMG in bringing the disparate community together and to encourage community participation at an end of year ‘community symposium’. This event was intended as a community-based celebration of 10 years of work by the IKHMG, but also an important communications strategy to demonstrate the level and breadth of community support and range of activities being undertaken under the auspices of the IKHMG to address harbour and catchment health. This strategy therefore had twin goals of raising community awareness and driving community participation, both in the event and deliberations over the future of harbour management, and in restoration initiatives.

The IKHMG sought to engage community directly and through media communication. Central to this strategy was the use of IKHMG partners, stakeholder and ‘flagship farmers’ to communicate their stories of awareness and concern about the local environment, their engagement and involvement with the IKHMG and their support for the ongoing initiatives. As this campaign sought to engage as widely as possible within the community, ‘community stories’ from the points of view of local farmers and business operators, corporate business, local leadership and indigenous perspectives. As recent research into rural decision-making in New Zealand has revealed (Brown, 2013), in the primary production sector levels of trust around information sources is highest among immediate professional and peer groups, such as fellow farmers, vets and rural finance providers.

In line with this strategy, these community narratives were recorded and produced into short, authentic community messages, encouraging people to recognise the environmental challenges faced by the region, the importance of community driven initiatives and to encourage attending the community symposium. These messages were then circulated online via the IKHMG’s existing social media channels, such as Facebook, Twitter and the organisations blog. In conjunction with community narratives, community members and IKHMG participants made themselves available for media coverage as the event drew near. The campaign generated significant media coverage in a short period of time, including in both local and nationally significant media (*NZ Herald*, 2014 – see overleaf). Direct stakeholder communications were directed at IKHMG member and partner organisations to ensure full participation of these groups at the event.

Within the community, Kaipara region farmers and landowners were targeted as an especially important target audience for campaign messages, with a central campaign goal to ensure high levels of participation at the symposium from this sector of the community, given their importance as land users. Given the scepticism with which many sources of information within the rural community are treated (Brown, 2013), carefully targeting information at this sector of the rural community was important. Specifically targeted information publicising the symposium was therefore made available directly to the rural community through veterinary clinics, rural supply stores and agents.

The two day symposium followed a conference format, featuring approx. 40 separate presentations. These presentations and interactive sessions were delivered by IKHMG members and partners, often focusing on their specific area of responsibility or expertise; by regulatory and scientific agencies; and by community members themselves. across the broad themes of;

- ecosystems;
- connecting with mātauranga Māori;
- integrated management;
- communities and relationships;
- implementing integrated management; and planting two million trees (a central IKHMG project).

The symposium featured three plenary speakers, retired Deloitte NZ Chairman and Chair of New Zealand Sustainable Business Development Council, Nick Main; Māori Northland farmer, forester and Environment Court Commissioner, Kevin Prime; and soil health and biological farming advocate Graeme Sait, as the IKHMG sought to draw and connect with diverse community members and stakeholders.

The format of the symposium, including as speakers as it did, not only technical experts and officials but community members, practitioners, landowners and indigenous speakers provided significant space and time for the discussion of the key issues facing the Kaipara Harbour, the barriers to effective integrated management, the successes that have been achieved in realising the IKHMG common vision and the work for the future. Within this dialogic space, as a constitutive part of it, were the multiple voices of audience members – the combined attendees, invited guests, presenters and organisers who formed the forum. A final session closed the event with an open forum, in which ‘idea-walls’ were produced by event participants, as a means of capturing and recording participant contributions.

For the purposes of event evaluation, symposium attendees were surveyed in the two weeks after the event, using the LimeSurvey online survey tool. The survey consisted of 14 questions, including scaled, check box and verbatim answers. Fifty-four complete responses were received (sample size 195 registrations, 27.7% response rate).

Overall it is clear from this data that the communications campaign successfully achieved its objectives of a successful event, in generating non-hierarchical, accessible and diverse dialogue across community awareness, the work of the IKHMG and the issues facing the Kaipara Harbour. It is clear too that the symposium attracted key audiences, such as Kaipara land owners, and representatives of the political and regulatory authorities and successfully provided community members with opportunities to share, learn and discuss community-driven approaches to managing the Kaipara Harbour.

Fig. 1 Which of these community sectors do you primarily identify with?

Kaipara catchment landowner	16	36%
Community member	12	27%
Education/Research	10	23%
Government agency	6	14%
Non-government organisation	6	14%
Business/Industry	5	11%
Local government	4	9%
Iwi	4	7%
Other:	4	7%

Fig. 2 What is your involvement with the IKHMG?

Partner organisation/member	19	45%
General Public	17	40%
Other	10	18%
Iwi/hapū	9	21%

Clearly survey respondents became engaged and motivated to learn more and to take action as a result of the campaign and the experience of the symposium. Significant majorities of respondents confirmed that the symposium successfully communicated the purpose and achievements of the IKHMG (90%); increased knowledge about the Kaipara Harbour (88%); effectively promoted action on issues facing the harbour (76%) and was an effective means to share knowledge and information (84%)

Many survey respondents stated they would employ the information they gained in tangible activities, clearly demonstrating success in encouraging greater levels of community participation in environmental restoration and protection. For instance:

- **How will you use the information presented at the Event in future?**
 - *(I gained) [g]eneral knowledge of area I visit often. understanding of farming methods taken up by my whanau. I will support IKHMG initiatives in the future.*
 - *Background material for school lessons opportunities for student involvement stimulus for the introduction of various new activities*
 - *The IKHMG model is inspiring and I am recommending people look at your website and activities to inform their own work, where it is focused on environmental restoration, or draws on a collaborative/ partnership approach.*
 - *To advocate for sustainable farming, biodiversity enhancement and water quality improvement in Kaipara through Living Water partnership.*
 - *To help the IKHMG improve the Kaipara Harbour's mauri through working with landowners in the catchment on sustainable land use initiatives.*
 - *It gives me the mandate to go forward. What we are doing is what communities and tangata whenua want.*
 - *I attended the event on Sunday and enjoyed the speakers. My reason for attending was that I work with the Kaipara Harbour Joint Political Committee (Democracy Advisor) and on a personal level I am passionate about the environment*
 - *[I will use the information]...In discussion with other members of the Northland Conservation Board and community groups*
 - *To advocate for sustainable farming, biodiversity enhancement and water quality improvement in [the] Kaipara through our Living Water partnership*
 - *To promote the IKHMG and to advance negotiations with the Crown for co-governance over the Kaipara*

Communicative spaces in practice

Clearly therefore, community driven communication campaigns and symposia of this nature are effective tools in fostering community involvement and civic engagement in deliberating resource management issues (Brulle, 2010). While the case discussed above contained elements of 'campaign communications', ultimately these too were community developed and delivered, and in support of the grassroots (flaxroots) institution of the community symposium. This was achieved outside elite designed or implemented process, rather the community constructed its own dialogic space, in which active citizenship could be demonstrated and communicated (Brulle, 2010).

Such processes institute 'horizontal' (Phillips, 2011) processes of dialogue, in which community members (both indigenous and non-indigenous), governors, representatives of industry, regulators and scientists are engaged in dialogue and exchange. As with the IKHMG symposium, this can produce the conditions for an efflorescence of 'values-rationality' through a polyphony of voices (Flyvbjerg, 2001). In these conditions it may be possible to approach requirements that Senecah (2004) articulated for effective participatory process, that relations of trust are established, that participants are legitimised as such and that there is the possibility of their voices being recognised as important and potentially impactful. As the evidence suggests the community symposium did provide these conditions and that community members and symposium participants were legitimate voices in deliberations concerning the harbour and its management. Indeed the IKHMG event provided for the

efflorescence of values-rationality (Flyvbjerg, 2001), as community and indigenous voices were included, legitimated and valued in these discussions.

This event therefore provides a possible model for the communication of the complementarity of indigenous knowledge – in our case mātauranga Māori – and western science. The broader purpose of the IKHMG and its community engagement has been to develop and establish a ‘common vision’ – *a healthy and productive Kaipara Harbour* (IKHMG, 2011), an articulation of community and stakeholder values and narratives in relation to the harbour. Dialogic and participative engagement serves as a vital mechanism through which values-based rationalities and narratives are produced, articulated and recognised. Indeed, through this process, otherwise frequently marginalised voices (Dutta, 2011) are given equal space, time and consideration, alongside established or institutional voices, such as governance authorities or scientists. In terms of mātauranga Māori, the *mana* (authority, influence or status) of indigenous voices is affirmed and the indigenous conceptual foundation for engaging in participatory and deliberative environmental communication is included in the production of values-rational approaches to environmental management. Indeed, in the present case, as the IKHMG is led by Maori groups, this formulation is somewhat reversed, in so far it is the *mana* of these groups which facilitates the IKHMG as a community-based stakeholder partnership. In our case, the presence of indigenous leadership is central and vital to the formation of the IKHMG and the bringing together the community at events such as the symposium. As an initiative that has successfully engaged and united frequently oppositional sectors there is perhaps an addition to be made to our normative conception of collaborative and participatory approaches – that of the centrality of the legitimacy that attends to indigeneity.

From a practical point of view however, and seeking to bridge the divide between theory and practice, there is the need to consider the question: *To what effect?* Here Flyvbjerg’s (2001) practical, values-based and contextual approach to understanding the production of [environmental] knowledge, ‘participation’ and, ultimately, environmental management outcomes is useful. The success of the IKHMG and the symposium *Looking back...thinking forward* on one hand demonstrates the legitimacy and effectiveness of the approach outlined above. In answering the practical question – *where are we heading?* at both a grass/flaxroots level and an administrative/regulatory level participative, dialogic approaches are useful, especially under conditions of complexity and diversity, and it does appear that driving environmental management according to community based values-rationality is viable. On the other hand a joint political committee has been established since 2012 by Kaipara Harbour governance authorities (Auckland Council, Northland Regional Council, and Kaipara District Council), along with Māori representatives, Te Uri o Hau, Ngāti Whātua ki Kaipara and Te Rununga o Ngati Whātua. Although this political committee has no mandate, decision-making or governance authority, it does symbolise the recognition of the need of integrated approaches to harbour and catchment management.

However, the existing statutory framework for resource management in New Zealand does not constructively provide for the possibility of integrated management. Collaborative or adaptive management strategies are only weakly provided for under the *Resource Management Act 1991*, and

the most advanced attempt to manage resources according to community-level, collaborative and values-driven approaches, the Canterbury Water Management Strategy, exists within an uncertain statutory framework (CWMS, 2009, pp. 56-59). Within our region, the Kaipara district is divided between 4 territorial authorities and multiple sectoral regulators, without a framework to provide for collaborative and integrated management.

The community therefore can drive processes through which the ‘practical wisdom’ and ‘polyphony of voice[s]’ (Flyvbjerg, 2001) is collected and combined, values and priorities discussed and negotiated (rather than idealised), upholding and expanding participatory norms. However, without a framework to locate these efforts the impact and the potential environmental management gains are undermined.

Therefore, *what should be done?* becomes an imperative question. Ultimately, processes facilitating the deliberation and reconciliation of diverse values and perspectives, enabled through community-based communication and events are constructive. As shown, these processes are effective in advancing participation in resource management dialogue, through community-driven inclusion of values-based, non-expert, non-technical and indigenous voices, alongside scientific and governance rationalities. This dialogue also advances the deliberation of potential governance models that facilitate integrated management and the realisation of shared goals and visions.

Flyvbjerg’s (2001) ultimate question however, that of *power* and how power shapes deliberative process, or either promotes or hinders moves towards collaborative and integrated management however remains unresolved. Certainly stakeholders, publics and resource managers are willing to *participate* and *deliberate* under conditions in which conventional power relations (governors and regulatory authorities in relation to the community) are either minimised or temporarily reversed (through indigenous leadership). However questions of authority, governance control and regulation cannot be directly addressed meaningfully in the absence of a statutory framework in which to ground integrated or collaborative innovations in resource management⁸ – particularly in relation to ecosystems that span political or regulatory control. The question of what steps are being taken towards integrated management and the relations of power that characterise these policy developments, locally, regionally and nationally must direct analytic attention away from community-level deliberative process and to questions of policy development.

⁸ see CWMS (2009)



References

Berkes, Fikret (2004) Rethinking community conservation. *Conservation Biology*, 18(3), 621-630.

- (2007) Community-based conservation in a globalized world. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A*, 104(39), 15188-15193.
- (2008) The Evolution of Co-Management, *Journal of Environmental Management*, 90, 1692-1702.
- (2009a) Evolution of co-management: role of knowledge generation, bridging organizations and social learning. *Journal of Environmental Management*, 90(5), 1692-1702.
- (2009b). Indigenous ways of knowing and the study of environmental change. *JRSNZ*, 39(4).

Berkett, N. and Sinner, J. 2013. *Collaborative Process and Role of Council*, Policy Brief No. 8, Landcare Research, NZ.

Brown P. (2013) Survey of Rural Decision Makers. Landcare Research NZ Ltd. Available: <http://www.landcareresearch.co.nz/science/portfolios/enhancing-policy-effectiveness/srdm>. Accessed: 7 May 2015

Brulle, R.J. (2010) From environmental campaigns to advancing public dialogue: Environmental communication for civic engagement, *Environmental Communication*, 4, 1, 82-98.

Canterbury Water Management Strategy. 2009. Available: <http://ecan.govt.nz/publications/Plans/cw-canterbury-water-wanagement-strategy-05-11-09.pdf>

Cinner, J.E. & Aswani, S. 2007, Integrating customary management into marine conservation, *Biological Conservation*, 140, 3-4, 201-216.

Conservation Act 1987 (NZ)

http://www.legislation.govt.nz/act/public/1987/0065/latest/whole.html?search=ts_act%40bill%40regulation%40deemedreg_conservation+act_reselel_25_a&p=1#DLM103610 (12 September 2013).

Cox, R. 2006. *Environmental Communication*, Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Department of Conservation. 2005. MPA Policy and Implementation Plan. Wellington: Department of Conservation.

Depoe, S.W. and Delicath, J.W. 2004. Introduction, in, Depoe, S.W., Delicath, J. W., and Aeppli Eisenbeer, M.F., 2004. *Communication and Public Participation in Environmental Decisionmaking*, Albany: State University of New York Press.

Dodson, G. (2013) Co-governance and local empowerment? Conservation partnership frameworks and co-management at Mimiwhangata, New Zealand, *Society and Natural Resources*, Forthcoming.

Durie, M. (1998) *Te Mana, Te Kawanatanga; the politics of Maori self-determination*, Auckland: Oxford University Press.

Dutta, M. 2011. *Communicating Social Change: Structure, Culture, Agency*. New York: Routledge.

Fisheries Act 1996 (NZ)

http://www.legislation.govt.nz/act/public/1996/0088/latest/DLM394192.html?search=ts_act%40bill%40regulation%40deemedreg_fisheries+act_reselel_25_a&p=1

(12 September 2013)

Flyvbjerg, B. (1998) *Rationality and Power: Democracy and Practice*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

- (2001) *Making Social Science Matter*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Forgie, V., Horsley, P. and Johnston, J (2001) *Facilitating Community-Based Conservation Initiatives*, Wellington: Department of Conservation.

Forster, M. (2010) Recovering our ancestral landscapes: A wetland's story, in Selby, R., Moore, P. and Mulholland, M. (2010) *Māori and the Environment: Kaitiaki*, Wellington: Huia Publishers.

Freire, P. 1993. *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*, New York, Continuum.

Granek, E. F. Madin, E. M. Brown, M. A., Figueira, W., Cameron, D. S., Hogan, Z., Kristianson, G., deVilliers, P., Williams, J. E., Post, J., Zahn, S., Arlinghaus, R. 2008. Engaging Recreational Fishers in Management and Conservation: Global Case Studies, *Conservation Biology*, 22, 5, 1125-1134.

Harmsworth, G. and Awatere, S. 2013. Indigenous Māori Knowledge and Perspectives on Ecosystems, in Dymond, J. (2013) *Ecosystem Services in New Zealand: Conditions and Trends*, Lincoln, NZ, Manaaki Whenua Press.

Integrated Kaipara Harbour Management Group (2011) *Integrated Strategic Plan of Action*. Available: <http://www.kaiparaharbour.net.nz/Publications>

Jacobson, C., & Stephens, A. 2009. Cross cultural approaches to environmental research and management: a response to the dualisms in Western science. *Journal of the Royal Society of New Zealand*. 39, 4.

Jenkins, B., Henley, G. 2013. Collaborative Management: Community Engagement Process as the Decision Making Process. Melbourne, Australia: Environment Institute of Australia and New Zealand 2013 Annual Conference (EIANZ), 23-24 Oct 2013.

Kawharu, M. 2000, Kaitiakitanga. *Journal of the Polynesian Society*, 109, 349-370.

Land and Water Forum. 2010. *Report of the Land and Water Forum: A Fresh Start for Fresh Water*. Available <http://www.landandwater.org.nz/Site/Resources.aspx>

- 2012a. *Second Report of the Land and Water Forum: Setting Limits for Water Quality and Quantity, and Fresh Water Policy and Plan Making Through Collaboration*. Available <http://www.landandwater.org.nz/Site/Resources.aspx>

- 2012b. *Third Report of the Land and Water Forum: Managing Water Quality and Allocating Water*. Available <http://www.landandwater.org.nz/Site/Resources.aspx>

Lyver, P., (2005) Co-managing environmental research: Lessons from two cross-cultural research partnerships in New Zealand, *Environmental Communication*, 32, 4, 365-370.

Marsden, M. 1992. *Kaitiakitanga: A definitive introduction to the holistic worldview of the Māori*. Available: http://www.marinenz.org.nz/documents/Marsden_1992_Kaitiakitanga.pdf

McLean, K. & Cullen, L. 2009. Research methodologies for the co-production o

knowledge for environmental management in Australia, *Journal of the Royal Society of New Zealand*, 39:4, 205-208.

Moller, H., Lyver, P., Bragg, C., Newman, J., Clucas, R., Fletcher, D., Kitson, J., McKechnie, S., Scott, D. & Rakiura Titi Islands Administering Body (2009) Guidelines for Participatory Action Research Partnerships, *New Zealand Journal of Zoology*, 36, 211-241.

Mulholland, M. (2010) The death of the Manawatu River, in Selby, R., Moore, P. and Mulholland, M. (2010) *Māori and the Environment: Kaitiaki*, Wellington: Huia Publishers.

Mutu, M. (2010) Ngāti Kahu kaitiakitanga, in Selby, R., Moore, P. and Mulholland, M. (2010) *Māori and the Environment: Kaitiaki*, Wellington: Huia Publishers.

Palliser, A. (2015) *A Methodology for Praxis-based Studies of Natural Resource Management: A Phronetic Approach, Informed by Post-normal Science and Critical Systems Thinking* (unpublished manuscript).

Phillips, L. 2011. *The Promise of Dialogue*, Amsterdam, John Benjamins BV.

Resource Management Act, 1991 (NZ) available:

<http://www.legislation.govt.nz/act/public/1991/0069/latest/DLM230265.html>

(April, 2015)

Robson, J.P., Miller, Andrew, M., Ridrobo Carlos, J., Burlando, C., Deutsch, N.,

Kocho-Schellenberg, J., Pengelly, R. D. and Turner, K.L. 2009. Building communities of learning: indigenous ways of knowing in contemporary natural resources and environmental management. *Journal of the Royal Society of New Zealand* 39, 4: 173-177.

Rotarangi, S. and Russell, D. (2009) Socio-ecological resilience thinking: Can indigenous culture guide environmental management? *JRSNZ*, 39, 4, 209-213.

Senecah, S. 2004. The Trinity of Voice: The role of Practical Theory in Planning and Evaluating the Effectiveness of Environmental Participatory Process, in Depoe, S.W., Delicath, J. W., and Aepli Eisenbeer, M.F., 2004. *Communication and Public Participation in Environmental Decisionmaking*, Albany: State Univeristy of New York Press.

Servaes, J. 2008. *Communication for Development and Social Change*, Thousand Oaks, Calif.: Sage.

Stephenson, J. & Moller, H. 2009. Cross-cultural environmental research and management: Challenges and progress, *Journal of the Royal Society of New Zealand*, 39, 4.

- Tipa, G. (2010) Cultural opportunity assessments: Introducing a framework for assessing the suitability of stream flow from a cultural perspective, in Selby, R., Moore, P. and Mulholland, M. (2010) *Māori and the Environment: Kaitiaki*, Wellington: Huia Publishers.
- Twyman, C. 2000. Participatory Conservation? Community-Based Natural Resource Management in Botswana, *The Geographical Journal*, 166, 4, 323-335.
- Uunila, L. 2003. Community Involvement in Marine Management in New Zealand, *USDA Forest Service Proceedings*, RMRS-P-27.
- Walker, G. 2007. Public Participation as Participatory Communication in Environmental Policy Decision-Making: From Concepts to Structured Conversations, *Environmental Communication*, 1, 1, 99-110.
- Waikato River Authority. 2013. *Annual Report 2013*, Hamilton: Waikato River Authority.
- Warner, J. (2007) *Multi-Stakeholder Platforms for Integrated Water Management*, Aldershot: Ashgate Publishing.