

**Waahi Tapu & The Kāpiti Coast:
A Research Report**

**Prepared by Pātaka Moore
(Whaiao Ltd)**

For

**Āti Awa ki Whakarongotai, Ngāti Raukawa,
& Ngāti Toa Rangatira (Ngāti Haumia)**

And the

Kāpiti Coast District Council

**Final
(September, 2012)**

He Mihi

Ka tangi te tītī, ka tangi te kākā, ka tangi hoki ko au.

Tēnei ka mihi atu ki ngā kuia me ngā koroua kua whakanuia tēnei mahi rangahau. Nā o koutou kaha ki te manaaki i tēnei kaupapa, tēnei ripoata e puta atu ki te marea hei tautoko ake i ngā waahi tapu o tō tātou rohe.

Ki te kotahitanga o Āti Awa, Ngāti Raukawa, me Ngāti Toarangatira, tēnei au, tō koutou mōkai, e whai tonu ana i ngā kōrero a kui mā a koro mā mō ēnei waahi whakahirahira. He honore nui tēnei ki a au. Ko tāku hei rangahau hei tuhi, ko koutou ngā kaipupuru i ngā taonga, me kī, ngā kōrero me te mātauranga kua waihotia mai e ratou mā.

Ka mihi ake hoki ki ngā kaitautoko i te kaunihera a rohe a Gael, Jim, Monica, Te Paea, Hannah, Emily, me Tamsin. Tēnā koutou kua whai kaha ki te tautoko i tēnei o ngā mahi.

Tēnā koutou katoa.

Table of Contents

<u>He Mihi</u>	p. 2
<u>Introduction & Scope</u>	p. 4
<i>Report Limitations</i>	p. 5
<u>1. Research Background</u>	p. 7
<i>Tangata Whenua & Kāpiti Coast District Council</i>	p. 7
<i>Waahi Tapu – Some Definitions</i>	p. 8
<i>Waahi Tapu Research Complexity</i>	p. 9
<u>2. Tangata Whenua Environmental Values & Heritage</u>	p. 12
<i>Māori Environmental Values & Cultural Heritage</i>	p. 12
<i>Cultural Heritage Management</i>	p. 15
<u>3. Local Government & Iwi Policy Provisions</u>	p. 19
<i>National Legislation</i>	p. 19
<i>Wellington Regional Council Regional Policy Statement</i>	p. 20
<i>Kāpiti Coast District Council District Plan</i>	p. 21
<i>Iwi Management Plans</i>	p. 22
<u>4. Research Methodology & Methods</u>	p. 24
<i>Kaupapa Māori Research Methodology</i>	p. 24
<i>Cultural Supervision & Safety Protocols</i>	p. 26
<i>Methods</i>	p. 26
<i>The Research Process</i>	p. 27
<u>5. Proposed Classification System</u>	p. 29
<i>Scope</i>	p. 29
<i>Classification System</i>	p. 30
<u>6. Recommendations</u>	p. 32
<i>Continuous System Improvement</i>	p. 32
<i>Development of Waahi Tapu Provisions</i>	p. 33
<i>Conduct Further Cultural Heritage Research</i>	p. 33
<u>7. Conclusion</u>	p. 34
References	p. 35
Bibliography	p. 38
Glossary of Māori Environmental Values	p. 39
Appendix 1: Cultural Supervision & Safety Protocols	p. 45
Appendix 2: Cultural & Ethical Guidelines	p. 49

Introduction & Scope

Since its establishment in the mid 1990s, Te Whakaminenga o Kāpiti (Te Whakaminenga)¹ have highlighted the need for waahi tapu² research associated to the three iwi of the district³, to be adequately recorded and protected by the Kāpiti Coast District Council (KCDC). This report contributes to this goal and supports the three iwi in their quest to identify and protect waahi tapu that are particular each to them.

Recording areas of significance for mana whenua feeds into the 10-year review of the KCDC District Plan. In this case it is particularly concerned with council provisions concerning the districts landscapes, character and heritage. This report generates further knowledge regarding significant mana whenua⁴ landscapes, character and heritage areas on the Kāpiti Coast. Six sections are covered in this research report:

1. Research background
2. Tangata Whenua Environmental Values & Heritage
3. Local Government & Iwi Policy Provisions
4. Research Methodology & Methods
5. Proposed Classification System
6. Recommendations; and
7. Conclusion.

As a first step in establishing a waahi tapu classification system, it is important to recognise that such systems are often, and may forever be, a *work in progress*. For example priority sites, as defined by mana whenua, will be the first to be considered for inclusion in the revised District Plan. All future sites will be assessed based on their value and meaning to the iwi who hold mana

¹ A Kāpiti Coast District Council (KCDC) and Iwi mandated partnership group, see:

<http://www.kapiticoast.govt.nz/Tangata-Whenua/Te-Whakaminenga-o-Kapiti---Iwi-and-Council-Partnership-Committee/>

² Please see the Glossary of Māori Language on p.39 for general translations of Māori terms.

³ Te Āti Awa ki Whakarongotai, Ngāti Raukawa, Ngāti Toarangatira.

⁴ The terms “mana whenua” relate directly to the ART Confederation of Iwi, whereas “tangata whenua” and “Māori” are used interchangeably in this report.

whenua over that site and/or area against District Plan policy and provisions. It is also worth noting that as Māori relearn their past, sites of significance will be an integral part of that learning process.

Developing a classification and protection system that is relevant, valid and robust according to both mana whenua and KCDC, will greatly enhance the district's landscape, character and heritage value. Most importantly it will provide another avenue for a constructive and mutually beneficial relationship between KCDC and iwi.

Report Limitations

This report discusses complex Māori concepts, such as “waahi tapu”, “kaitiakitanga”, “tapu”, “noa” and “rangatiratanga” outside of its indigenous linguistic setting e.g. in the English language. This is an obvious limitation, in that transplanting such philosophical elements into a written English medium means that Māori knowledge systems become isolated from their unique linguistic setting and meaning. This commonly results in Māori world-views becoming restricted and defined within Western/European approaches to seeing and making sense of the world.

Further, often Māori environmental values and terms are broad and defined in different ways depending on local contexts and iwi specific viewpoints. Narrow definitions of Māori environmental and heritage values tend to be too restrictive of their dynamic meaning, which can result in misinterpretations. It is not the aim of this report to constrain and limit complex Māori concepts or world-views but rather explore them, enliven them and celebrate them through use.

In recognising these linguistic and cultural limitations, every effort has been made to explain concepts generally.⁵ Even so, readers are encouraged to engage widely – in both te reo Rangatira (the Māori language) and English – in order to better comprehend the meaning and implications of each value and how they relate to one another.⁶

⁵ See a Glossary of Māori Environmental Values on p. 45.

⁶ See for example Barlow, 2001; Mead, 2003; Selby, Moore & Mulholland, 2010; Kawharu, 2002; Marsden, 2003.

This report is not based solely on primary research information. Rather, it has utilised secondary sources, such as local government policy and planning documents, relevant policy papers and empirical research literature from New Zealand, and internationally peer-reviewed journals.

Research Background

Tangata Whenua & Kāpiti Coast District Council

The Kāpiti Coast has a long history of settlement and migration. Originally the coast was settled by a collective of five iwi - Ngāi Tara, Ngāti Apa, Rangitāne, Muaūpoko and Ngāti Kahungunu. The arrival of a collective of northern iwi - Te Āti Awa (from Taranaki), Ngāti Raukawa (Maungatautari) and Ngāti Toarangatira⁷ (Kāwhia) - in the early nineteenth century resulted in iwi conflicts between both collectives over land and resources.⁸

By the late 19th century various agreements between iwi provided greater cooperation and largely peaceful co-habitation between the Whangaehu River and the northern tip of the south island. A number of joint projects between the iwi of the Kāpiti Coast, those being Te Āti Awa, Ngāti Raukawa and Ngāti Toa, culminated in the building of Rangitāne Church in the late 1840s, the creation of the Ōtaki Māori Racing Club, and later the support for the rebuilding of Raukawa Marae as a Marae Matua in the 1930s. In effect the iwi were galvanised by whakapapa, by their history together and by their desire to live on the coast together as an intertribal forum. In more recent times some have described the confederation as the ART Confederation, and have provided a space in “which the iwi could negotiate their affairs”.⁹ The ART Confederation further entrenched their role as mana whenua holding kaitiakitanga responsibilities along the Kāpiti Coast.¹⁰

In 1989 the amalgamation of the Kāpiti Borough Council, the Ōtaki Borough Council and the southern boundary of Horowhenua County Council, saw the establishment of KCDC.¹¹ This consolidation was a direct result of reforms in the New Zealand Local Government sector. A number of community boards were established at this time, which feed into and guide KCDC business and community involvement.

The relationship between KCDC and iwi has been fused together by the creation of *Te Whakaminenga o Kāpiti*. The establishment of a Memorandum of Partnership between the Council

⁷ Otherwise known as Ngāti Toa

⁸ Maclean (1999).

⁹ Kāpiti Coast District Council, 2007, p. 1.

¹⁰ Ibid. p. 1.

¹¹ Kāpiti Coast District Council (2000)

and IWI in 1994, created Te Whakaminenga o Kāpiti (Te Whakaminenga).¹² Democratic representation via regular district elections, community boards, Te Whakaminenga and direct public consultation, enables KCDC to set priorities and serve the interests of Kāpiti rate-payers and residents generally.

Waahi Tapu – Some Definitions

Since its inception, one of the primary concerns for Te Whakaminenga has been the recognition and protection of waahi tapu along the Kāpiti Coast.¹³ There are many broad definitions of waahi tapu. Below are four drawn from different sources: Te Rūnanganui o Ngāti Hikairo (an iwi authority from the Kāwhia area), KCDC, Te Puni Kōkiri and the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO).

Barton & Thorn (2010), on behalf of Te Rūnanganui of Ngāti Hikairo, define waahi tapu as:

Urupā (burial grounds), rua kōiwi (place where skeletal remains are kept), sites where skeletal remains once were, unless the tapu has been removed, caverns and underwater burial places, places where baptismal rites were performed, waahi whenua (repository for placenta), whare karakia, tūahu (enclosures used for divination and other mystic rites), battle grounds and other places where blood was spilled and where tapu has not yet been removed waiora (springs or sources of water for healing), sources of water for death rites, ara purahourua (sacred pathways for messengers), places imbued with the mana of chiefs or tūpuna, landforms such as mountains which embody the creation stories and whakapapa of tangata whenua.¹⁴

The Kāpiti Coast District Plan (2010) defines waahi tapu as:

Sites deemed sacred and which are imbued with a spirituality that distinguishes them from other areas. Waahi tapu may be associated with creation stories of Tangata Whenua, a particular event (such as a battle or ceremony); it may be where the whenua (placenta) was returned to the earth, or where a certain type of valued resource was found.¹⁵

Te Puni Kōkiri (1996) define waahi tapu as:

¹²Kāpiti Coast District Council, 2007, p. 2.

¹³ Ibid. p. 41.

¹⁴ Barton & Pipi, 2010, pp. 43-45.

¹⁵ Kāpiti Coast District Council, 1999, C6-4.

A place sacred to Māori in the traditional, spiritual, religious, ritual or mythological sense.¹⁶

Internationally, UNESCO (1998) define a “cultural landscape” as:

...Techniques of sustainable land-use, considering the characteristics and limits of the natural environment they are established in, and a specific spiritual relation to nature. Protection of cultural landscapes can contribute to modern techniques of sustainable land-use and can maintain or enhance natural values in the landscape. The continued existence of traditional forms of land-use supports biological diversity in many regions of the world. The protection of traditional cultural landscapes is therefore helpful in maintaining biological diversity.¹⁷

When put together, an understanding of waahi tapu can be broad but locally specific. The concept concerns physical and metaphysical dimensions. This can create complexity and tensions regarding policy and rule provisions safeguarding such sites. This research project is an important contribution in assisting the consolidation of iwi, Council, and the general public’s knowledge regarding waahi tapu on the Kāpiti Coast and how best to provide for them.

Waahi Tapu Research Complexity

Historically in New Zealand raising the awareness about the tangible and intangible importance of waahi tapu amongst tangata whenua and others has been difficult. Some of the primary reasons for this difficulty are summarised below:

- *New Zealand’s colonial history*: Despite the signing of Te Tiriti o Waitangi in 1840 and its provisions to protect tangata whenua interests and secure their self-determination, settlement of Pākehā-Europeans in the nineteenth century and the subsequent establishment of British and colonial law, systematically undermined the knowledge, values, lands and practices of tangata whenua.¹⁸ This colonial history has resulted in a struggle for tangata whenua to maintain their tino rangatiratanga (absolute authority and

¹⁶ Te Puni Kōkiri, 1996, p. 27.

¹⁷ UNESCO, 1998, Paragraph 38, p. 9.

¹⁸ See Durie, 1998; Walker, 1990; L.T. Smith, 1999; Barton & Throne, 2010.

self-determination) regarding their unique cultural identity, language, the natural environment, and future affairs.

- *Maintaining integrity:* Tangata whenua have had experience of sacred sites being robbed and violated by non-Māori.¹⁹ For this reason, there is justified fear amongst iwi that any disclosure of sensitive information could be abused if placed in the public arena without their consent.²⁰ This situation can jeopardise the trust iwi might have towards “outside” agencies wanting to collect heritage or cultural information. It also diminishes and challenges a host of tangata whenua environmental values, such as kaitiakitanga, mana, rangatiratanga and tapu.

- *Loss of knowledge:* With the decline in numbers of kaumātua, specific knowledge about areas of significance to iwi is also declining or being lost.²¹ This is compounded by the reality that often iwi or hapū do not always have the necessary resources to investigate areas that may have special significance to them. This situation can restrict the intellectual resources that iwi and hapū have at their disposal. In turn this can negatively impact on their ability to be active participants in decision-making regarding their territorial boundaries or rohe.

- *Low levels of public awareness:* There is little empirical research and evidence on the changing public attitudes towards Māori cultural heritage, or cultural heritage generally in New Zealand. Anecdotally, it is likely that there is a lack of non-Māori awareness and education about waahi tapu and why they are a unique part of New Zealand’s cultural heritage. This dearth of understanding and appreciation can create a barrier in safeguarding and enhancing these areas for future generations. It makes an integrated approach to heritage management difficult to justify to rate-payers, and therefore undertake this research locally and nationally.²²

¹⁹ Barton & Thom, 2010, p. 15.

²⁰ Ibid, p. 15.

²¹ Kāpiti Coast District Council, 2007, p. 42.

²² No formal and systematic means of surveying public awareness of wāhi tapu was undertaken for this report. However, such work would be valuable in gauging public awareness regarding heritage values and wāhi tapu in the district.

It is important to recognise that these factors complicate a research project of this scope. This complexity is born out of the fact that only four waahi tapu are currently listed in the Kāpiti Coast District Plan. Without the support and mandate given by Te Whakaminenga to KCDC, alongside a work programme specified under the KCDC Annual Plan (2010/2011), this project would have been impossible to undertake. The authority to carry out this research is an important step in creating a classification and protection system that is relevant, valid and robust. It is dependent on the cooperation and support of iwi and KCDC.

This research will enhance the current district's landscape, character and heritage through better coordination of systems that will benefit Kāpiti residents, tangata whenua of Kāpiti, developers and ratepayers. The following section provides an overview of Māori environmental values in relation to heritage in New Zealand and internationally.

1. Tangata Whenua Environmental Values & Heritage

As tangata whenua and as kaitiaki we have responsibility for the environment and for those that share the environment. Kaitiakitanga is not an obligation which we choose to adopt or to ignore; it is an inherited commitment that links mana atua, mana tangata and mana whenua, the spiritual realm with the human world and of those with the earth and all that is on it.²³

Māori cultural heritage - as represented in the places and spaces that are of significance to whānau, hapū and iwi - cannot be separated from Māori environmental values generally.²⁴ The 'people' and the 'environment' are not mutually exclusive groups in indigenous knowledge systems.²⁵ In this sense, values such as rangatiratanga, kaitiakitanga, tikanga, mauri, tapu and noa (to name but a few) are inextricably connected to waahi tapu. These interconnections are discussed in more depth below.

Māori Environmental Values & Cultural Heritage

Descriptions and explanations of related cultural and heritage values cannot be done justice within a written report. For this reason, readers are encouraged to engage widely - in both te reo Rangatira (the Māori language) and English - to better comprehend the meaning and implications of each value and how they relate to one another in practice. As a beginning, below are some examples of how waahi tapu can relate to Māori people and environmental values:²⁶

- *Rangatiratanga*: This can be interpreted as the ability of tangata whenua to determine sites of cultural significance based on their historical and contemporary relationship to the material and non-material world. Up-holding rangatiratanga means tangata whenua have the free authority to determine the protection needed of specific sites. It enables their preferences, authority and self-determination to be respected and upheld regarding sites of significance.

²³ Selby, Moore & Mulholland, 2010, p. 1.

²⁴ Whangaparita *et al* (2003).

²⁵ Memmot & Long, 2002, p. 44.

²⁶ Examples of these values are based on the *Māori Values Framework* as defined by Whangaparita *et al*, 2003, p. I-1-I-2.

- *Kaitiakitanga*: This means iwi and hapū have a collective custodial responsibility to protect areas of significance to them. By not enforcing protection and rules, kaitiaki can compromise their obligations to safeguard waahi tapu. This could negatively impact on future generations, as their cultural knowledge of sites becomes lost, and their connection and responsibility to care for the natural and spiritual world can become compromised. Not upholding kaitiakitanga obligations may also result in local tangata whenua losing their integrity or mana.
- *Tikanga*: As a framework for expressing tangata whenua belief systems, lore, practices and commonsense thoughts, tikanga implies that waahi tapu be placed under the governance of tangata whenua. This means rules are put into place by tangata whenua regarding the care and respect for waahi tapu.
- *Mauri*: As a life principle instilled in all things by the supreme creator, the mauri of waahi tapu refers to the being and form of a particular area. Preserving waahi tapu can enhance this life principle. Conversely mauri can be diminished by unauthorised changes or developments to waahi tapu.
- *Tapu*: Sites of significance for tangata whenua can be imbued with sacredness, and therefore afforded protection. The establishment of tapu over an area often implies an appreciation and respect for that area. Subsequently, access to an area may be subject to restrictions or off limits.
- *Noa*: As a complementary to tapu, noa enables people and objects safe and unrestricted contact with an area of significance. Having a space declared noa recognises its health and resilience in the face of, for example, population growth, landscape development and demand.

- *Rāhui*: Rāhui generally take the form of temporary restrictions for either the protection of people (e.g. when there is a death at sea and fishing is unsafe) or as a conservation measure. These areas can be classed as ‘tapu’ for a period of time.

In combination these elements are part of a wider description of Māori heritage. The Māori Heritage Council has developed ways of understanding how Māori heritage values can be protected and enhanced. For the Māori Heritage Council, “Māori heritage” is defined as:

...A living spirituality, a living mana that transcends generations. It comes to life through relationships between people, the material and the non-material.²⁷

This holistic definition relies on people understanding the practical application of Māori environmental values and principles in their day-to-day lives. For people who are not familiar with this, challenges to “commonsensical” or Western culture, notions of place and space can be questioned. However, the Māori Heritage Council has developed four elements that can act as a mechanism to promote, identify, protect, preserve and conserve Māori heritage. These are summarised as:²⁸

1. *Identification and protection*: Conservation of physical objects and places under the *Historic Places Act 1993*; awareness of Māori heritage places among those who seek to develop land and/or make decisions about it; promotion of registration of Māori heritage places; engagement in statutory advocacy processes for the protection of cultural sites.
2. *Knowledge*: Recognition of Te Whare Kōrero – traditional iwi, hapū and whānau knowledge concerning Māori heritage; knowledge in the public domain that is used in Māori heritage protection; utilising modern archaeological and architectural analyses to generate new knowledge.
3. *Experience*: People’s appreciation of waahi tapu must be based on creating sustainable and meaningful experiences involving Māori heritage. These experiences must be sustainable economically with knowledgeable people and resources; be meaningful to a

²⁷ Māori Heritage Council, 2009, p. 8.

²⁸ Ibid, pp. 10-11.

variety of audiences; enabling people to grasp the 'specialness' and 'distinctiveness' of Māori heritage places.

- *Creation*: Recognition that Māori heritage is not only of the past – it is a continuum of life that continues to unfold. Reinterpretation of Māori heritage must be rooted in a deep understanding of Māori traditions and customs.

The challenge remains for local government and tangata whenua to provide for cultural heritage values within every-day practices of district planning. The mechanisms outlined above offer one pro-active way to do this.

Co-management or joint management arrangements have also emerged as a way of ensuring iwi and hapū participation in local government decision-making. For example, Ngāti Tūwharetoa Iwi and Taupō District Council have established a "Joint Management Arrangement" (JMA), which:

...Provides for Ngāti Tūwharetoa participation in resource consent decision-making and an enhanced consideration and recognition of the relationship of Ngāti Tūwharetoa to their culture and traditions with their ancestral lands, water, sites, waahi tapu and other taonga.²⁹

Currently there is no empirical research or evaluation that might provide evidence as to how effective these arrangements are in practice. For example, it will take time to assess whether the experiences of tangata whenua regarding the recognition and protection of their waahi tapu are at a level that enables them to practice rangatiratanga and kaitiakitanga. Similarly, what impacts these arrangements will have on local government planning improvement and priorities are presently unknown.

Cultural Heritage Management

International experiences suggest that it not an easy process to implement practices that protect cultural heritage or landscapes.³⁰ As a bottom line, Smith, Morgan & van der Meer (2003) argue

²⁹ Local Government New Zealand, 2011, p. 9.

³⁰ See Porter (2006).

that management processes are ultimately about finding formal ways of *managing conflict*. They posit that conflict arises because of different knowledge and disciplines, and the subsequent meanings held by communities and professionals:

Above all, cultural heritage management is about managing conflict. At one level it is about managing conflict over heritage places and how they should be used. At another level it is about managing conflict over the meanings given to heritage and the past and how these meanings are used in the present.³¹

As an example Smith *et al* (2003) refer to archaeology and its application in heritage management. They argue that contemporary archaeology tends to control and sideline indigenous forms of knowledge about an area. This can result in clashes between “official” (archaeological knowledge and processes) and “unofficial” (indigenous knowledge and processes) ways of providing for cultural heritage management in local plans:

...It is archaeological knowledge, values and understandings about the meanings of the past that are often given primacy in any conflict. This in turn means that archaeological knowledge is often used, albeit sometimes without the consent of archaeologists, to regulate and arbitrate over conflicts over the meaning and disposition of heritage items or places. As a consequence, those interests or groups who draw on the past to reaffirm a sense of community and belonging may themselves become indirectly regulated by archaeological knowledge through cultural heritage management. Through this process, many communities, and indigenous communities in particular, come into conflict with the archaeological discipline.³²

The conflicts that can emerge from conventional heritage management are not merely technical. International experience suggests that cultural heritage conflicts are usually based around larger political and socio-cultural rights.³³ In these instances, research has found that effort and resources need to be put into place at the local government level in order to avoid conflict.³⁴ Targeted resources that focus on fully accommodating the unique and specific heritage knowledge of indigenous peoples in planning processes could improve outcomes. In parallel, local government

³¹ Smith, Morgan, & van der Meer, 2003, p. 67.

³² Ibid, pp. 67-68.

³³ See Porter (2006); Mutu (2010).

³⁴ Memmott & Long, 2002, p. 54.

agencies and indigenous communities both have a role in gauging and increasing public knowledge and appreciation of cultural heritage in district development.

New Zealand is no exception to heritage management conflicts. As identified earlier, this is particularly obvious in relation to non-Māori organisations such as local government working with Māori heritage sites.³⁵ Because waahi tapu can concern properties that are not “seen”, “touched”, “monitored”, “recorded” and therefore understood by local officials, a disjuncture can occur between both groups. Memmott & Long (2002) explain this disjuncture:

The cultural heritage of Indigenous sacred place and geography is one of intellectual complexity and beauty, but not one that can be readily detected or defined using conventional archaeological methods. Any external attack on such places is often an attack on Aboriginal identity since such identity is defined within a cognitive domain of place-specific knowledge and invisible properties of place.³⁶

Sites, intangible and tangible, deemed sacred by tangata whenua remain vulnerable to new planning development because of population growth and transport demands. These demographic and development pressures can compromise the value and protection of any area for tangata whenua. A local and public example of this situation regards the construction of the Western Route Kāpiti Expressway. In this instance the New Zealand Transport Agency (NZTA) made an executive decision to build the new expressway “off the eastern corner of sacred Māori land at Waikanae, where it cuts between a sacred tree and an urupā”.³⁷

In sum, traditional archaeological and conventional planning practices – grounded within Western scientific and processual approaches believed to be “expert, neutral and value-free” – tend to be unhelpful on their own. Such processes need to become nestled within an integrated approach that is adopted by tangata whenua and council regarding cultural heritage planning.³⁸

If an integrated approach is not adopted, and standardised non-Māori rules of resource management planning are used to quantify and qualify waahi tapu, such measures will fall short of

³⁵ See Whangaparita *et al* (2003); Barton & Thom (2010); Cheyne & Tawhai (2007); Selby, Moore & Mulholland (2010).

³⁶ Memmott & Long, 2002, Pp. 51-52.

³⁷ The Dominion Post, “Buy up homes and let people move on”, Saturday, May 7, 2011, A9.

³⁸ Porter, 2006, p. 361.

appreciating the importance of areas sacred to Kāpiti tangata whenua, and of importance to rate-payers generally. For example, this situation can create delays in consent processes for all parties, and further rupture the relationship between tangata whenua and the territorial authority. In these cases, evidence suggests a more nuanced way of integrating knowledge and practices will be needed in local government legislation, policy and planning:

Cultural landscapes and Indigenous knowledge are valid components of cultural heritage theory, as demonstrated in recent discourses on cultural heritage management. Consequently, cultural landscapes and Indigenous knowledge must also be valid components of cultural heritage practice. Problems of management and implementation are important, but they are mechanistic problems. They must be dealt with at the legislative and policy levels.

There is a genuine desire by many heritage professionals, despite legislative constraints, to work towards a cultural heritage practice that supports the integration of archaeology, cultural heritage and Indigenous knowledge.³⁹

³⁹ Prangnell, Ross & Coghill, 2010, p. 152.

2. Local Government & Iwi Policy Provisions

National Legislation

The KCDC District Plan provisions for waahi tapu are based on a number of national laws that regulate public conservation, reserves and heritage areas. Included in this suite of legislation are land and heritage areas that directly concern tangata whenua and waahi tapu. Legislation that are explicit in acknowledging waahi tapu include:

- Land Transfer Act (1952)
- The Reserves Act (1977)
- The QEII National Trust Act (1977)
- The Conservation Act (1987)
- The Resource Management Act (1991)
- The Historic Places Act (1993)
- The Te Ture Whenua Māori Act (1993)
- The Resource Management Amendment Act (2003)
- Overseas Investment Act (2005)
- Marine and Coastal Area (Takutai Moana) Act (2011)
- Treaty of Waitangi Claim Settlements and Special Legislation.

This legislative backdrop regarding waahi tapu is also influenced by the *Local Government Act* (LGA) (2002), which was created to enable “democratic local decision-making and action by, and on behalf of, communities.” The LGA states that social, economic, environmental and cultural wellbeing must also be considered in the present and future by local government.⁴⁰

In relation to tangata whenua and local government, sections 14 and 82 of the Act stipulate that local authorities are required to:

- Establish and maintain processes to provide opportunities for Māori to contribute to local

⁴⁰ See sections 14(1)(b) & (c) of the Local Government Act (2002).

decision-making

- Consider ways in which the local authority can foster the development of Māori capacity to contribute to decision-making processes
- Provide relevant information to Māori in the community.

The LGA enables local authorities to play a leading role in promoting the well-being and sustainable development of communities. As part of this over-arching aim, enhancing the capacity of Māori to participate in decisions regarding waahi tapu is explicit. The LGA (2002) states that if local authorities are considering any option concerning land or a body of water, they must:

...Take into account the relationship of Māori and their culture and traditions with their ancestral land, water, sites, waahi tapu, valued flora and fauna, and other taonga.⁴¹

These provisions are given added authority under the *Resource Management Amendment Act* (2003), which requires local authority decision-makers to:

...Recognise and provide for the ancestral relationship of Maori and their culture and traditions with their ancestral lands, water, waahi tapu and other taonga.⁴²

Further, the RMA stipulates that local government must:

...Take into account any relevant planning document recognised by an iwi authority, and lodged with the council, to the extent that its content has a bearing on resource management issues of the region when preparing or changing a regional policy statement, or regional plan or district plan.⁴³

Wellington Regional Council Regional Policy Statement (operative plan)

The Wellington Regional Council (WRC) is responsible for the management of natural and physical

⁴¹ See section 77(1)(c).

⁴² See sections 6(e), 6(f), 6(g), and 7.

⁴³ See sections 66(2A) & 74(2A).

resources of the Wellington Region, including land, water, air, soil, minerals and energy, all forms of plants and animals and all structures.⁴⁴ It prepares and implements policy for the management of these resources under Section 30 of the RMA. As a result, the regional council prepares a Regional Policy Statement (RPS) in accordance with this Act. The RPS has a number of policies that directly concern waahi tapu, these include:

- *Policy 48 Avoiding adverse effects on matters of significance to tangata whenua*: This means that when Council considers a resource consent application, or a plan change the WRC must have regard to avoiding adverse effects on “places, sites and areas with significant spiritual or cultural historic heritage value to tangata whenua”.⁴⁵
- *Policy 21 Protecting historic heritage values – district and regional plans*: Avoid the destruction of unidentified archaeological sites and waahi tapu with significant historic heritage values.

Linked to these policies concerning waahi tapu are two policy objectives:

- Resource management with tangata whenua (Objective 27, 1); and
- Historic Heritage (Objective 15, 2b).

Kāpiti Coast District Council District Plan

The KCDC district plan must give effect to the RPS and any national policy statements and national environmental standards. Subsequently, policies specific to tangata whenua are contained within section C6 of the current KCDC District Plan (DP).⁴⁶ Section C.6.1 of the DP is headed by objective 1.0, which relates to the Treaty of Waitangi and states that KCDC must:

⁴⁴ Proposed Wellington Regional Policy Statement, May, 2010, p. 7.

⁴⁵ Ibid, p. 168.

⁴⁶ The District Plan is currently under review. A Tangata Whenua District Plan Review Working Party has been established to provide meaningful tangata whenua contributions and additions to this process.

Take into account the principles of the Treaty of Waitangi when managing the resources of the Kāpiti Coast, have particular regard to Kaitiakitanga in the management of the Districts resources and ensure the relationship of the tangata whenua with the natural environment in the District is recognised and provided for.⁴⁷

Section C6, which is based on the provisions of the RMA (1991) and the values of Kāpiti Coast mana whenua, goes on to state that:

...the visions and the priorities set by individual communities in pursuing sustainable management should be reflected in resource allocation decisions. Tangata Whenua will seek to play an active role in making these decisions, to incorporate cultural and spiritual values and associations with the natural world.⁴⁸

Policy 4 (C-4 & 5) of the KCDC district plan aims to “protect waahi tapu, sites of cultural importance and other taonga from desecration.” In particular it states that “any desecration of these sites/areas is abhorrent to Tangata Whenua” and that “activities which constitute desecration vary according to the nature of the site, including physical desecration, e.g. earthworks, or cultural desecration.” The policy also takes into account the provisions of the Historic Places Act (1993), as some sites in the Kāpiti District are subject to protection under this legislation.

Iwi Management Plans

The *Iwi Management Plan for Ōtaki River and Catchment* (2001) is the sole Iwi Management Plan (IMP) lodged officially with KCDC. In a similar vein to other IMPs, the plan establishes a vision for the exercise of kaitiakitanga, with particular reference to the Ōtaki River and catchments.

The Plan sets out objectives and policies that afforded Te Rūnanga o Raukawa with preparing “a set of environmental principles, after full consultation with Ngāti Raukawa Whanui, to guide Ngāti Raukawa consideration of and participant in the management of natural and physical resources”.⁴⁹ Since this statement was made in 2001, there does not appear to be any base-line environmental policies put into place.

⁴⁷ See C6-2.

⁴⁸ See C6-1.

⁴⁹ Te Rūnanga o Raukawa, 2001, p. 37.

The fact that there are no specific plans that aim to protect and enhance waahi tapu throughout the district is problematic. However, the current review of the district plan by the Tangata Whenua District Plan Review Working Party, will potentially contribute to strengthening waahi tapu provisions. In addition, Te Whakaminenga continues to advocate for building the capacity of iwi to protect their waahi tapu.⁵⁰ While Territorial Local Authorities around the country are making moves to protect waahi tapu (Jefferies & Kennedy, 2009) the Waitangi Tribunal has criticised the RMA as being relatively ineffective. In protecting waahi tapu, they suggest more collaboration between government authorities, local government and Māori:

We recommend that the Resource Management Act (1991) be made more consistently effective for the protection of waahi tapu and taonga (which the crown has conceded is not always the case), and that the Government, local authorities, and Māori should work together to publicise the protection measures available under it and ensure their use to the fullest extent possible in this context, we note the difference between archaeological sites and living' waahi tapu, known and valued by claimants today. One possible way forward would be for working groups of tangata whenua, crown officials, and local authorities, formed under the Resource Management Act, to locate those living waahi tapu most in need of protection.⁵¹

⁵⁰ Kāpiti Coast District Council, 2007, p. 43.

⁵¹ Cited in Jefferies & Kennedy, 2009, p. 58.

3. Research Methodology & Methods

Māori society has its own distinctive knowledge base. This knowledge base has its origins in the metaphysical realm and emanates as a kaupapa Māori ‘body of knowledge’ accumulated by experiences through history, of the Māori people. This kaupapa Māori knowledge is the systematic organisation of beliefs, experience, understandings and interpretations of the interaction of Māori people upon Māori people, and Māori people upon the world.⁵²

This waahi tapu research project is informed and underpinned by research promoting iwi, hapū and whānau development models promoted by Dr. Te Ahukaramū Charles Royal, Dr. Monty Soutar, Professor Hirini Moko Mead, Parekāwhia McLean and others.⁵³

Kaupapa Māori Research Methodology

This research utilised a kaupapa Māori methodology that offers a specific ethical approach to undertaking research by Māori, with Māori, for Māori, under tikanga Māori. The legitimacy of this methodology is embedded in research generating primary benefits and knowledge for whānau, hapū and iwi Māori.⁵⁴

In order to work alongside iwi members who have knowledge of waahi tapu in their area, the project has been firmly based within iwi and hapū structures. As a hapū and iwi-based researcher, I believe that the inherited values of kaitiakitanga, rangatiratanga, pūkengatanga, ūkaipōtanga, wairuatanga, manaakitanga and te reo Māori⁵⁵ are the appropriate tools to guide in the conservation, restoration, general management and protection of waahi tapu. These *kaupapa tuku iho*⁵⁶ have provided a useful and relevant framework for carrying out a research project of this nature. They are values that have been inherent in the way work has been taken forward with iwi and hapū participants.

⁵² Cited in Pihama, 2001, p. 77.

⁵³ See Selby & Laurie, 2005.

⁵⁴ See Pere & Barnes, 2009; Smith, 1999; Bevan-Brown, 1998.

⁵⁵ For more information on these inherited values see Māori Economic Taskforce (2011). *He Ōranga Hapori: A model for raising Māori community wellbeing*. Te Rōpū

⁵⁶ Winiata (2009) explains that *kaupapa tuku iho* “are among the treasures that we inherited from tūpuna Māori”, and “these values can contribute to being innovative in our activities as Māori” (p. 1).

Kaupapa Māori methodologies focus on strengthening iwi knowledge of their local environments. There is a cultural and ethical imperative that creating and recording scarce cultural and environmental knowledge, such as waahi tapu, must be available in a medium that is useful and accessible for future generations. A kaupapa Māori approach aims to enhance the understanding of iwi about waahi tapu and its qualities in relation to a unique identity, and as a means of enhancing the cultural heritage of the Kāpiti Coast. This waahi tapu research project has aimed to increase and preserve the body of knowledge available to iwi members now and into the future.

The approach used in this research process has specifically encouraged:

- *Manaakitanga*: ensuring participant needs are met to the best of my ability
- *Whakapapa*: acknowledgement of our genealogical connection to kaumātua and other informants, which strengthens relationships
- *Rangatiratanga*: assertion of whānau, hapū and iwi self-determination through involvement in the research process
- *Pūkengatanga*: supporting and promoting local and specific information.

Upholding the above values has been vital in progressing the research. Unlike other research projects that begin and end within a committed timeframe, utilising a kaupapa Māori approach within my own rohe regarding environmental issues such as this, has resulted in on-going relationships with participants. This relationship is on the one hand an opportunity to celebrate whakapapa and whanaungatanga, kotahitanga and manaakitanga, however these relationships will not simply be relinquished at the conclusion of this project, but rather will continue on for decades, and could quite probably become inter-generational. This relationship continuity is part of a process of whanaungatanga that is a hallmark of the selected methodology and method, as Wihongi (2002) explains:

Kinship connections or whakapapa connections are those connections, which are established between whānau members who have a common descendent. The

reciprocal responsibilities, which existed between these kin, are culturally bound relationships and behaviors. For example kaumatua are considered to hold a wealth of information around tikanga and kawa. Hence guidance is sought from these people with respect to whānau processes.⁵⁷

Cultural Supervision & Safety Protocols

The nature of this research project has meant a number of cultural considerations have needed to be planned for. In mid-2010 a Waahi Tapu Reference Group (WTRG) was established in order to guide the research process and provide on-going advice. This group is comprised of iwi representatives of Te Āti Awa ki Whakarongotai, Ngāti Raukawa, Ngāti Toarangatira.. The advice provided and sought included physical (access and information regarding sites) and spiritual safety (blessings, rites of passage protocols). This has been crucial in allowing the research process to unfold in a manner that is consistent with local tikanga and local kawa. In addition to this research group, a risk management and communications strategy was put together and followed in order to ensure personal, participant and research safety.⁵⁸

Methods

This research utilises qualitative, semi-structured, in-depth interview methods, used widely in national and international oral history research.⁵⁹ Such methods are conducive in working with iwi and hapū members. They allow for a natural conversation to occur between me as a researcher/whānau member, and participating whānau, hapū and iwi. This project has adhered to the cultural and ethical guidelines developed by Pipi *et al* (2004) and adapted here.⁶⁰

The rights and welfare of participants is of the greatest importance, and has been taken seriously throughout the undertaking of this research. In parallel to the process of conducting qualitative

⁵⁷ Wihongi, 2002, p. 2.

⁵⁸ These cultural supervision & safety protocols are contained in Appendix 1.

⁵⁹ See Selby & Laurie, 2005.

⁶⁰ These guidelines are contained in Appendix 2.

work with mana whenua, I have also consulted historical documents, and relevant texts regarding iwi and the history of the Kāpiti Coast.

The Research Process

Working with three connected yet distinct iwi in relation to their waahi tapu is not straightforward. Each iwi has its own way of maintaining knowledge regarding waahi tapu. As such, they have all adopted different approaches to classifying areas of significance. Variation exists regarding how information has been passed down and shared within iwi and towards external organisations. Some complex and challenging issues arose during the research process, which reflect the general challenges regarding waahi tapu research outlined earlier.⁶¹ The main challenges have included:

- *Scarce iwi knowledge*: It was common for iwi knowledge regarding waahi tapu to rest with only a handful of individuals. Creating the time and space to speak with these individuals has been inconsistent. Such individuals are often iwi leaders with specialised knowledge regarding their iwi and hapū. As a result they are often over-committed to various and competing projects regarding iwi affairs and development. This has meant time to build rapport and trust and gather information has been constrained.
- *Reliance on secondary historical sources*: It was common for iwi to have relied on previous historical works, such as Adkin (1948) and Carkeek (1966) for details about their waahi tapu. While these books offer important records and historical information about the district, they are not an absolute substitute for local iwi, hapū and whānau knowledge regarding their waahi tapu.
- *Inconsistent levels of information and availability*: Some waahi tapu are well researched and known publically, while others are not. For example Rangiātea (Mūtīkotiko) Church is known to hold a high level of cultural importance to mana whenua and Māori generally. Information regarding the Church is accessible and abundant. Therefore protections are

⁶¹ See pp. 5-6 of this report.

fairly straightforward. In contrast, the urupā existing on privately owned farmland, which has inadequate fencing and protection is less straightforward. This may be due to a low level of knowledge of the farmer coupled with limited iwi knowledge by local mana whenua of the specific site. In addition, some information may be contested amongst iwi members, or not representative of the full collective.

The dynamics above have compromised the information gathering for this project. While a component of the research work has been based on library, archive and desktop searches, the majority of the work is reliant on people, their willingness, time and good-will.

Overall, the difficulties associated with finding a large cross-section of iwi members knowledgeable about waahi tapu on the Kāpiti Coast demonstrates the decline of cultural knowledge in the district. This is the sad reality being faced by the researcher and indeed the iwi. It also highlights the importance of this work and the process involved in gaining the information.

4. **Proposed Classification System**

To properly assess place-based knowledge systems and to formulate strategies which allow their Indigenous owners to protect and maintain them, it is necessary to map entire cultural landscapes and corridors and their dynamic and holistic cognitive properties, rather than merely selecting isolated 'best-example' sites to record and protect. However, cultural landscapes, as opposed to isolated cultural sites, impede large-scale economic exploitation of the environment. Whereas miners, pastoralists, foresters, etc. may be quite prepared to leave isolated 'islands' of sites within their development areas, statutory recognition of the value of a cultural landscape is likely to preclude development for the most. There is thus a basic conflict of interest which, without adequate legislative (as well as political) support, mitigates against the preservation and maintenance of cultural landscapes.⁶²

Scope

The current review of the District Plan (2009-2012) has enabled the inclusion of additional waahi tapu sites to be given protection by the council. This is the first time a large number of these sites have been identified in a systematic way by tangata whenua and KCDC. Including these sites in the District Plan will provide a more robust protective system and enhance the district's cultural heritage in general.

Initially, Te Whakaminenga identified 474 waahi tapu sites to be added into the District Plan. These waahi tapu were sourced from historical literature such as Adkin (1948) and Carkeek (1966). However, since initiating this research project, work with Te Whakaminenga and iwi members has resulted in an increase of sites to 622 sites.⁶³

These additional sites include pits and middens, terraces and stonewalls located in subdivisions and other areas under development in the district. In addition, some of the 596 sites are known to exist on traditional iwi boundaries. This results in some of these areas overlapping with iwi boundaries.

⁶² Memmott & Long, 2002, p. 53.

⁶³ As at 02 March 2012

Classification System

Below is an overview of the proposed classification system used for the waahi tapu sites collected to date:

- *Establishment of Database:* The database system has been created using the most up to date and user-friendly technology available. This is so multiple forms of information can be uploaded and sustained over time. It is also envisaged that the database can be developed by each of the iwi to include other meta-data that the iwi may deem as appropriate. The aim is to provide a database that is accessible and practical for iwi members and respective KCDC staff. The database will be of interest because it will hold information concerning the public sphere, alongside private information, iwi and council planning, and relevant Treaty claim information. The database will not only be the major information management tool but it will be home to all of the information gathered for the project. This will include maps, pictures, old and new site photos, soundclips from interviews, newspaper articles, literature, GPS points, and anything else gathered over the course of the project.
- *Priority sites:* Iwi have identified a total of 25-30 sites each (per iwi) of specific significance to them. The criteria for selection of these sites differed from iwi to iwi. Different levels of sensitivity exist surrounding the information shared for the system, and their priority. An indicator system has been developed in order to demonstrate the level of sensitivity regarding each site and piece of information.
- *Database indicators:* There are three levels of sensitivity regarding the site on the database. This has been established to manage the information. In each instance (regardless of sensitivity) the iwi is to be contacted if a site is to be approached or works undertaken in the vicinity. Accidental Discovery Protocol also remain regardless of site and location. Each site within the database will be colour coded as below:

- **Red** indicates a highly sensitive site for iwi. In this case limited information may be shared with KCDC, therefore the site is not publicly available. This site should be protected. The site report will reflect this level of sensitivity. Iwi should be spoken to when further information (over and above what is displayed in the site report) is required.
 - **Amber** indicates a cautionary approach. Some information on this site is available publicly but some information will be withheld by iwi. In this instance KCDC staff should recognise that a site exists, but iwi are to be spoken to regarding the site.
 - **Green** refers to sites where information is accessible to the public. Information can be read via the site report however it would be prudent to discuss these sites when required.
 - If sites are deemed **Red** or **Amber** and more information is requested, written permission that includes justifications of why more information is requested must be made to the respective iwi. Based on the information provided, the respective iwi will then make a decision regarding access to information about the site(s) under question.
- *Classification key:* In addition to the database colour indicators, a classification key has also been further developed in order to designate different waahi tapu. For example, various symbols will be used to indicate whether the site relates to ahu, pā tuna, whenua, mahinga kai, urupā, kāinga, middens, pits etc.
 - *Waahi Tapu Template:* Iwi will have been asked to provide baseline information for a “waahi tapu template”. This template will be used to gather initial information regarding the site(s). A waahi tapu researcher will then provide research and analysis and complete a site report for each site.

6. Recommendations

The proposed classification system has various associated benefits. The system aims to enhance manaakitanga, while upholding the inherited values of kaitiakitanga, tikanga, mauri, tapu and noa associated with waahi tapu. A literature search of Māori-specific plan provisions⁶⁴ has identified elements that are helpful for local government and mana whenua in protecting and enhancing waahi tapu. Based on this research, and the experience of working locally with iwi, below is a set of recommendations that aim to augment a relevant Cultural Heritage Inventory and waahi tapu protection system for the Kāpiti Coast:

Continuous System Improvement:

- I. KCDC continue to work with tangata whenua to determine how information on areas of significant value are identified and recorded, and how such areas should be protected.
- II. KCDC continue to work with tangata whenua to identify areas that may need to have public access limited, which would protect significant tangata whenua values that are vulnerable to disturbance.
- III. KCDC to continue to collaborate with tangata whenua, to create a set of appropriate waahi tapu enforcement provisions that are reviewed periodically.
- IV. KCDC to support further research into cultural precincts that enhance the understanding of the KCDC, the public, and tangata whenua about the interconnectedness of sites (eg: pā, urupā, cultivations, tuahu, mahinga kai sites, transportation routes). This is vital in gaining a better appreciation for sites and their surrounding areas, rather than 'sites' alone.

⁶⁴ See Jefferies & Kennedy (2009b).

Development of Waahi Tapu Provisions:

- I. Create effective provisions in the district plan that ensure resource consents and subdivision rules and standards recognise the relationship tangata whenua have with their ancestral lands, water sites, waahi tapu and taonga.
- II. Where a resource consent application provides for the return of waahi tapu to iwi or hapū, the positive effects on iwi will be taken into account.
- III. Where waahi tapu are kept or returned to tangata whenua, processes for ownership are established as “Maori Reserves” under Te Ture Whenua Māori Act/Māori Land Act (1993) and kept within the ownership of appropriate iwi or hapū.
- IV. Provide contracts to iwi and hapū to help protect, maintain and/or restore sites with significant historic or cultural values; or compensate the full actual costs of any permanent loss of mana whenua values.

Conduct further cultural heritage research:

- I. Conduct a public awareness survey that gauges public awareness regarding the district’s cultural and natural heritage values.
- V. Based on the results of the cultural heritage survey, develop and implement cultural heritage education programmes in order to raise public awareness of cultural and natural heritage in the district.

8. Conclusion

The Kāpiti Coast has a long history of Māori settlement and migration. As a result there are multiple areas and sites of significance to tangata whenua. Raising the awareness about the tangible and intangible importance of waahi tapu to district rate-payers and tangata whenua is difficult and complicated. Indeed, through incorporating a kaupapa Māori research methodology, this report has found that there is scarce and declining iwi knowledge regarding waahi tapu in the district.

Currently iwi and hapū rely heavily on secondary sources for information about their traditional areas and boundaries. In addition there is no consistent way that iwi hold and share such valuable information. Again, these elements can be seen as symptomatic of New Zealand's colonial history, a lack of local provisions that maintain waahi tapu integrity over time, a loss of Māori cultural knowledge, and low levels of public awareness generally.

However, since initiating this project, there has been an increase of recorded waahi tapu, from 474 to in excess of 621 sites. And this is an important accomplishment. By developing a classification and protection system (as described in section 6), the district's landscape, character and heritage will be improved. A well-developed and regularly reviewed waahi tapu classification system has the potential to enhance manaakitanga, while upholding the inherited values of kaitiakitanga, tikanga, mauri, tapu and noa.

Based on the recommendations given in this report, a robust Cultural Inventory System developed by KCDC and tangata whenua will work towards fulfilling the vision as outlined by the Māori Heritage Council. A well-developed classification system will benefit the working relationship between iwi and KCDC, through raising bi-cultural awareness, and practical actions that take place to halt the decline of the district's unique cultural heritage.

References

Adkin, G.L. (1948). *Horowhenua: Its Māori Place-Names and Their Topographical and Historical Background*. Department of Internal Affairs: Wellington.

Barlow, C. (2001). *Tikanga Whakaaro: Key Concepts in Māori Culture*. Oxford University Press: Auckland.

Barton, & Pipi. (2010). *Te Tahuanui: Ngāti Hikairo Heritage Management Plan*. Te Rūnanganui o Ngāti Hikairo: Kawhia.

Carkeek, W.C. (1966). *The Kāpiti Coast: Māori History and Place Names*. A.H. & A.W. Reed: Wellington.

Cheyne, C. & Tawhai, V. (2007). *He wharemoa te rakau, ka mahue: Māori engagement with local government: Knowledge, experiences, and recommendations*. School of People, Environment and Planning, Massey University: Palmerston North.

See: <http://mro.massey.ac.nz/bitstream/handle/10179/552/hwtrct.pdf?sequence=3>

Durie, M. (1998). *Te Mana, Te Kawanatanga: The Politics of Māori Self-Determination*. Oxford University Press: Auckland.

Jefferies, R. & Kennedy, N. (2009). *Māori Outcome Evaluation: A Kaupapa Māori Outcomes and Indicators Framework and Methodology*. The International Global Change Institute & The University of Waikato. The University of Waikato: Hamilton.

See: http://www.waikato.ac.nz/igci/pucm/mr/mr1_moe.pdf

Jefferies, R. & Kennedy, N. (2009b). *Māori Provisions in Plans: Mana Whenua, Mauri of Water, and Waahi Tapu*. The International Global Change Institute & The University of Waikato. The University of Waikato: Hamilton.

See: http://www.waikato.ac.nz/igci/pucm/mr/mr3_mpp.pdf

Kāpiti Coast District Council (1999). *District Plan Objectives and Policies*. Kāpiti Coast District Council: Paraparaumu.

See: <http://www.kapiticoast.govt.nz/Forms-Documents/Policy-and-Strategy/>

Kāpiti Coast District Council (2007). *The History of Te Whakaminenga o Kāpiti*. Kāpiti Coast District Council: Paraparaumu.

Kāpiti Coast District Council (2000). *Strategic Plan*. Kāpiti Coast District Council: Paraparaumu.

See: <http://www.kapiticoast.govt.nz/Forms-Documents/Policy-and-Strategy/>

Kawharu, M (Ed.) (2002). *Whenua: Managing Our Resources*. Reed New Zealand: Auckland.

Local Government New Zealand (2011). *Local Authorities and Māori: Case studies of local arrangements*. Local Government New Zealand: Wellington.

See: http://www.lgnz.co.nz/library/files/store_024/000000507784.pdf

Maclea, C (1999). *Kāpiti*. Whitcombe Press: Wellington.

Māori Heritage Council (2009). *Tapuwae: The Māori Heritage Council Statemnet on Māori Heritage – A vision of places of Māori heritage*. New Zealand Historic Places Trust: Wellington.

See:

<http://www.historic.org.nz/Publications/~media/Corporate/Files/Publications/Tapuwae%20English.ashx>

Māori Economic Taskforce (2011). *He Ōranga Hapori: A model for raising Māori community wellbeing*. Te Rōpū Pakihi: Ōtaki.

See: <http://www.tpk.govt.nz/documents/taskforce/met-rep-heorangahapori-2011.pdf>

Marsden, M. (T.A.C. Royal Ed.) (2003). *The Woven Universe: Selected Writings of Rev. Māori Marsden*. The Estate of Rev. Māori Marsden: Ōtaki.

Memmot, P. & Long, S. (2002). Place Theory and Place Maintenance in Indigenous Australia. *Urban Policy and Research*, Vol. 20, No. 1.

Mead, H.M. (2003). *Tikanga Māori: Living by Māori Values*. Huia Publishers: Wellington.

Mutu, M. (2010). Ngāti Kahu kaitiakitanga. In Selby, R., Moore, P., Mulholland, M., (Eds.). *Māori and the environment: Kaitiakitanga*. Huia Publishers: Wellington

Pihama, L. (2001). *Tihei Mauri Ora: Honouring Our Voices. Mana Waahine as a Kaupapa Māori Theoretical Framework*. Unpublished PhD. The University of Auckland: Auckland.

See: http://www.kaupapamaori.com/assets//PihamaL/tihei_mauri_ora_chpt1.pdf

Porter, L. (2006). Rights or Containment? The Politics of Aboriginal Cultural Heritage in Victoria. *Australian Geographer*, Vol. 37, No. 3. Pp. 355-374, November.

Prangnell, J., Ross, A., & Coghill, B. (2010). Power Relations and Community Involvement in Landscape-Based Cultural Heritage Management Practice: An Australian Case Study. *International Journal of Heritage Studies*, Vol. 16, Nos. 1-2, January-March, pp. 140-155.

Selby, R., Moore, P., & Mullholland, M. (Eds.) (2010). *Māori and the Environment: Kaitiaki*. Huia Publishers: Wellington.

Selby, R., Laurie, A.J. (2005). *Māori and Oral History: A Collection*. National Oral History of New Zealand: Wellington.

Te Puni Kōkiri (1996). *Sites of Significance Process*. Te Puni Kōkiri: Wellington.

The Dominion Post, "Buy up homes and let people move on", Saturday, May 7, 2011, A9.

UNESCO (1998). *Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention*. Paragraph 38, p. 9.

See: <http://whc.unesco.org/archive/opguide99.pdf>

Walker R. (1990). *Ka Whaiwhai Tonu Matou: Struggle Without End*. Penguin Books: Auckland.

Wihongi, H. (2002). *The Process of Whakawhanaungatanga in Kaupapa Māori Research*. Australia & New Zealand Third Sector Research Sixth Biennial Conference: Doing Well. November 27 – 29, 2002, Auckland.

Winiata, W. (2009). *How Kaupapa Contribute to Innovative Activities*. Our People, Our Future Conference, 1-2 September. Ōtaki: Te Wānanga-o-Raukawa.

Whangaparita, L., Awatere, S., Nikora, L. (2003). *Māori Perspectives of the Environment: Summary Document*. Technical Report No. 6. Māori and Psychology Research Unit, The University of Waikato & Manaaki Whenua Landcare Research: Hamilton.

Smith, L.T. (1999). *Decolonizing Methodologies: Research and Indigenous Peoples*. Zed Books: London.

Smith, L., Morgan, A., & van der Meer, A. (2003). Community-driven Research in Cultural Heritage Management: the Waanyi Women's History Project. *International Journal of Heritage Studies*, Vol. 9, No. 1.

Bibliography

- Awatere, S. (2003). *Tangata Whenua Perspectives*. In Technical Review No 24, New Zealand Land Treatment Collective & Manaaki Whenua Landcare Research.
- Boast, R., Erueti, A., McPhail, D., Smith, N.F. (Eds.) *Māori Land Law*. LexisNexis: Wellington.
- Hayward, J., & Wheen, N.R., (2004). *The Waitangi Tribunal: Te Roopu Whakamana i te Tiriti o Waitangi*. Bridget William Books: Wellington.
- Kawharu, M. (Ed) (2002). *Whenua: Managing our resources*. Raupō Publishing Ltd: Auckland.
- Mead, H.M. (2003). *Tikanga Māori: Living by Māori Values*. Huia Publishers & Te Awanuiarangi: Wellington.
- Minhinnick, N. (1989). *Kaitiaki*. Auckland: Nganeko Kauhau Minhinnick.
- Patterson, J. (1992). *Exploring Maori values*. Dunmore Press: Palmerston North.
- Ryan, P.M. *The Raupō Dictionary of Modern Māori: Māori-English, English-Māori*. Raupō Publishing Ltd: Auckland.
- Te Whāiti, P., McCarthy, M., & Durie, A. (1997). *Mai i Rangiātea Māori Wellbeing and Development*. Auckland University Press: Auckland.
- Williams, H.W. (1985). *A Dictionary of the Māori language*. Legislation Direct: Wellington.
- Winiata, P. (2003). *Guiding Kaupapa of Te Wānanga-o-Raukawa*. Te Wānanga-o-Raukawa: Ōtaki.

Glossary of Māori Environmental Values

Hapū

Definitions: Sub-tribe; pregnant; section of a large tribe; clan; secondary tribe

Explanation: A smaller collective of families, which when combined or brought together create a tribe (see 'Iwi') of Māori people. It is also known as a state of pregnancy of a woman.

Iwi

Definition: Tribe

Explanation: The largest political unit in Māori society, comprised of many sub-tribes (see 'Hapū'). An ariki or paramount chief is the leader of the tribe. A tribe normally occupies a particular area of land, which has been in their possession for many generations.

Kaitiaki

Definitions: Spiritual assistants of the gods; spiritual minders of the elements of the natural world; guardian; tribal custodians; tribal guardian(s); keeper; preserver; conservator; foster-parent; protector; messengers between the spirit and human worlds

Explanation: The responsibility incumbent on tribal members in a particular area to be guardians of a resource for future generations.

Kaitiakitanga

Definitions: Guardianship; trusteeship; resource management; preservation; conservation; fostering; protecting; sheltering; accountability; maintain

Explanation: The exercise of guardianship by tangata whenua of an area in accordance with tikanga Māori in relation to natural and physical resources; this includes the ethic of stewardship.

Acting so as to preserve and maintain taonga (see 'Taonga'). Ensuring safety in all activities.

Underlying this concept is a clear line of accountability to whānau, hapū and iwi. It is a holistic approach in that it provides for restoration of damaged ecological systems, restoration of ecological harmony, increased usefulness of resources, and reduced risk to present and future generations.

The resources of earth do not belong to man but rather, man belonged to the earth. Man [sic] as well as animal, bird, fish could harvest the bounty of mother earth's resources but they did not own them. Man [sic] had but 'user rights'.

Kaupapa tuku iho

Explanation: The treasures inherited from tūpuna Māori. These constitute values that can contribute to being innovative in activities as Māori.

Mauri

Definitions: Life principle or life essence of all living things; life force; metaphysical force that all living beings possess; vitality; the elemental essence imparted by wairua (see 'Wairua').

Explanation: All natural and physical resources possess mauri. Everything has a mauri, including people, fish, animals, birds, forest, land, seas, and rivers: the mauri is that power which permits these living things to exist within their own realm and sphere. No one can control their own mauri or life-existence. Loss or pollution of this spiritual life principle deprives its basis of the protection of the gods, a fact that spells disaster to it.

Mauri seems to be whatever it is in an ecosystem which is conducive to the continued good health of the ecosystem. All matter, organic and non-organic, has an intrinsic dynamic core that confers an element of uniqueness, but within a network of interacting entities.

Tangible and non-tangible divides become irrelevant since objects are seen as having a life-force that contradicts and notion of inertness. The mauri principle can also be quantified; a chemical analysis, for example, will reveal the composition of an object and its relationship to other elements within the environment while qualitative accounts will be able to determine how the object is perceived by others.

Mana whenua

Definitions: Sovereign status; customary authority over lands; territorial rights; power associated with the possession of lands; power of the ability of land to produce the bounties of nature

Explanation: A political idea used when laying claims to resources. Different levels of the hapū social order exercised different kinds of rights in the same area of land. Māori collectives who have retained authority/control in the land and can advance a variety of bases to support their claim.

If a group asserting authority over a locality waned over time through political misfortune a new group could replace it. It therefore makes more sense to speak of different groups and individuals *owning rights in the land* [sic], rather than owning land itself.

Manaakitanga

Definitions: Show respect or kindness to; entertain; care for; express love and hospitality towards people

Explanations: Mana enhancing behavior, taking care not to trample another's mana. In relationships we are aware of mana, our own and theirs.

Behaving in ways that elevate others; showing respect and consideration toward others; generosity and fulfilling reciprocal obligations.

Noa

Definitions: Free from tapu or any other restriction; just, merely

Explanation: This concept is used usually through prayer or incantation to lift the tapu of a person, object or landscape and make it safe. It is the opposite of 'tapu' (see 'Tapu').

Pūkengatanga

Definitions: Set of skills; teaching

Explanation: Teaching, preserving and creating knowledge as part of the mātauranga continuum with other ways of knowing.

Rāhui

Definitions: A mark to warn people against trespassing; protection; restriction; conservation.

Explanation: Rāhui are a form of social control designed to manage the interrelationship between people and the environment. They can be used in the case of tapu (see 'Tapu'), or for temporary protection of fruit, bird or fish. They can also be used to restrict the use of land, sea, rivers, forests and gardens. A rāhui would be put on a place or resource by a person, iwi, hapū or family with the 'mana' to enforce it and it would stay in place until it was lifted.

Rāhui generally take the form of temporary restrictions for either the protection of people (e.g. when there is a death at sea and fishing is unsafe) or as a conservation measure.

Rangatiratanga

Definitions: Independence; chiefly power; chieftainship; humility self-determination; leadership by example; self-management; authority; jurisdiction; sovereign rights; customary authority and control; sovereignty; generosity; altruism; diplomacy; knowledge for the benefit of people

Explanation: This term is used in Article 2 of Te Tiriti o Waitangi (1840). Tangata whenua have the authority to control and manage the resources within their territory. The importance of walking the talk, following through on commitments made, manaakitanga, integrity and honesty.

Exhibiting leadership by example; the ability to bind people together; following through on commitments

Tangata whenua are able to make binding decisions that affect tangata whenua affairs.

The advancement of Māori as Māori, and the protection of the environment for future generations.

Individual qualities include leadership and chieftainship over a social group, a hapū or iwi.

Within Pākehā law, rangatiratanga is defined as a lesser obligation and a lesser 'power' than the right and exercise of crown sovereignty.

Tapu

Definitions: The power and influence of the gods; sacredness; set aside

Explanation: Everything has inherent tapu because everything was created by Io (Supreme God), each after its kind or species. The land has tapu as well as the oceans, rivers, and forests, and all living things that are upon the earth. Man [sic] is tapu because he is created by the gods.

There is good tapu and there is bad tapu. We possess the capacity to choose what power or tapu we will follow.

Tapu has also been extended to include all kinds of restrictions and prohibitions, such as people with some contagious disease or people handling the dead, and women during menstruation.

Tikanga

Definitions: Guides to moral behavior; determining responsibilities and obligations and protecting the interests of future generations

Explanations: Tikanga is not a simple set of rules, instead the most appropriate tikanga for a group is at a given time and in response to a particular situation through a process of consensus reached over time and based both on tribal precedent and the exigencies of the moment.

Taonga

Definitions: An object or resource which is highly valued; items which are greatly reassured and respected; material and non-material elements, which shape a group's identity and status; treasure; property; a highly prized object

Explanations: Taonga means more than objects of tangible value. It includes cultural properties such as language, social properties including children and environmental properties – rivers, birds and special land sites

The person or object is removed from the sphere of the profane and put into the sphere of the sacred. It is untouchable, no longer to be put to common use.

Te Reo

Definitions: Language; the Māori language

Explanations: The repository of all that we are as Māori. The medium through which we as Māori articulate our world view. Without te reo, Māori people will not be able to maintain our uniqueness as a people.

Ūkaipōtanga

Definitions: Land; home; motherly figure

Explanations: The places Māori find ourselves, our strength, our energy. Having a place where you belong, where you count, where you are important and where you can contribute.

Waahi tapu

Definitions: Sacred spots/areas/places; cemetery; reserved ground

Explanations: Sites deemed sacred and which are imbued with a spirituality that distinguishes them from other areas.

Waahi tapu may be associated with creation stories of tangata whenua, a particular event (such as a battle or ceremony); it may be where the whenua (placenta) was returned to the earth, or where a certain type of valued resource was found.

Wairua

Definitions: Spirit(s); attitude; mood; soul

Explanations: All things have a spirit as well as a physical body; even the earth has a spirit, and so do the animals, birds, and the fish; mankind also has a spirit.

Spiritual and physical bodies were joined together as one by mauri.

The spirit is immortal.

Whakapapa

Definitions: Genealogy; to lay one thing upon another

Explanations: The foundation of the Māori world view. This is the genealogical descent of all living things from the gods (Ranginui and Papatūānuku) to the present time. We become one with these ancient spiritual powers and carry out our role in creation and contributing to our future.

Everything has a whakapapa: birds, fish, animals, trees, and every other living thing: soil, rocks and mountains also have a whakapapa.

A way of helping to define a person in time, place and position. It prescribes the degree, extent and size of the birthright: entitlements.

Whakapapa is a key attribute which validates membership into a whānau, hapū and iwi. From this fact the person gains access into the resources of the hapū and iwi although it may not be until adulthood is reached that one is able to experience the full benefits.

Whanaungatanga

Definitions: Relationships; interdependence; collectivity

Explanations: Whanaungatanga embraces whakapapa and focuses on relationships. A system of kinship, including rights and reciprocal obligations that underpin the social organisation of whānau, hapū and iwi. Being part of the larger whole, the collective.

Knowing you are not alone, but that you have a wider set of acquaintances that provide support, assistance, nurturing, guidance and direction when needed. Assuring others that they are not alone. Our people are our wealth.

Appendix 1: Cultural Supervision & Safety Protocols

Waahi Tapu Reference Group

It is important for this project to be positioned squarely as an iwi project – that is to be lead by iwi. In addition this project needs to be housed inside a kaupapa Māori framework for it to be a success, that is, *by iwi, for iwi, about iwi*. That said, the Kāpiti Coast District Council is fully supportive of this work.

It has therefore been the desire of members of Te Whakaminenga o Kapiti that an iwi steering group, namely the *Waahi Tapu Reference Group (WTRG)* be convened to guide the direction of this project. This group was brought together for their inaugural meeting on the 6th of July 2010. The Waahi Tapu Reference Group is open to the iwi members of Te Whakaminenga and they will co-opt support where and when it is required. This group is available to the researcher when assistance and advice is required.

Key roles of the WTRG are:

1. to provide direction and assistance to researcher
2. to advocate amongst iwi and hapu the need for this project
3. to report back to iwi and hapu
4. to assist in the establishment of processes that are appropriate for iwi and hapu
5. to support in establishing protocols around information management (particularly sensitive information)
6. to provide ongoing mentoring to the researcher
7. to provide cultural support when required by researcher

It is envisaged that the researcher will not inundate the steering committee with unnecessary requests and/or information, but rather gain assistance and support where required.

Risk Management

‘The right intention is the best form of insurance’.

As part of a ‘risk management’ plan, the researcher would like to establish a number of people that would be available to guide site visits to waahi tapu. This would include preparation for site visits, undertaking karakia when visiting and exiting sites and providing general advice about the site. It is envisaged that when the researcher needs to visit a certain site that he is accompanied by tangata whenua to ensure tikanga and kawa are upheld according to that particular iwi and/or hapū. If the iwi/hapu chooses to provide the location and therefore asks the researcher to visit alone, then it is hoped that all information that might be useful to the researcher has been shared (eg: places to go, places *not* to go).

Below are some generic guidelines and tikanga/kawa for visiting sites.

- Being aware of the weather forecast
- Notify colleagues and whanau of times you are to be away and the proximity of your visit
- Always carry a mobile phone

- Stick to timeframes where possible
- Do not visit sites on dusk, or after dark
- Always carry water
- Be in the company of a female where appropriate
- Be aware of mate/tūpāpaku lying in state on marae in that area
- Undertake karakia on entering and exiting sites
- Be accompanied (where possible) by tangata whenua, and/or kaumātua.

And also:

- Having immediate access to kaumātua/tohunga karakia should something unforeseen occur to the researcher or to a member of the party.

Communications Strategy

It is hoped that this project will be supported by whānau, hapū and iwi. In many cases waahi tapu and sites of significance to tangata whenua will be of significance to a particular hapu or whanau (eg: a hapu-based marae). Other sites will be of interest to the iwi (eg: Rangiātea Church). The researcher endeavours to consult all those that are concerned, and this guidance will come via the Waahi Tapu Reference Group.

It is envisaged that members of Te Whakaminenga o Kāpiti will provide updates to their respective hapu and iwi as part of their reporting. Additionally it is envisaged that the researcher will initiate and maintain contact with hapu, kaumātua and committees that will be key in keeping good communications.

It would be advantageous to make contact with people who have experience in other waahi tapu research. They will provide the fundamental advice required for projects such as this one. This group is made up of people from organisations that have undertaken both unsuccessful and successful projects. The main reason for this is so that an insight can be gained in to projects and the reason for success/partial success/failure. In addition, it would be good for the project to be able to notify these people of our project for the following reasons:

- Gain general support
- Gain resources, presentations, tips, and advice
- Increase awareness nationally about this project

It would be advantageous to maintain a level of contact with the group below throughout the project for ongoing support and guidance.

Initial contact will be made with Group 1 to ask for their support and gain assistance. Many of these people/organisations will be aware of the project and my appointment as researcher.

Contact with the *professional support group* on the other hand is to inform them of the project, and to ask for the opportunity to maintain contact if the need arises. I would envisage a level of support from most of these people.

Below is a list of individuals who have taken part or managed waahi tapu projects for other areas. Included is an explanation of my contact with each person:

1. Frank (Kīngi) Thorne (Waikato, Kāwhia Moana).
 - Is currently undertaking research into waahi tapu for the Māori Land Court in the Waikato/Kāwhia area
 - He has recently published 500 sites for Ngāti Hikairo (one of the large iwi of Waikato)
 - Frank has iwi and hapu research experience
 - Frank has close links to Ōtaki and Ngāti Raukawa and is willing to be called upon if needed.
2. Caleb Royal (Ngāti Raukawa, Ōtaki).
 - Is currently undertaking a cultural health monitoring & mapping project in the Wairarapa
 - Has experience in managing hapu and iwi projects
 - Caleb is willing to share his experience of 9 years working within the ART confederation and is happy to support this project
3. Jason Kerehi (Wairarapa)
 - Currently working for Ngāti Kahungunu ki te Wairarapa
 - Was the Project Manager for Wairarapa waahi tapu projects
 - Contact has been made with Jason and he is willing to be on a contact list to share his expertise and experience when required
4. Takerei Norton (Ngāi Tahu)
 - Takerei was instrumental in the success of the Murihiku waahi tapu project
 - Takerei has responded favourably to our request to have him act as a contact should we need his assistance.
5. Kiri Parata (Āti Awa)
 - Kiri has vast experience in iwi and hapu-led projects. She also has considerable experience in the interface between council and iwi/hapu.
 - Kiri has been contacted is happy to provide a historical perspective, and is also willing to be contacted should the need arise.
6. Mike Grace (Wairarapa).
 - Is currently the Māori Liaison Office for the Wellington regional Council, Wairarapa Office.
 - Is facilitating iwi/council projects
 - Has a number of contacts that could/would support this project
 - Mike is familiar with this project and is willing to support (check).
7. Gannin Ormsby (Waikato)
 - Team Leader for Maori Unit Environment Waikato (EW)
 - Has shared their work and experience

- Is aware of my work on this project and I feel comfortable contacting Gannin for advice if the need arises
8. Garth Harmsworth (Ngāti Raukawa ki raro)
- Garth is one of the most well known iwi facilitators/researchers in the country. Garth currently works for Manaaki Whenua Landcare Research.
 - Garth has an established track record of iwi/hapu research and is familiar to Ngāti Raukawa, Āti Awa and Ngāti Toa.
 - He is familiar with this project and is willing to be contacted should we need his support.
9. Rawiri Faulkner (Ngāti Raukawa, Ngāti Toarangatira)
- Rawiri is a former Greater Wellington Regional Council staff member and has vast experience in forging relationships between iwi/hapu and government.
 - Rawiri is aware of the need for this project and is supportive.
 - His contacts and experience would be invaluable as a touch stone for this project, and as such he is willing to share where the project feels he could contribute.

Pātaka Moore
30 July 10

Appendix 2: Cultural & Ethical Guidelines (Pipi et al (2004))

- *Aroha ki te tangata – Respect for people:* Allow ART iwi to define the nature of their involvement and the processes that must be collectively observed.
- *He kanohi kitea – Meeting face-to-face:* Meeting face-to-face is crucial in Māori society. Meeting in person will enable our relationship to develop and trust to evolve. This approach is valued over writing letters and should be genuine in nature, approached with humility.
- *Titiro, whakarongo, kōrero – Look, listen, speak:* Looking and listening before speaking enables the development of understanding and a position to speak from. Speaking is about affirmation, acknowledgement, support, validation, questioning, clarification, and challenging of the cultural considerations that will emerge.
- *Manaaki ki te tangata – Looking after people:* This involves a process of collaboration and reciprocity. It is underpinned by working with ART iwi in a way that “gives back to them” – establishing care and respect for all involved in the waahi tapu research process.
- *Kia tūpato – Caution:* This is underpinned by the need to be politically astute, culturally safe and reflexive. This means observing different ART iwi kawa and tikanga (protocols and processes). It involves behaving and functioning in a culturally safe manner at all times.
- *Kaua e takahia te mana o te tangata – Do not trample on the mana of the people:* This requires the involvement of ART iwi from the projects inception, during its implementation and towards the reports final dissemination. It is about seeking advice and guidance from ART iwi over the duration of the project. The Waahi Tapu Reference Group has been vital in undertaking this supervisory role.
- *Kia ngākau māhaki – Be humble and do not flaunt your knowledge:* Respect the knowledge and wisdom of those ART iwi members who participate. The generation of a waahi tapu research report and classification system will reflect the collective knowledge arising from our collaborative relationships.