

INTEGRATED TOURISM MANAGEMENT: PRELIMINARY SYNTHESIS OF CASE STUDY FINDINGS

September 2003

Marc Baily, Paul Blaschke, Janet Gough, Wayne Pihema, Nick Taylor and

Julie Warren

Introduction

The objectives of this four year Foundation for Research Science and Technology (FRST) funded research programme are to –

- evaluate existing approaches to planning and managing visitor related developments in natural areas,
- define an integrated model for application in multi-stakeholder management contexts,
- pilot, evaluate and refine that model for specific cases, and
- develop an approach for integrating ecological, economic, social and cultural (including Maori) factors in the planning and management of natural areas for tourism and other uses.

The programme will provide direction for integration of the above components of sustainability, as well as the recognition of a finite capacity for some activities at some sites; the sometimes competing requirements of tourism and recreation activities, and cultural and amenity values, for all sectors of society; and the need to monitor progress towards sustainability.

Four end-user groups are directly involved in the research - the tourism industry, government agencies, professional associations, and iwi (as part of the industry, host communities, and resource managers). Their participation occurs through the establishment of a wide-ranging Reference Group, the inclusion of a range of research team clients from the tourism sector as active participants in the project, close interface with professional practitioners, and the full-time involvement of a Maori researcher.

The specific tasks for the first year of the project were to

- identify, review and evaluate approaches, models and tools developed in overseas contexts to integrate ecological, economic, social and cultural factors in outdoor recreation, tourism planning and other related areas of natural resource management and evaluate existing approaches relevant to the New Zealand context
- survey 50 participants in planning and management in multi-stakeholder contexts involving natural areas to determine the efficacy of existing approaches, and
- synthesise this information

Year 1 of the study concluded that there are a number of tools that could usefully be used more extensively in New Zealand. These include –

- LAC and ROS
- Economic rationing tools
- Community visioning approaches, and participatory approaches
- Impact assessment tools

- Management of tourism resources by tangata whenua, either alone or in some sort of partnership with appropriate agencies/organisations.

A series of examples covering a range of broad geographical localities, particular activities such as tracks, and local areas including towns and parks were used as the basis for selecting case studies for the second year of the programme.

The selected case studies are listed in Appendix A; they represent a range of tools/approaches adopted to address perceived management problems.

This report summarises the findings of the case studies, and uses the case studies to illustrate and evaluate the application of particular management tools.

Giving land special status through zoning and other mechanisms

The case studies have highlighted a number of different ways to confer special status on land as a basis for its management. Zoning, or distinguishing areas that have particular characteristics, values or uses, was the most frequent mechanism. Zoning is often established through the formal processes associated with preparing detailed management plans. Case studies show zoning (either physical or temporal) can be an effective way to manage natural areas for different users and different outcomes. The benefit of zoning is that it has statutory force, with clearly defined rules and standards. The case studies also point to the value of using a consultative approach to identifying and establishing the zones, as evidenced by stakeholders' acceptance of management plans if the process of their development is seen as fair (as in Tongariro National Park, Karori Wildlife Sanctuary and Mt Bruce). While the traditional form of zoning is through the District Plan, the use of other techniques such as management zones is gaining prominence. The benefits of this approach, as shown below, are that the 'zoning' can be site specific and more flexible than the District Plan zoning.

Some of the successful applications of zoning include examples where a whole area has a particular zoning and others where there is detailed zoning of uses within an area.

- Puponga Farm Park, at the base of Farewell Spit, is used as a buffer zone to protect the ecologically fragile and valuable sand spit. Within the farm park as a whole, particular areas are fenced off to protect their nature values, while other activities are allowed in the general areas. The buffer zone has a multitude of uses including control of stock, vehicle access, diverting public attention from the spit, as a firebreak and to provide public access to beaches. The farm park is also an attraction in its own right, providing a rural experience for increasingly urbanised visitors.
- Site specific management zones can be used in small and contained areas of high ecological, cultural and other values. In the Kaori Wildlife Sanctuary, management zones have been established to avoid conflicts of use, for instance between absolute protection and the desire to foster visitor numbers. Zones were identified on the basis of a biological survey and include areas of intensive use (e.g., to meet tourism and recreation objectives) and remote locations (e.g., to meet ecological objectives). The zones have a time component – that is, there is an expectation that areas could be rezoned given changing management objectives, visitor patterns etc. Similar use of zoning has occurred on Kapiti Island to manage for visitors and conservation purposes.

- Mt Bruce is another natural area that is zoned to accommodate different and potentially conflicting activities. Different areas are managed for captive breeding of threatened species, release of species and tourism recreation.
- The Whenua Rangatira at Orakei Auckland is a result of prolonged protest by Ngati Whatua o Orakei culminating in the Bastion Point occupation during the 1970s. The land is set aside for the common use and benefit of hapu members *and* the citizens of the city of Auckland. The Whenua Rangatira, at Orakei Auckland is zoned under the Orakei Act (1991) in terms of who must benefit, what activities are allowed, and who may be hold leases or licenses over the land for those activities. Farming, tribal, community and cultural activities only are allowed subject to a management plan drafted by the Orakei Reserves Board; a body constituted under the Orakei Act (1991) and made up of three members from the Auckland City council and three from the Ngati Whatua o Orakei Maori Trust Board. However only hapu members may carry out the farming, tribal, community and cultural activities, and only they may be granted leases or licenses over the land. The Reserves Act (1977) calls for a management plan to be prepared for the use, enjoyment, maintenance, protection, preservation and appropriate development of the land for hapu members and the citizens of Auckland. In this way while special status is granted to the land by legislation, those same laws create a definite and increasing tension between the needs of the hapu and the needs of Auckland citizens.
- ECAN has also used zoning in its management of Lake Pearson. After effectively prohibiting the use of power boats through the use of water safety regulations, ECAN created a Wildlife Refuge to ensure both protection of the grebe and passive rather than active recreational use of the lake.
- The consultative process used to establish a special management zone around the Hump Ridge Track shows the value of a more collectively informed identification process. The zone, the boundaries of which were set through a consultation process, attracts more intensive management and resourcing, and is managed to protect national values.

Some of the case studies examined illustrate circumstances where zoning could assist in providing solutions.

- Through the district resource management plan process, Puppu Springs could be protected through a Plan Change which could make swimming, diving or recreational uses of the springs water a Discretionary Activity (where applications could be made for consent to do some diving) or a Prohibited Activity (where no application for consent could be made or granted). Such a plan change would likely attract submissions in opposition, and if approved, would need to be supplemented by education and enforcement.
- Because the tops of the mountains in the Tongariro National Park are sacred to tangata whenua (among other things because Ngati Rangi used to bury their dead in the Ruapehu crater), these areas are zoned in the Tongariro National Park Management Plan to restrict ski field development and some other activities. Some tangata whenua believe these areas should be zoned to more absolutely limit ski field development and the numbers of people walking on, and to the top of, the mountains. Only a generation ago old Maori would not even look at the mountain, let alone walk on it. Such protection could also form part of the hazard management relating to the craters.
- The Ngai Tahu Deed of Settlement provides a less effective example of conferring special status on an area to protect its special qualities. Under a Deed of Recognition, the Settlement sets out a special status of Kura Tawhiti as a topuni area, given its cultural and ecological value. The same document also establishes the basis for a joint management arrangement between DOC and Ngai Tahu. However, while this status provides the area with more

protection for cultural values than is provided through the Conservation Act, the protection is not easily enforceable and joint management is still proving difficult to implement in practice.

In areas characterised by multi-jurisdictional management, zoning has proved more difficult to establish despite a wide range of stakeholders believing that zoning could provide the basis for protecting cultural and ecological values and managing conflicting uses. Issues arise from matters such as the mix of public and private tenure, ownership and/or administrative responsibility or adjoining areas. There are also different governance regimes within the public sector (examples of the lack of synergy include between the RMA, Conservation Act, Marine Reserves Act and the Conservation Act as well as between Conservation Management Strategies, Regional Policy Statements, etc). Public and private stakeholders have different relationships to the resource, in terms of responsibility for management, commitment to the area, voluntary and regulatory codes of regulation and self regulation and exploitation of the resource. Abel Tasman, Pupu Springs, Punakaiki and North Head are all examples.

Visioning exercises

‘Visioning’ exercises are participative processes whereby groups or communities develop agreed strategies as responses to commonly agreed problems and desired outcomes. Typically an external facilitator is used. A charrette is one example of these visioning exercises. It is an intensive planning session usually held at the community level where a small group of participants, over time, discuss a particular problem or set of problems and develop strategies or plans in response. Participants usually try to achieve a level of consensus or agreement about the actions required.

Various visioning processes that have occurred in the case study areas show how community input into management plans, especially when there are multiple uses, can lead to greater collective commitment to the final plans. However, the case studies also show that the implementation phase often does not live up to community expectations. In some of these cases, resources had been made available for the visioning process but not the implementation process. In addition, communities often lack statutory processes to turn vision into reality or, if they have these statutory processes, they cannot easily be applied or are not appropriate. Visioning is essentially a consensual non-statutory process that may become contentious if it is given statutory teeth.

Examples include –

- A visioning process for the management of Pupu Springs included DOC, iwi, local government, residents, divers, conservation groups, tourism operators and commercial interests like salmon farmers. However, the implementation of the vision is still to occur with the above groups holding different aspirations as to what will result in the statutory process
- Experience of visioning processes at North Head, Waitomo, Punakaiki and Kaikoura also show the difficulties of turning visioning processes and charrette into action. The implementation of strategies that have resulted from community and stakeholder exercises are typically wanting.
- The development and implementation of a shared vision for the management of Mt Bruce was facilitated by a collective focus on a sub-project – the Pukaka Project. This more narrowly focused sub-project became the vehicle for the wider group of interested parties (including tangata whenua, DOC and conservation groups) to develop a shared vision for the

whole of the area, to develop a set of objectives that reflected the multiple uses for the area, and to develop protocols for working together.

- The Karori Wildlife Sanctuary is an exception to the visioning/implementation gulf. Forest and Bird initially presented the proposal to the wider community, looking for support and endorsement of the initial vision. The Karori Wildlife Sanctuary Trust was established and community and business support continues to build, despite earlier concerns by locals whose former free access to the areas has been curtailed with the completion of the fence and the setting of an entry fee. Local tourism operators are beginning to recognise the economic potential of the Sanctuary, and the Trust in turn is looking at developing integrated marketing strategies with Te Papa, Otari, the Wellington Botanical Garden, Parliament Buildings, Wellington Zoo, Mount Bruce, Somes Island and other tourism operators.

Implementation of the actions agreed during a visioning exercise requires commitment from all stakeholders. The most successful cases have included the developed of an active implementation programme and commitment o this from all stakeholders.

Monitoring

Monitoring of visit numbers, social and environmental impacts etc. needs to be an inherent part of the management of areas to ensure that the identified qualities are protected, and to assess the implementation of plans and objectives. The case studies show the difficulties of carrying out monitoring given the tools available.

Some of the lessons from the case studies are described as follows.

- The Aircraft Monitor developed for Aorangi (Mt Cook) measures aircraft noise both acoustically and perceptively. The tool is used by DOC to establish the limits of acceptable change (LAC) by setting a 25% threshold on visitors' annoyance with noise. This means the tool measures changing perceptions rather than absolute noise levels. Presumably it can also be used to monitor changes in perception against absolute noise levels. The case study showed the need to adapt monitoring tools to different groups. The development of the tool, although not intended for use by the aircraft operators in the area, has prompted them to form their own group and establish some voluntary rules to reduce the impact.
- A number of visitor satisfaction and perceptions of crowding surveys have been undertaken by DOC. When repeated they become a monitoring tool. These surveys frequently indicate strong relationships between the accuracy of visitors' prior expectations of their experience and their satisfaction with the experience.
- In response to its monitoring of 4WD vehicles to the coastal region of Pegasus Bay, ECAN recognised the need to impose limits, which were established through a consultative process which culminated in a 4WD strategy. The mechanism to implement the limits is discussed under *Concessions, permits, licences and regulations*.
- In contrast to the other natural areas within this study monitoring visitor numbers and social and environmental impacts have not been developed at the Whenua Rangatira. No specific surveys or instruments have been used to define or set visitor limits. However, the local authority, Auckland City Council, is actively seeking to drive up both user numbers and recreational groups within the Whenua Rangatira. The headland is being marketed as a place to take part in special events (Millenium celebrations) and observe maritime activities (such as the recent Americas Cup, Auckland Regatta Day). Auckland City noted thousands of Aucklanders had utilised the Whenua Rangatira for those special events. The development of walkways and lookouts by Auckland City points to more intense future usage. Monitoring at

this site may be beneficial for identifying under-usage and to create strategies to both increase user numbers where appropriate and to manage multiple uses.

Voluntary action

A number of case studies showed the value of user self-management, organised through collective mechanisms such as care groups, voluntary codes and operator groups. The formation of these groups and/or codes usually reflected a grassroots recognition of the problem and the need for some level of group or community responsibility to act to alleviate it. Here are examples of voluntary action:

- At Pupu Springs, the local community indicated its wish for the establishment of care groups through a community consultation process and the resulting Plan commissioned by DOC and the Tasman District Council (TDC). It was recommended that these care groups include iwi, DOC, community and landowner representatives.
- Also at Pupu Springs, divers have developed a voluntary Code of Conduct in response to tangata whenua concern about diving in a place of high spiritual value (and presumably to avoid a total ban). The Springs also have high conservation value. The Code recognises the sacred value of the area by limiting the hours for diving, diver numbers and time in the water. The Code, which is displayed at the carpark, does seem to have reduced diving activity in the water but not to the levels that would satisfy tangata whenua (which would be no diving). For tangata whenua, any bodily contact is inappropriate. While the voluntary Code has reduced activity, DOC and the TDC acknowledge that a total ban on diving and other bodily contact would require statutory backing.
- At the Whenua Rangatira within Orakei, Auckland the Ngati Whatua o Orakei Maori Trust Board is vested as owner of the land – although analogous to Kura Tawhiti, management is jointly vested in the trust board and a local authority (Auckland City Council). The Ngati Whatua o Orakei Maori Trust Board might be viewed as a tangata whenua ‘care group’, although its trustees receive nominal payments for meeting. However hapu members unhappy at the direction the trust board was taking in allowing specific tourism development initiatives to continue without a hapu mandate protested by meeting en masse at the site of the proposed development. The group was reasonably large and constituted a wide representation of the hapu’s whanau. The trust board changed their direction because of the pressure exerted which illustrates the multi-layered nature of ‘care groups’, their inherent identity as part of the ‘grass-roots’ community, and their ability to generate spontaneous decisive action which is possible only with real community identity.
- At Kura Tawhiti rock climbers have developed a code that recognises the ecological importance of the area, and as a consequence some parts of the area are out of bounds. The code is less informed by the cultural significance of the area. As with Pupu Springs, a more statutorily based mechanism may be required to protect the cultural values of the area to the extent required by local Maori.
- Aoraki/Mt Cook local operators have formed an Aircraft Users Group that works with DOC to find acceptable ways to operate in the area. They negotiate with DOC (and vice versa) over matters such as flight paths and types of aircraft. Informal groups have also been established at Fox and Franz Josef Glaciers. Experience has shown that the success of these groups depends very much on the people involved, both amongst the operators and in DOC.
- At Fox Glacier, one guiding company has voluntarily established limits to the number of visitors taken on trips to the Glacier, the operators explaining that the limit reflects their greater interest in their commitment to the area than making a profit. This action is perceived as different from the approaches of new arrivals who are perceived to have less commitment to the local resource base and community.

- In the Waitomo area landowners in the caves areas have formed a landcare group, with the support of Environment Waikato. This group has taken an active role in managing properties to protect the Waitomo Glow-worm Caves catchment, mainly by planting and riparian management. By reducing sedimentation into the caves, these activities are acknowledged to have had a positive (though not easily measurable) effect on the sustainability of the cave system.

Community participation

Community based initiatives

Community based action can provide the basis for the development and management of natural areas in ways that incorporate community aspirations (including economic benefits) and take account of natural, cultural and heritage values.

- Tuatapere's development of the 53 km Hump Ridge Track, which opened late 2001, provides one example. The track is located at the South East of Fiordland National Park and within the South West New Zealand Heritage and includes both national park and Maori (SILNA) land by agreement of the Maori landowners. In this example the development is seen as meeting the needs of a range of stakeholders including the local community, land owners, relevant central and local government agencies and users – the people walking the track. The success factors in this process include the generous timeframe allowed (from idea to action took around 10 years), the development of a feasibility study that specifically considered social and economic impacts, on-going liaison between the community the Southland District Council and DOC (as well as a partnership arrangement with respect to DOC administered land), and a strong champion who remained involved for the life of the project.
- The Karori Wildlife Sanctuary is a community initiative spearheaded by Forest and Bird. The Karori Wildlife Sanctuary Trust represents a wide range of interests and continues to work with the local Wellington community, including business, environmental, residential and recreational interests.

Consultation

While the need for consultation is often part of the rhetoric around how to develop workable management plans, in reality its use is often problematic.

- At Waitomo, Pupu Springs and Punakaiki, problems have been experienced in translating diverse community views, gained through consultation, into viable solutions when hard decisions are necessary. For instance, in Pupu Springs, DOC needs to make a firm decision (around diving) that will not please all the stakeholders.
- Case studies highlight the inadequacy of consultation with tangata whenua. For instance, that the sacred values of Pupu Springs were not fully appreciated and the consequent inappropriate recreational use of the springs may be attributed to lack of consultation in the preparation of the management plan.
- As is often the case, in some case studies (North Head, Waitomo, Pupu Springs) community expectations as a result of consultation, could not be fulfilled. Often these failures, especially in rural areas, appears to be linked to community expectations that better tourism management will lead to increased economic development in a district.

The use of consultation, both as a means of developing plans and as a statutory requirement, will likely increase given the consultation requirements of the Local Government Act 2002. The result

of this will be more community driven management plans, which may lead to further instances where community aspirations, stakeholder interests, and administrative bodies will be in conflict.

Stakeholder relationships

When relationships between stakeholder groups are strong, the extent to which natural areas are managed in an integrated way seems enhanced. Some examples from our case studies reflect the small town contexts where stakeholders live in reasonably close proximity, have children in the same schools and so on. Examples include:

- The Whenua Rangatira at Orakei Auckland. As with other cases within this study the pattern of relations between stakeholders is shaped mainly by two dominant institutional organisations, one being the Auckland City Council – the other the Ngati Whatua o Orakei Maori Trust Board, the legally constituted body for the Orakei hapu. The Orakei hapu has a clear and vigorous communal identity. However, tourism development on the Whenua Rangatira – their last remnant of ancestral land is not shaped by them but by interaction between government agencies, and the agencies themselves such as;
 - the Orakei Reserves Board which manages the Whenua Rangatira
 - Auckland City which co-manages the Reserves Board and interacts with the hapu at the individual, community and hapu level,
 - Te Puni Kokiriri, which has funded whanau tourism initiatives.

Hapu aspirations stand in direct contrast to those of Auckland city. The development of the Whenua Rangatira is dependent on Auckland City Council as a co-manager of the land, and as a joint-creator of the management plan through their membership on the Orakei Reserves Board. The management plan defines the activities that hapu members may pursue on the Whenua Rangatira. Hapu members cohere as whanau groupings and exert pressure to gain access to resources through government agencies such as those above or through the trust board. Furthermore whanau groupings tend to block vote their own whanau representatives on to the 11 member trust board and through alliances with other whanau groupings seek to dominate the trust board.

Intense cultural and kinship contexts mean that stakeholder relationships within Orakei may be viewed as multi-layered and contingent. Stakeholders in the Whenua Rangatira may be reconfigured according to the scale of the organisation, kin relations and community immersion. Auckland City Council and the Ngati Whatua o Orakei Maori Trust Board may be in adversarial positions in a number of other contexts due to the tangata whenua status of the trust board and the territorial authority status of the Auckland City Council. However they both merge within the Orakei Reserves Board. While it is true that reserves board members from both groups still hold to their own institutional cultures, perspectives and biases each of the groups do become familiar with the other and learn to work together. Where the Orakei Reserves Board acts against the interest of hapu members or whanau groups within the hapu, it is not difficult for disgruntled hapu members to draw conclusions of disloyalty by the Ngati Whatua members of the reserves board.

At another level whanau groups work very hard to progress their own tourism initiative over those of other whanau. This is despite close proximity both physical (papakainga residents) and familial (through kinship ties) of whanau members and their children. Often those

differences and disagreements are glossed over at hapu meetings or social occasions – particularly at schools or where the children are present.

- The Tongariro National Park area, where key senior managers in both DOC and operator companies have known each other for a long time (often having had shared work experiences) and staff of the various organisations are long standing members of the local community;
- Mt Bruce, where DOC, Rangatane and the Mt Bruce Trust independently commented on the quality of their working relationships and the positive impact of these on their management of the area.

Iwi, hapu and Maori involvement in tourism development decisions

Historical context

Agencies need to understand the complex nature of historical events and conflicts that shape relationships today, within hapu/iwi, between hapu/iwi and between iwi and others. Examples include the history of land claims, decisions of the Maori Land Court, and past relationships with local and central government agencies. Such issues raise a number of questions. For instance, to what extent do key agencies understand historical events shaping iwi and Maori relationships (within and between iwi/hapu and between iwi and others?) and their responses to them? How do those understandings (or lack of understandings) affect agency responses to iwi and Maori issues relating to development?

Iwi/Maori structures and institutions

Agencies need to understand the social, political and economic structures (both traditional and contemporary) of iwi and hapu (e.g. marae, papakainga, runanga, and land trusts). Some of these structures and institutions, such as runanga and trusts, are artificial constructs, for instance established through legislation. These structures can restrict hapu and iwi capacity to be flexible and shape the way they respond to tourism development and the activities of relevant agencies.

The extent to which agencies such as local government and DOC understand these iwi and hapu social, political and economic structures are reflected in their communications processes with iwi, hapu and Maori. Without such understanding, it is difficult for them to develop communications processes that appropriately and accurately reflect these structures.

Relationship to the natural environment

Iwi and Maori are concerned about the protection, enhancement, access to and customary use of natural resources, sites of significance and waahi tapu.

Maori communities are increasingly concerned about tourism operations, with or without the required concessions/permissions, trespassing on Maori land or desecrating urupa, waahi tapu and other sites of cultural significance.

To avoid such inappropriate use, it may be appropriate for local and central government agencies to involve iwi, hapu and/or whanau in tourism related planning processes from the earliest stages and to ensure that Maori values and practices are taken into account.

Legislative frameworks

Opportunities and barriers posed by legislation, particularly the RMA, Conservation Act, the Local Government Act, Reserves Act and the Historic Places Act and enactments affect specific iwi. Further research is needed to identify specific opportunities and barriers posed by legislation for exercising kaitiakitanga, iwi, hapu or Maori tourism development and other related aspirations. Research is also needed to understand iwi, hapu and Maori perceptions of these barriers and opportunities and agencies' responses to them (i.e. to facilitate opportunities and reduce barriers).

Barriers to participation

'Consultation overload' is a significant problem for Maori, and the time and energy of Maori tends to be thinly spread because of the range of matters requiring iwi/hapu/Maori involvement as stakeholders. The same few mandated people, especially kaumatua, become involved in many sectors and with many agencies despite the lack of capacity, capability (people with the appropriate skills and experience) and financial resources within tribal structures.

These problems are potentially compounded by inadequate consultative processes and an imbalance of power between Maori organizations and key agencies (with related cultural differences). Often the consultation processes of agencies do not allow for meaningful engagement. Elements of these inadequate processes include poor communication and information dissemination, lack of internal co-ordination, lack of understanding of how and who to contact in the Maori community and lack of practical support to facilitate their participation. One way to improve these processes is for agencies to involve iwi, hapu and Maori in the development of consultation protocols. They could also attempt to be flexible on timeframes to accommodate pressures on iwi.

In addition, there is often an unequal power balance between agencies and iwi, hapu, Maori, with added cultural differences leading to them "Talking past each other" or the agencies taking insufficient cognisance of Maori cultural values and specific iwi contexts.

One way address power inequalities is through relationship building, with agencies working to establish relationships with iwi, hapu Maori over time (through thick and thin), rather than just instrumentally for specific consultations.

Expectations of participation and decision-making

Iwi and Maori expect to participate in decision-making given their constitutional status. However, the encouragement that iwi and Maori are given to participate through conventional planning processes (e.g. district plan, annual plan, conservancy management plan and resource consent processes) varies. Encouragement could come in the form of specific arrangements to reflect the special status of iwi or hapu, specific partnership or co-management arrangements and the development of conflict management processes with iwi, hapu and Maori before they are needed.

Opportunities for Maori in tourism

Natural areas and resources either owned/controlled by Maori, or part of their traditional whenua, are often the target of tourism developers. It is not unusual for this to be occurring in a regional context where there is little in the way of Maori tourism activity. This external interest in tourism development based on the resources of tangata whenua can result in conflict between them,

relevant local and central government agencies, recreationists and the tourism industry, including individual developers.

Consideration needs to be given to facilitating (or not limiting) hapu, iwi and Maori development of their own tourism resources. How could tourism contribute to Maori social, economic and cultural development, what types of tourism activities could achieve the desired outcomes, what are the local and regional barriers to and opportunities for their meaningful participation in the industry, what supports do they need to achieve their aspirations and what changes can agencies make to address these.

Acceptable limits to tourism

Like communities in general, iwi, hapu and Maori are concerned about the potential negative impacts of tourism and, therefore, the need to limit tourism. Often these limits are social or cultural in nature and can lead to conflicts between the aspirations of local people and those interested in tourism development.

The research needed to underpin the identification of limits to tourism is lacking generally. Thus, research that focuses on iwi, hapu and/or Maori perceptions of acceptable limits to tourism is rare.

Working parties and other collaborative working arrangements

The value of working parties and other collaborative working arrangements is demonstrated in a number of the case studies especially to address multi-jurisdictional responsibilities.

- The activities of the Hurunui Lakes Working Party (HLWP), formed in the early 1990s at the initiation of the Hurunui District Council, show the value of working parties to address particular issues but also how they can evolve to address new issues. The HLWP was initially established in response to the perceived negative impacts of increasing 4WD use in the area but its recent focus has shifted to resolving what to do with the 65 private baches “squatting” at Loch Katrine. The group has consulted and worked with the local community, bach owners, DOC and other stakeholders and come up with a collectively developed and agreed solution (bar a couple of dissenters) that includes rebuilding a smaller number of co-operatively managed baches that are also available to the public.
- A stakeholder working party was set up to address problems around speeding jet boats on Lake Pearson and their impact on wildlife and flora. Their interest was in finding ways to protect the natural and recreational qualities of the lake for fishing, camping, boating (other than jet boating), day visitors, hut users and native species. While ECAN found a solution to the problem through marine safety regulations, the working party may have influenced ECAN’s interest in finding a solution.
- The Karori Wildlife Sanctuary Trust, which includes Forest and Bird, DOC, Totally Wellington, iwi, private commercial, state and community interests, has proved an effective structure for increasing community support, attracting resources, developing an increasingly commercially oriented operation and setting up a number of specially management zones for achieving different outcomes.
- The Hauraki Forum focuses on the management of the wider catchment including the Hauraki Gulf, Waitamata Harbour, the Firth of Thames, the east coast of Coromandel Peninsular and the Gulf Islands. Participants represent DOC, iwi and local government (Auckland Regional Council, Auckland City Council, Coromandel District Council, Waikato

Regional Council). Its two levels (the forum and the supporting officers) provide the basis for collaborative approaches to management of the natural environment. While the politicians and some local government managers are sceptical about the value of the forum, the officers find the forum very helpful in their policy and operations work.

Setting limits

A number of different approaches to setting limits have been considered or employed, with varying success, in the case study areas where the numbers of visitors or the level of particular activities are seen to have negative social, cultural and/or physical impacts. In a number of areas there is some level of direct or indirect limitation put on visitor numbers although the practice is not always backed up by acknowledgement of theories such as carrying capacity and limits to acceptable change nor by the research necessary to establish appropriate visitor or activity levels. This is apparent at Waitomo, Milford, Farewell Spit, Ruapehu skiing areas, Karori, Pegasus, Punakaiki, Kura Tawhiti, Hauraki Gulf, North Canterbury beaches and Abel Tasman).

Examples and the limitations to practice are described.

- Bounds on aircraft activity at Aorangi are based on a purpose developed monitoring process to assess the limits of acceptable change (LAC).
- Crowding management, including the adoption of one-way visitor movements, has been implemented at Waitomo to some extent and is based on assumed (but not systematically researched) social and physical carrying capacity. However the trend in growth of visitor numbers at the caves indicates that the visitor experience is close to being degraded. Perceptions of crowding there indicate “higher than capacity” crowding, especially in summer, with studies and management necessary to preserve the experience.
- In areas where there are multiple access points and independent travellers it is more difficult to implement visitor management mechanisms. Examples include Abel Tasman and the Tongariro Crossing.
- Physical displacement of activity from sensitive areas (usually through zoning) is another way to address limits to activity. This occurs in Waitomo, Karori Wildlife Sanctuary and Lake Pearson and probably needs to occur in places like Kura Tawhiti and Pupu Springs.
- At Fox and Franz Josef the management plans limit the number of people on the glacier (on guided trips) through permitting two companies to take a limit of 300 visitors per day per glacier in groups not exceeding 15 people. In this case, while the limits are based on research, the figure is somewhat arbitrary, and it is unclear whether the limits are for physical, social or safety reasons.
- At Milford there are stated limits but little research to back these up. Given that operators tend not to respect stated limits that have no obvious foundation, there are no mechanisms in place to enforce or implement the limitations. In terms of aircraft landings the limits are enforceable..
- On the Hump Ridge Track, operators limit the numbers of visitors through a hut booking system that is designed to both address the social and physical carrying capacity of the track and amenities and maximise the economic benefits of the track to the community. Given the pricing structure of the walk, the system is enforceable (there are full time staff and hut wardens) and (in most cases) requires trampers to stay in Tuatapere the night before they start the walk (hence bringing money into the community).
- The level of jet boating on Lake Pearson was perceived as exceeding social and physical carrying capacity, although no research has been undertaken to estimate the social and physical carrying capacity. As discussed under *Concessions, licences and regulations*, the

carrying capacity was effectively assumed to be nil through the use of water safety regulations to ban jet boating entirely.

- In the Hurunui Lakes area, a coded gate and associated booking system has been adopted to limit the numbers of people/vehicles that can go beyond Loch Katrine. The system, which also included periods when no vehicles can gain access (usually between July and October) is generally seen to work. Again the set limit to vehicles is not informed by research.
- There are no limits put on the number of people who walk the Tongariro Crossing in spite of a widespread sense that the social carrying capacity of the track is exceeded during much of the year. It is the most frequently used “back-country” track in the country.

Concessions, permits, licences and regulations

Rules and regulations, even when they are intended for other purposes, can be put to effective use to achieve conservation and recreational outcomes. For instance, the control of speeding boats on Lake Pearson in the Waimakariri Basin provides a good example. Water Safety Regulations were used effectively by ECAN to protect the natural quiet of the area as well as wildlife and other nature conservation values. These regulations enabled ECAN to restrict the speed of boats to 5 knots within 200 metres of the shoreline, effectively stopping all speeding within the lake.

Though the conservation values of the area were recognised through the various planning documents of local government and DOC, these did not provide enforceable limitations on activity.

Access licences have been used effectively at Pegasus Bay for the control of 4WD vehicles. Fees attached to the licences fund the monitoring and enforcement mechanisms. The licenses are purely to restrict and control the activity..

The DOC concessions system can be a way of DOC sharing responsibility for visitor satisfaction and managing social impacts, with commercial operators. Some might see it as a way of DOC avoiding these responsibilities.

The value of co-ordinated information, interpretation and research

One way to protect special values and manage visitor use is to provide information about the areas special cultural, natural and other qualities and, given these, the permitted and/or appropriate behaviour and activities. Information provision, in the form of signage, brochures and interpretation, was noted as an especially important management tool, particularly for managing cultural significance and impacts, at Pupu Springs, Kura Tawhiti, Tongariro National Park, Mt Bruce, and Punakaiki.

Specific attention needs to be given to who provides the information, what it covers as well as to the most appropriate information dissemination and interpretation mechanisms, given the message, the intended audience, the range of uses and values and the physical environment.

There is a need for more coordinated information sharing between key players in the development and management of natural areas. These include DOC, local government and tourism organizations such as Tourism New Zealand, Regional Tourism Organisations and visitor centres.

- Case studies highlight the potentially negative impacts (such as crowding) that can occur as a consequence of poor communication between key organisations or ill-informed development strategies. For instance, the lack of effective communication between DOC and Tourism New Zealand with reference to the Tongariro Crossing means it continues to be marketed as the “best one-day walk in the world” when visitor numbers have probably exceeded the social carrying capacity that ensures visitor satisfaction. Other issues such as safety, given the changeable weather patterns in the area, are also not reflected in the marketing strategy¹. Waitomo Caves may be another example of a marketing/capacity discrepancy.
- The value of Regional Tourism Organisations working with wider economic interests in their region was highlighted in a number of case studies. In Northland and Southland the amalgamation of the RTOs into the regional economic development agencies will hopefully lead to better integration of tourism into the wider economic development strategies).

Conclusion

This report summarises the results of 22 case studies that were identified from the interviews and literature review undertaken in 2002-2002. These case studies were in the main ‘desk-top’ studies amplified where possible with site visit.

The case studies demonstrates that a range of tools is currently being used in New Zealand, and illustrates that in many cases several different tools are being used in one area or for one activity.

It is notable that a number of different approaches to setting limits have been considered or employed, with varying success, in the case study areas where the numbers of visitors or the level of particular activities are seen to have negative social, cultural and/or physical impacts. In a number of areas there is some level of direct or indirect limitation put on visitor numbers although the practice is not always backed up by acknowledgement of theories such as carrying capacity and limits neither to acceptable change nor by the research necessary to establish appropriate visitor or activity levels. Thus while there is implicit use of these tools, there is often little knowledge or understanding of either the assumptions on which the approach is based, or the limitations on application.

The synthesis of the case studies has allowed the project team to identify three areas where in-depth case studies will be refined during the third year of the project. Two of these areas are the Tongariro Crossing and the Hauraki Gulf. The third will either be the Catlins or Doubtful Sound (as a comparison with Milford Sounds).

The final year of the project will involve trialling of the ‘tool-box’ that has been developed, in areas yet to be selected.

¹ The Copland Pass crossing at Mt Cook provides a similar example.

Appendix A

Case studies

Catlins
Doubtful Sound
Farewell Spit and Puponga Farm Park (buffer)
Fox Glacier and Franz Josef Glacier
Hauraki
Hump Ridge
Kaitorete Spit
Kapiti
Karori Sanctuary
Kura Tawhiti
Lake Pearson
Loch Katrine
Milford
Mount Bruce
Mount Cook
North Head (Hauraki Gulf)
Orakei - Whenua Rangatira
Pegasus 4WD
Punakaiki and Kaikoura
Pupu Springs
Tongariro Crossing
Waitomo