

22b If you did not get feedback, do you think it would have been useful to get feedback about your submission?

- Yes..... 1
 No 2
 Don't know 3

23 How well do you think the management plan review took all points of view into account?

Please tick <u>one</u> box.					
<input type="checkbox"/> 1	<input type="checkbox"/> 2	<input type="checkbox"/> 3	<input type="checkbox"/> 4	<input type="checkbox"/> 5	<input type="checkbox"/> 6
Did not take views into account at all		Neutral		Fully took account of all views	Don't Know/Cant remember

If you have any additional comments about how well views were taken into account, please write them here:

SECTION FIVE: OVERALL VIEWS ON THE OPPORTUNITIES FOR PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT IN THE REVIEW PROCESS

24 What were the key strengths of the processes for public participation in the Whanganui National Park management plan review?

25 What were the key weaknesses of the processes for public participation in the Whanganui National Park management plan review?

26 Please provide additional comments here on how the Department of Conservation's public participation processes for management plan reviews could be improved.

ABOUT YOU

To help us analyse our data, we have a few more questions about you.

27 Did you prepare your submission on the Whanganui National Park draft management plan as an individual or as a representative or member of an organisation? (Tick only one.)

- Individual..... 1 (Go to Question 28)
- Organisation..... 2 (Go to Question 29)
- Other..... 3 (Go to Question 29)

28 Do you participate in or are you a member of any outdoor recreation, conservation or environmental groups?

- No..... 1
- Yes, please give the name(s): _____ 2

Go to question 30

29 Please indicate the type of organisation you prepared a submission on the Whanganui National Park draft management plan for: (Tick only one.)

- Conservation or environmental group..... 1
- Outdoor recreational group..... 2
- Concessionaire..... 3
- Business..... 4
- Maori/Iwi/Hapu group..... 5
- Local/regional government..... 6
- Central government..... 7
- Other, please specify: _____ 8

31 Are you.....? (Tick only one.)

- Female..... 1
- Male..... 2

32 Which ethnic group(s) do you belong to? (Tick as many as apply.)

- European/New Zealand European/Pakeha 1
- Māori 2
- Pacific Islander 3
- Asian (incl Indian)..... 4
- New Zealand/Kiwi 5
- Other ethnic group, please specify: _____ 6
- Refused 7

33 And which of the following best describes your highest qualification? (Tick only one.)

- No qualification..... 1
- School qualification 2
- Certificate or Diploma..... 3
- Polytechnic/University courses below Bachelors degree 4
- Bachelor degree..... 5
- Post-graduate degree (Honours, Masters, PhD) 6
- Other 7
- Don't know..... 8
- Refused..... 9

34 At present, are you.....? (Tick as many as apply.)

- Self employed/business owner 1
- Full-time salary or wage earner 2
- Part-time salary or wage earner (less than 30 hours per week)..... 2
- Retired 3
- Full-time home-maker 4
- Student 5
- Unemployed 6
- Other beneficiary..... 7
- Other, please specify: _____ 8
- Refused 9

35 What is your individual income for last year, before tax?

- Nil income or loss..... 1
- Under \$20,000 2
- \$-20,000 - \$30,000..... 3
- \$-30,000 - \$50,000..... 4
- \$-50,000 - \$70,000..... 5
- \$-70,000 - \$100,000..... 6
- \$100,000 and over 7
- Don't know..... 8
- Refused 9

36 In which of the following areas of New Zealand do you live? (Tick only one.)

- Northland 1
- Auckland 2
- Waikato..... 3
- Bay of Plenty 4
- Gisborne 5
- Hawke's Bay..... 6
- Taranaki..... 7
- Manawatu-Wanganui..... 8
- Wellington-Wairarapa 9
- Tasman..... 10
- Nelson 11
- Marlborough 12
- West Coast..... 13
- Canterbury 14
- Otago..... 15
- Southland..... 16
- Other, please specify: _____ 17

37 Have you made submissions on any management plans or strategies for any other protected areas, besides Whanganui National Park, or submissions on consent applications or proposed plans and policies under the Resource Management Act or Local Government Act? If so, what were these? (Select all the apply)

- A conservation management strategy for an area 1
- A conservation management plan for a specific site (e.g. a forest park or reserve)..... 2
- A national park management plan..... 3
- A marine reserve management plan..... 4
- A resource consent process 5
- A proposed regional or district plan 6
- A designation process for an area of land 7
- A long-term council community plan..... 7
- Other, please specify: _____ 8

THANK YOU VERY MUCH

If you have any further comments you would like to add about public participation in management plan reviews please write below:

**Please place your completed questionnaire in the self-seal envelope provided or you can return it free of charge directly to:
 Freepost 2088 Wn, Research New Zealand, PO Box 10-617, Wellington.**

Appendix 4

INTERVIEW SCHEDULE

Evaluation of public involvement in management plan reviews:

Interview form

Introduction

- Introduce self and involvement as a researcher, rather than as an expert in DOC's management planning processes.
- Outline purpose of evaluation, methods (survey and stakeholder interviews) and focus on process compared to content.
- Summarise key strengths, weaknesses and improvements to the process suggested by respondents to survey.
- Outline protocol for interview, how the information will be used and confidentiality (intend listing people we spoke to but not attributing specific comments to individuals), get their consent.
- Any issues re audio recording the interview?
- Discussion covers six main areas – hand over sheet with my contact details.

1. Purpose of public involvement

Staff and Board

- Why does DOC review management plans every 10 years, what is it trying to achieve?
- What is DOC hoping to achieve by involving the public in the review process? (i.e. what is the purpose of public involvement?)
- Do you think people in DOC share a common understanding about what they hope public involvement will add to the process?

Public

- What do you think DOC is trying to achieve through reviewing the [WNP] management plan every ten years?
- What do you think DOC is hoping to achieve by involving the public in the review process? (i.e. what is the purpose of public involvement?)
- What were you hoping to achieve by getting involved in the review?

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

2. Scope of reviews and level of involvement

Staff and Board

- Do you think people are clear about what is included in the scope of the review, and what is not? (e.g. do people understand what is covered by a management plan as opposed to CMS and general policies?)
- Do you think the scope of the [WNP] management plan review was about right? (i.e. should it be focused solely on policy direction or operational matters too?)
- What are the key attributes of an effective submission? (also, how useful do you think form-submissions are?)

Public

- Were you or are you clear about what is included in the scope of the review, and what is not? (e.g. do people understand what is covered by a management plan as opposed to CMS and general policies?)
- Do you think the scope of the [WNP] management plan review was about right? (i.e. should it be focused solely on policy direction or operational matters too?)
- What are the key attributes of an effective submission? (also, how useful do you think form-submissions are?)
- Were you clear about DOC's expectations in terms of the level of feedback they were expecting?
- Did you respond on policies and proposals in the draft plan that you supported, as well as those that you objected to, and why/why not?

3. Methods for public involvement

Staff and Board

- What ways of public engagement worked really well, and why?
- What ways did not work very well, and why not?
- What lessons are there for DOC from public involvement in other planning, policy or consent processes?
- How could DOC improve its processes?

Public

- What ways of public engagement worked really well, and why?
- What ways did not work very well, and why not?
- Are there other ways you would have liked to have been involved, and how?
- What lessons are there for DOC from public involvement in other planning, policy or consent processes?
- How could DOC improve its processes?

4. Results

Staff and Board

- What does public involvement add to the process / what difference does it make?
- Through the methods used for public involvement, do you think it achieves what is intended? (i.e. see *Purpose*)
- What additional benefits does it bring? (e.g. public awareness and relations)

Public

- What do you think public involvement add to the process / what difference does it make?
- Through the methods used for public involvement, do you think it achieves what is intended? (i.e. see *Purpose*)
- What additional benefits does it bring? (e.g. public awareness and relations)
- Has your involvement in the process encouraged or discouraged you from getting involved in other processes or activities that DOC does or coordinates?

5. Resources and capacity

Staff and Board

- Does the public involvement process require significant resourcing to deliver?
- Is this level of investment appropriate, worthwhile, and is it sustainable?
- Do you think people and organisations have sufficient capacity to effectively engage in the process?
- Do you think DOC had/has sufficient capacity to effectively engage with the public in the process?
- Did DOC make any resources available to support public involvement, and/or should it? (e.g. best practice guidelines or the NZCA booklet)
- How can the process be made more efficient? (e.g. especially thinking about the duration of the reviews)

Public

- Do you find that it required a significant amount of time or other resources to fully engage with the review?
- Was this investment warranted / worthwhile, and is it sustainable?
- Did you have sufficient capacity to effectively engage in the process?
- Do you think DOC had/has sufficient capacity to effectively engage with the public in the process?
- Are there any particular tools or resources that DOC could provide that would make your involvement easier?
- How can the process be made more efficient? (e.g. especially thinking about the duration of the reviews)

6. Representation

Staff and Board

- Do you feel the breadth of public representation in the review process is adequate or appropriate? What more could be done?
- What would more usefully contribute to the review and the purposes of public involvement in the review: a greater level of involvement from a smaller number of stakeholders or some involvement from a far wider representation of people / groups – i.e. the general public? (or is this trade-off not appropriate)
- There is a perception that the process favours particular views and interests over others, and, therefore, treats groups unequally. Do you have any comments on this?

Public

- Do you feel the breadth of public representation in the review process is adequate or appropriate? What more could be done?
- What would more usefully contribute to the review and the purposes of public involvement in the review: a greater level of involvement from a smaller number of stakeholders or some involvement from a far wider representation of people / groups – i.e. the general public? (or is this trade-off not appropriate)
- There is a perception that the process favours particular views and interests over others, and, therefore, treats groups unequally. Do you have any comments on this?

Appendix 5

DATA TABLES

TABLE A5.1. Q1—HOW DID YOU FIND OUT THAT THE DEPARTMENT OF CONSERVATION (DOC) WAS GOING TO REVIEW THE [PARK] MANAGEMENT PLAN?

	PROPORTION OF RESPONDENTS* (%)
Saw a public notice in the newspaper	25
Read an article/story in the newspaper	18
Heard a public notice or a media statement on the radio	5
Received a letter or a copy of the public notice direct from DOC	28
Saw a notice on the DOC website	5
Saw a notice in a DOC office or visitor centre	4
Through direct contact with DOC staff	16
Through involvement in a group or club	43
Through family, friends, or neighbours	19
Other	10

* $n = 231$.

Note: totals may exceed 100% because of multiple responses.

TABLE A5.2. Q3—PLEASE INDICATE THE WAYS YOU WERE INVOLVED IN THE [PARK] MANAGEMENT PLAN REVIEW PROCESS.

	PROPORTION OF RESPONDENTS* (%)
I made written suggestions on what should be included in the draft plan or written comments in response to a discussion paper	48
I was approached for advice or views on specific issues	7
I attended a public meeting or an interest group meeting to discuss suggestions on what should be included in the draft plan or in response to a discussion paper	14
I attended a public meeting or an interest group meeting to discuss proposals contained in the actual draft management plan	19
I prepared a written submission on the draft management plan	74
I was contacted to clarify some aspects of my submission	4
I attended a formal hearing to present an oral submission on the draft management plan	25
Other	10

* $n = 231$.

Note: totals may exceed 100% because of multiple responses.

TABLE A5.3. Q4—DID YOU WANT THE OPPORTUNITY TO BE INVOLVED OR CONTRIBUTE TO THE REVIEW PROCESS IN ANY OTHER WAY? IF SO, WHAT WAS THIS?

	PROPORTION OF RESPONDENTS* (%)
I would have liked to make written suggestions on what should be included in the draft plan or to have made comments in response to a discussion paper	14
I would have liked to attend a public meeting or an interest group meeting to discuss suggestions on what should be included in the draft plan or in response to a discussion paper	14
I would have liked to attend a public meeting or an interest group meeting to discuss proposals contained in the actual draft management plan	16
I would have liked to attend a formal hearing to present an oral submission on the draft management plan	10
Other	8
No	48

* $n = 231$.

Note: totals may exceed 100% because of multiple responses.

TABLE A5.4. Q5—DID YOU RECEIVE AN INITIAL DISCUSSION DOCUMENT OR INFORMATION OUTLINING THE KEY ISSUES FOR THE DRAFT MANAGEMENT PLAN?

	PROPORTION OF RESPONDENTS* (%)
Yes	65
No	35
Total	100

* $n = 231$.

TABLE A5.5. Q6—WHAT INFORMATION DID YOU RECEIVE?

	PROPORTION OF RESPONDENTS* (%)
A discussion document	45
A letter, a pamphlet, or an information pack outlining the review process	25
A letter, a pamphlet, or an information pack outlining key management planning issues covered in the review	23
A copy of the existing approved management plan for the area	16
A copy of particular sections of the new plan as it was being drafted	20
Other	9
Don't know	5

* $n = 231$.

Note: totals may exceed 100% because of multiple responses.

TABLE A5.6. Q7A—HOW HELPFUL WAS THIS INITIAL INFORMATION IN HELPING YOU TO UNDERSTAND THE REVIEW PROCESS?

	PROPORTION OF RESPONDENTS* (%)
Not very helpful	5
	6
Somewhat helpful	25
	20
Very helpful	31
Don't know / can't remember	11
No response	3
Total	100

* $n = 151$ —subsample based on those who received initial information.

TABLE A5.7. Q7B—HOW HELPFUL WAS THIS INITIAL INFORMATION IN HELPING YOU TO UNDERSTAND THE ISSUES COVERED IN THE REVIEW?

	PROPORTION OF RESPONDENTS* (%)
Not very helpful	7
	8
Somewhat helpful	23
	25
Very helpful	20
Don't know / can't remember	15
No response	3
Total	100

* $n = 151$ —subsample based on those who received initial information.

TABLE A5.8. Q8—DID YOU PROVIDE ANY WRITTEN OR ORAL FEEDBACK OR SUGGESTIONS TO DOC IN THIS INITIAL STAGE OF THE REVIEW?

	PROPORTION OF RESPONDENTS* (%)
Yes	48
No	52
Total	100

* $n = 231$.

TABLE A5.9. Q9—WHAT SOURCES OF INFORMATION DID YOU USE IN PUTTING TOGETHER YOUR FEEDBACK?

	PROPORTION OF RESPONDENTS* (%)
Discussion paper	41
Newspaper	10
Radio	4
Television	3
Internet	5
Group meeting with DOC staff	16
Group meeting without DOC staff	12
Public meeting with DOC staff	16
Individual meeting or contact with DOC staff	22
Personal experience / knowledge of the area	71
Other	23

* $n = 111$ —subsample based on those who provided feedback at the initial stage of the review.
 Note: totals may exceed 100% because of multiple responses.

TABLE 5.10. Q10—DID YOU ATTEND ANY PUBLIC OR INTEREST GROUP MEETINGS DURING THIS INITIAL STAGE OF THE REVIEW?

	PROPORTION OF RESPONDENTS (%)
Yes	24
No	76
Total	100

TABLE A5.11. Q10A—IF YES, HOW HELPFUL DID YOU FIND THE MEETINGS TO UNDERSTAND THE ISSUES COVERED IN THE REVIEW?

	PROPORTION OF RESPONDENTS* (%)
Not very helpful	16
	4
Somewhat helpful	33
	22
Very helpful	20
Don't know / can't remember	5
Total	100

* $n = 55$ —subsample based on those who attended meetings during the initial stage of the review.

TABLE A.5.12. Q10B—IF NO, WHY DID YOU NOT ATTEND?

	PROPORTION OF RESPONDENTS* (%)
Meeting not available	13
Wasn't that interested	3
Time/date prevented me	22
Location prevented me	30
Didn't think it would be helpful	11
Didn't know about any meetings	27
Other	16

* $n = 176$ —subsample based on those who did not attend meetings during the initial stage of the review.

Note: totals may exceed 100% because of multiple responses.

TABLE A5.13. Q12—DID YOU ATTEND ANY PUBLIC OR INTEREST GROUP MEETINGS WITH DOC AFTER THE DRAFT MANAGEMENT PLAN HAD BEEN PUBLICLY RELEASED?

	PROPORTION OF RESPONDENTS* (%)
Yes	22
No	78
Total	100

* $n = 231$.

TABLE A5.14. Q12A—IF YES, HOW HELPFUL DID YOU FIND THE MEETINGS TO UNDERSTAND THE ISSUES COVERED IN THE DRAFT MANAGEMENT PLAN?

	PROPORTION OF RESPONDENTS* (%)
Not very helpful	16
	4
Somewhat helpful	27
	22
Ver helpful	25
Don't know / can't remember	6
Total	100

* $n = 51$ —subsample based on those who attended meetings after the plan had been released.

TABLE A5.15. Q12B—IF NO, WHY DID YOU NOT ATTEND?

	PROPORTION OF RESPONDENTS* (%)
Meeting not available	9
Wasn't that interested	5
Time/date prevented me	28
Location prevented me	32
Felt that the draft plan covered all issues well and it was not necessary to attend	13
Didn't think it would be helpful	11
Didn't know about any meetings	24
Other	18

* $n = 180$ —subsample based on those who did not attend meetings after the plan had been released.

Note: totals may exceed 100% because of multiple responses.

TABLE A5.16. Q13—WHAT SOURCES OF INFORMATION DID YOU USE IN PUTTING TOGETHER YOUR WRITTEN SUBMISSION ON THE DRAFT MANAGEMENT PLAN?

	PROPORTION OF RESPONDENTS* (%)
Existing approved management plan	20
The draft management plan	58
Newspaper	6
Radio	1
Television	2
Internet	6
Group meeting with DOC staff	10
Group meeting without DOC staff	9
Public meeting with DOC staff	6
Individual meeting or contact with DOC staff	14
Personal experience / knowledge of the area	72
Other	27

* $n = 231$.

Note: totals may exceed 100% because of multiple responses.

TABLE A5.17. Q14—DO YOU THINK THAT THE DRAFT MANAGEMENT PLAN ALONE PROVIDED ENOUGH INFORMATION FOR YOU TO MAKE YOUR SUBMISSION?

	PROPORTION OF RESPONDENTS* (%)
Yes	65
No	24
Don't know	11
Total	100

* $n = 231$.

TABLE A5.18. Q15A—PLEASE RATE THE INFORMATION THAT WAS PROVIDED IN THE DRAFT MANAGEMENT PLAN FOR THE COVERAGE OF THE KEY ISSUES?

	PROPORTION OF RESPONDENTS* (%)
Inadequate / neglected key issues	7
	8
Neutral	19
	24
Adequate / covered all key issues	28
Don't know / can't remember	11
No response	3
Total	100

* $n = 231$.

TABLE A5.19. Q15B—PLEASE RATE THE INFORMATION THAT WAS PROVIDED IN THE DRAFT MANAGEMENT PLAN FOR HOW EASY IT WAS TO UNDERSTAND?

	PROPORTION OF RESPONDENTS* (%)
Very difficult to understand	5
	7
Neutral	26
	28
Very easy to understand	20
Don't know / can't remember	10
No response	3
Total	100

* $n = 231$.

TABLE A5.20. Q15C—PLEASE RATE THE INFORMATION THAT WAS PROVIDED IN THE DRAFT MANAGEMENT PLAN FOR HOW BALANCED IT WAS?

	PROPORTION OF RESPONDENTS* (%)
Unbalanced/biased	14
	17
Neutral	26
	12
Balanced/unbiased	11
Don't know / can't remember	16
No response	3
Total	100

* $n = 231$.

TABLE A5.21. Q16—WAS MAKING A WRITTEN SUBMISSION THE PREFERRED WAY FOR YOU TO PARTICIPATE IN THE [PARK] PLAN REVIEW, COMPARED TO SOME OTHER WAY?

	PROPORTION OF RESPONDENTS* (%)
Yes	83
No	13
No response	4
Total	100

* $n = 231$

TABLE A5.22. Q18—DID YOU ATTEND A HEARING TO SPEAK IN SUPPORT OF YOUR WRITTEN SUBMISSION ON THE [PARK] DRAFT MANAGEMENT PLAN?

	PROPORTION OF RESPONDENTS* (%)
Yes	25
No	69
Someone else spoke in support of my/our submission	6
Total	100

* $n = 231$.

TABLE A5.23. Q19—IF YOU DID NOT ASK TO BE HEARD, WHAT WERE YOUR REASONS WHY?

	PROPORTION OF RESPONDENTS* (%)
I had work obligations	23
The date/time of day prevented me	18
The location was not accessible	27
I felt the written submission was enough	45
My submission was in support of the draft management plan and I did not feel it was necessary to speak to this	7
My interests were being represented by someone else	19
I don't like hearings	9
Other	23

* $n = 168$ —Subsample based on those who did not ask to be heard in support of their submission. Total may exceed 100% because of multiple responses.

TABLE A5.24. Q20—PLEASE RATE HOW DIFFICULT YOU FOUND SPEAKING IN SUPPORT OF YOUR SUBMISSION AT THE HEARING.

	PROPORTION OF RESPONDENTS* (%)
Found it very difficult	5
	7
Neutral	16
	26
Found it very easy	44
Don't know / can't remember	2
Total	100

* $n = 57$ —subsample based on those who spoke in support of their submission.

TABLE A5.25. Q22—HAVE YOU RECEIVED ANY WRITTEN FEEDBACK ABOUT YOUR SUBMISSION ON THE WHANGANUI NATIONAL PARK MANAGEMENT PLAN REVIEW?

	PROPORTION OF RESPONDENTS* (%)
Yes	45
No	55
Total	100

* $n = 231$.

TABLE A5.26. Q22A—HOW USEFUL WAS THIS FEEDBACK?

	PROPORTION OF RESPONDENTS* (%)
Not very useful	13
	5
Neutral	35
	21
Very useful	19
Don't know / can't remember	7
No response	1
Total	100

* $n = 104$ —Subsample based on those who have received written feedback about their submission.

TABLE A5.27. Q22B—IF YOU DID NOT GET FEEDBACK, DO YOU THINK IT WOULD HAVE BEEN USEFUL TO GET FEEDBACK ABOUT YOUR SUBMISSION?

	PROPORTION OF RESPONDENTS* (%)
Yes	70
No	6
Don't know	18
No response	6
Total	100

* $n = 127$ —Subsample based on those who did not receive written feedback about their submission.

TABLE A5.28. Q23—HOW WELL DO YOU THINK THE MANAGEMENT PLAN REVIEW TOOK ALL POINTS OF VIEW INTO ACCOUNT?

	PROPORTION OF RESPONDENTS* (%)
Did not take views into account at all	10
	11
Neutral	23
	13
Fully took account of all views	7
Don't know / can't remember	31
No response	5
Total	100

* $n = 231$.

TABLE A5.29. Q27—DID YOU PREPARE YOUR SUBMISSION ON THE [PARK] PLAN AS AN INDIVIDUAL OR AS A REPRESENTATIVE OR MEMBER OF AN ORGANISATION?

	PROPORTION OF RESPONDENTS* (%)
Individual	59
Organisation	29
Other (please explain)	6
Both individual and organisation	6
No response	0
Total	100

* $n = 231$.

TABLE A5.30. Q28—DO YOU PARTICIPATE IN OR ARE YOU A MEMBER OF ANY OUTDOOR RECREATION, CONSERVATION OR ENVIRONMENTAL GROUPS?

	PROPORTION OF RESPONDENTS* (%)
No	30
Yes (please give the name(s))	69
No response	1
Total	100

* $n = 150$ —subsample based on those who completed the submission as an individual.

TABLE A5.31. Q29—PLEASE INDICATE THE TYPE OF ORGANISATION YOU PREPARED A SUBMISSION ON THE WHANGANUI NATIONAL PARK DRAFT MANAGEMENT PLAN FOR.

	PROPORTION OF RESPONDENTS* (%)
Conservation or environmental group	12
Outdoor recreational group	40
Concessionaire	7
Business	10
Māori/Iwi/Hapū group	1
Local/regional government	5
Central government	1
Other	22

* $n = 92$ —subsample based on those who completed the submission as a representative of an organisation.

Note: total may be less than 100% due to rounding.

TABLE A5.32. Q30—IN WHICH AGE GROUP ARE YOU?

PROPORTION OF RESPONDENTS* (%)	
15-19	1
20-29	3
30-39	12
40-49	18
50-59	29
60-69	23
70+	12
95	3
Total	100

* $n = 231$.

TABLE A5.33. Q31—ARE YOU MALE OR FEMALE?

PROPORTION OF RESPONDENTS* (%)	
Male	74
Female	23
No Response	3
Total	100

* $n = 231$.

TABLE A5.34. Q32—WHICH ETHNIC GROUP(S) DO YOU BELONG TO?

PROPORTION OF RESPONDENTS* (%)	
European/NZ European/Pakeha	68
Māori	4
Pacific Islander	1
Asian (incl. Indian)	0
New Zealand / Kiwi	37
Other ethnic group	1
Prefer not to say	3

* $n = 231$.

Note: total may exceed 100% because of multiple responses.

TABLE A5.35. Q33—AND WHICH OF THE FOLLOWING BEST DESCRIBES YOUR HIGHEST QUALIFICATION?

	PROPORTION OF RESPONDENTS* (%)
No qualification	4
School qualification	15
Certificate or Diploma	14
Polytechnic/University courses below Bachelors degree	14
Bachelor degree	18
Post-graduate degree (Honours, Masters, PhD)	22
Other	6
Don't know	1
Refused	4
No response	2
Total	100

* $n = 231$.

TABLE A5.36. Q34—AT PRESENT ARE YOU...?

	PROPORTION OF RESPONDENTS* (%)
Self-employed / business owner	33
Full-time salary or wage earner	37
Part-time salary or wage earner (less than 30 hours per week)	9
Retired	21
Full-time home-maker	2
Student	3
Unemployed	0
Other beneficiary	0
Other	5
Prefer not to say	1

* $n = 231$.

Note: total may exceed 100% because of multiple responses.

TABLE A5.37—Q35 WHAT WAS YOUR INDIVIDUAL INCOME LAST YEAR, BEFORE TAX?

	PROPORTION OF RESPONDENTS* (%)
Nil income or loss	0
Under \$20,000	9
\$20,001-\$30,000	10
\$30,001-\$50,000	21
\$50,001-\$70,000	17
\$70,001-\$100,000	11
\$100,001 and over	5
Unsure	3
Prefer not to say	23
No response	2
Total	100

* $n = 231$.

TABLE A5.38. Q36—IN WHICH OF THE FOLLOWING AREAS OF NEW ZEALAND DO YOU LIVE?

	PROPORTION OF RESPONDENTS* (%)
Northland	0
Auckland	8
Waikato	5
Bay of Plenty	6
Hawke's Bay	2
Taranaki	2
Manawatu-Wanganui	7
Wellington-Wairarapa	7
Tasman	14
Nelson	12
West Coast	2
Canterbury	12
Otago	5
Southland	13
Other	3
No Response	2
Total	100

* $n = 231$.

TABLE A5.39. Q37—HAVE YOU MADE SUBMISSIONS ON ANY MANAGEMENT PLANS OR STRATEGIES FOR ANY OTHER PROTECTED AREAS ... ?

	PROPORTION OF RESPONDENTS* (%)
A conservation management strategy for an area	25
A conservation management plan for a specific site (e.g. a forest park or reserve)	26
A national park management plan	38
A marine reserve management plan	13
A resource consent process	31
A proposed regional or district plan	35
A designation process for an area of land	16
A long-term council community plan	26
Other	7

* $n = 231$.

Note: total may exceed 100% because of multiple responses.

How effective are the public input parts of DOC's statutory planning processes?

This study set out to evaluate the effectiveness of public participation in the New Zealand Department of Conservation's (DOC's) statutory planning processes, focussing on assessments of five recent National Park Management Plan reviews and one Conservation Management Plan review. It identifies the main constraints to public participation and provides recommendations for ways in which statutory participation processes can be improved.

Wouters, M.; Hardie-Boys, N.; Wilson, C. 2011: Evaluating public input in National Park Management Plan reviews: facilitators and barriers to meaningful participation in statutory processes. *Science for Conservation* 308. 104 p.