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# Introduction and approach

Hāpai Hapori commissioned Dovetail, an independent evaluation consultancy, to evaluate the Community-Led Development Programme (CLDP). In this report, we provide detailed case studies on each of the participating CLDP projects, as at April 2021. This document is a companion volume to a separate report that details overarching findings from the CLDP evaluation.

This evaluation report is informed by wide-ranging interviews with community partners and community advisors in each CLDP. These were supplemented by document analysis of the CLDP and participating communities.

This document draws on interviews with 53 community partners and 17 community advisors from Hāpai Hapori, conducted between August 2021 and January 2022.

Each interview explored the following areas:

* Applying principles of CLD locally through CLDP
* Relationship of community with Hāpai Hapori
* Learning and development through CLDP participation
* Engagement and relationships between advisors and community partners
* Diversity, equity and Te Tiriti o Waitangi
* Impacts and achievements
* Success factors
* Challenges, barriers and risks
* Improvements and adjustments to CLDP

All interviews were recorded and transcribed, and/or detailed notes were taken. Information sheets and consent forms for signing were supplied to all participants.

The main report on this evaluation provides further detail on the evaluation approach.

Appendices to this report provide background information on each community from programme documentation.

# Whananāki

Region: Northland

Year joined CLDP: 2017

Community vision: A culturally connected caring community

Current situation: About to exit CLDP after five years as per planned timeframes.

This summary is based on interviews with community members and the lead advisor, conducted in August to October 2021, along with analysis of background documentation.

## Whananāki community

The Whananāki Inlet is on the Tutukaka coast. It is accessible by local roads from State Highway 1, and is on Te Araroa (walking trail).

Historically, local residents make a distinction between the largely non-Māori community along the beach and estuary – referred to as ‘the beach’ (or ‘the coast’) – and the largely Māori community around the marae – referred to as ‘the valley’. Both areas are on the northern side of the estuary.

The hapū in South Whananāki, over a footbridge, has been less involved in the programme to date.

### History of the project

Whananāki was one of the first intake of communities into CLDP (2017) after the initial pilot phase.

One of the current coordinators had been close to the Whirinaki pilot project via its fund holder. She observed the early CLDP in operation and became interested in what could be done in Whananāki. Partly as a result, the community instigated a series of hui to discuss their aspirations. Through the hui, the community developed a “path plan” outlining where they wanted to head.

We came up with a vision which is a culturally connected, caring community and that was the vision that we came up with and then we decided that our mission was basically around Hoea Te Waka which was all about paddling the waka forward in unison and swiftly and it's five years on, almost five years and we’re now paddling in unison, but it’s not swiftly.

Following the hui, the community lodged an expression of interest with the Department, at which point a Hāpai Hapori advisor became involved.

The Whananāki CLDP Partnership Agreement was signed on 6 June 2017.

### Leadership and governance

Leadership has been spread across both ends of the community. There is a leadership group (now a formal Governance Group) of seven, which comprises representatives from:

* Beach: Beach Association, Landcare Group, Land-to-Sea Conservation.
* Valley: Marae Committee, Māori Committee (environmentally focused), Women’s Committee of the marae, young person’s representative.

The CLDP employs a team of three part-time coordinators, who play crucial leadership roles, as does the school principal, along none of these people are officially part of the leadership group.

### Project implementation

The three community coordinators are responsible for facilitating community collaboration and coordinating activities in line with the community CLD plan.

The part-time, shared nature of the positions is a deliberate strategy to bring in a diversity of skills, experience, networks, and a spread of ages. All have deep local connections. One has extensive experience in community-led development and project management, is particularly adept at working through any community tension, and is the most comfortable using the reporting system (Community Matters). Another has skills in social media, web and graphic design. The third was hired for their ability to reach and engage people in the community who have not been strongly involved to date.

For any given project, the leadership group identifies a community champion. It is that person who drives the project, with coordinators providing support.

Even though they're quite well connected in terms of the community, there's a distinction between the coast and the valley and generally we've found that what happens is … the CLD goes where the energy is. So they don’t try and push anything. If it's not going to happen it doesn’t happen but there's got to be the energy there to support it and I think that's one of the guiding principles that they've had is that don’t try and flog something if, the idea might have been great at the time but if there's no energy behind it then there's no energy.

Activities undertaken through the project include the following:

* Community hub feasibility
* Solar panel installation
* Flora and fauna project
* Wāhi tapu project
* Evaluation of community-led development practice and its impact on the community
* Intergenerational digital story telling initiative and contemporary pou
* Predator control project
* Native nursery
* Rongoa social enterprise, with the local school
* Ecotourism initiative
* Workshops and day trips, including inanga spawning, learn-to-snorkel, kiwi aversion dog training, waka trips

## Relationship with Hāpai Hapori

Overall, this is a community that expresses high satisfaction with Hāpai Hapori, as evidenced by such comments as “I think we get more than what we even expect.”

### Contribution of Hāpai Hapori to project

Community interviewees repeatedly noted the following contributions of Hāpai Hapori to the project:

**A consistent** **presence** – the lead advisor rarely misses a community meeting in Whananāki, and is also readily available to meet with coordinators “in town” (Whangārei). This is a reflection of the emphasis on whakawhanaungatanga, building relationships, in this community.

**The initial partnership agreement** was as an act of trust on both sides: “it was a big, big, for the community, to be signing a partnership agreement.”

**Resources** – funding provided momentum, with the coordinator positions considered the single most valuable use of money:

I think we would have still moved along maybe not at the pace we have because when people see, literally see things happening, it creates a bit of momentum and I think it would have taken us a lot, lot longer [without] having the resources and the support

**Access to other funding opportunities** – This is a good example of Hāpai Hapori providing practical support in a way that has built community confidence and guided them towards self-determination.

The lead advisor first successfully connected the community with Foundation North. Interviewee comments suggest the lead advisor takes opportunities to makes lessons explicit, for example by telling them that using Foundation North funding for the flora and fauna project was “a very good example of partnership.”

The community then learnt to leverage DIA funding to obtain larger grants from other organisations: the native nursery received $85,000 through CLDP and $675,000 over three years via Jobs for Nature.

Now, as the community transitions away from the CLDP, interviewees could draw on their experience over the past five years to articulate how to seek the money for ambitious projects:

If you had said at the beginning it's going to because a million dollars to build that Hub, we would have thought give up, don’t even bother but we’re like “No, no, we know how this works. You get one on board and then you go to the next one and then you spread widely and ask others hey we've got this much and just to finish we’ll need a contribution from you and you and you,” kind of thing. I think we’ll be able to do it and it is very important because the Hub pulls everything together, that's going to be our base for our social enterprise and it's a big part of our sustainability.

**Partnership –** in this case, Hāpai Hapori has modelled high trust and built up the community’s willingness to try new things.

Sometimes you get, and I've been involved in lots of kind of MOUs and MOAs and all sorts of things and partnerships and tha,t and really they're a piece of paper and they work but this one, it really like, the principles behind it, it’s been our experience that the principles have been honoured by both the community and the DIA and our fundholder too.

### Alignment with CLDP principles

The five principles of community-led development[[1]](#footnote-1) were seen to be deeply embedded in the project and guided day to day activity. The lead advisor’s approach is credited for much of this:

I’ll tell you one of the things I did like where I say he reflected, the principles were reflected, when I'd say, “Do you think we’re allowed to do this, can we do this,” and he’d go “Well it's not up to me, that's up to yourselves, that's up to the team, why don’t you take that to the leadership group,” and I'd go “Okay but they told me to take it to you,” and he says “No, no, we need to be guided by what you think as the community.” So to me that was a little bit of a surprise because I'm used to Government Departments saying, “No this is what you should do, this is what we advise.” So that was a pleasant surprise from the get-go.

In summary, Whananāki community members say that Hāpai Hapori has put all the principles into practice:

DIA never came across as it was chasing targets, it was creating opportunities.

## Community self-determination

### Supporting self-determination

The Lead Adviser says that he has learnt to be humble and listen to the community rather than rely on pre-conceived notions about how CLD ‘should’ be done. The appropriate support has often been in the form of connections and information.

He doesn’t say you're the experts but that's how he makes us feel by the way he always hands back to us but if we, he says but here's some information if that's going to help you. It's very empowering I think for us as a community.

Examples of how Hāpai Hapori has supported community self-determination, include:

* Consistently referring matters to the leadership team for decisions, holding back from giving advice.
* Consciousness of the power imbalance between Hāpai Hapori and the community.
* Purposeful building up of the community’s own resources, including networks and skills:

Maybe one of the most outstanding things about the CLDP is that they literally trust, we felt that as a community we were trusted that we were the experts in our community. So when we decided hey we want to do social enterprise and others didn't know a lot about that, we went off to conferences and stuff and we were supported to do that and it was like wow. But we have felt that we are treated like we do have the expertise and now we actually do see ourselves as the experts in our community.

The community plan has been a pivotal document, enabling the community to chart its own course:

That plan is not fixed in concrete but it's enough to, it's like the map. We can take different ways around on that map but we’re clear about the direction we’re heading and that's what that's enabled us to do, and when we’ve had a few challenges we've said, “Okay lets go back and have a look at our path plan.” And there's like, “Oh yep that's on the path plan.” We don’t rush to do everything and we can't, so we always go back, what are our main outcomes that we put on that path plan and we did it as a very visual thing.

Interviewees talked about their personal commitment to “sustainability and succession.” They remarked that the CLDP itself has helped them get to know the strengths and skills already possessed by people in the community. They consciously focus on building skills amongst community members. For example, a young person is being trained up to do filmmaking for the digital storytelling project, and four have been hired for the native nursery via Jobs for Nature funding.

Whoever we’re working with, … , we want them to have all the skills at the end, lifelong skills, it's not just the growing, we want to have them do their wheels tracks and rollers and licences and chainsaw licence and all those types of things. I think we’re looking at building well rounded people for society, for our community and giving them a bit of hope and opportunities and to grow that seed. It has been a stagnant community for a little while. They did have what they called back in the day they called it ACCESS courses and because they run it on a marae they called it a MACCESS Course[[2]](#footnote-2) and that was probably over 25 years ago, maybe a bit longer, that they were running courses at the marae but they seem to come and go, there was no kind of sustainability, it was just designed around the funding and once the funding ended that it was it. And so we know we’re shaping something more than that.

### Funding model

The fundholder agreement is with Ngā Manga Puriri charitable trust. Interviewees describe a successful arrangement.

Two aspects were mentioned in particular:

1. The fundholder is clear that its role is to ensure proper **process** in finance and HR matters, checking that funds are being spent where they should and that legal requirements are adhered to in HR. Interviewees report that the fundholder set firm boundaries from the start and has not become involved in the substance of decision-making.

It's like you're the decisionmakers, you set the budget, we’re not going to question you about that but if you go over budget we’ll be telling you, you'll get regular reports from us, we will ask you questions from time to time to make sure about if there's any decisions that are made regarding your finances, we will raise things with you. So they were clear from the get-go what they will do and what they won't do and from time to time they’ve said well that's up to you, you guys and they said, “Well we've got policies on how we manage HR, on how we manage finances and you guys need to look over that and tell us if you're happy or if you want changes because that's what will apply.”

1. The fundholder has demonstrated an understanding of the principles and practical realities of CLD. For example, the fundholder would process reimbursements weekly even though their preference was monthly. After a couple of years, coordinators were given a credit card to use for immediate purchases according to guidelines set by the fundholder. Interviewees mentioned that the fundholder had previous experience of CLDP via the Whirinaki pilot, and felt the fundholder had a clear understanding of the CLD principles.

Now the fundholder is teaching the coordinators how to manage finance and HR processes for themselves. Interviewees believe they have reached the stage where they can handle these matters independently, even though “it’s been wonderful having all that taken care of.”

### Community capacity

Arguably the litmus test of whether the programme has built community capacity is the point of transition, and interviewees were generally positive about the future beyond their active participation in the CLDP.

The community has set up the Te Whana O Te Nanakia Trust with a formal Governance Group. Some interviewees wondered how accessible their Hāpai Hapori adviser can be in future, while others expressed confidence that they would at least be referred to someone who can help even if it can’t be the adviser personally.

## Equity and Te Tiriti

### Role of Te Tiriti

Informal discussions about Te Tiriti and the principles of partnership amongst some members of the community provided some context to the development of the community vision:

It's not just a connected caring community that you might expect, it's a culturally connected caring community and that had a lot to do with the Treaty kōrero but I don’t think anybody really wanted to say the Treaty as such, but it was there, it definitely was there. Like okay so what does this mean, what does partnership mean in a community like ours.

People in Whananaki have generally chosen to focus on how equity and partnership can manifest in practice. There is a feeling – as in other communities – that it would be unhelpful to overtly frame their CLDP in terms of Te Tiriti

There were many that didn't even give a thought for that [Te Tiriti] at all but I feel it’s gone from strength to strength. I've still got a long way to go but in practice we’re starting to see a shift around that, and we don’t even use the word ‘equity’ but people are aware of that, we’re getting little shifts there. We don’t have to spell it out and use those words because sometimes those words just, I don’t know, for whatever reason sometimes they're a barrier.

### Mana whenua involvement

The Whananāki project was driven by mana whenua from the start. This is both reflected in and influenced by the fact that, until recently, CLDP meetings have been held at the marae.

The community hub will be located on the marae. Getting to that place took time but became a pragmatic decision about where land was available. Interviewees noted that there has been lots of kōrero around the implications of that location. While the coordinators and leadership group understand the hub to be a community resource, not a marae-only resource, the strong link between CLDP and the marae means that tikanga is beginning to influence the way things are done more widely. There is a sense in which tikanga can shine the spotlight on how a community lives its values across ethnic lines.

I think it's just small things, it's little things that are just put out there every now and again through them and it's things like conversations around, like the hub, will it be open when there's tangihanga, things like that and is this the right place for it if it can't be open and kuia getting up and saying if there's tangihanga in this community, why the hell should that place be open, no matter where it is, you know.

### Other diverse communities

Interviewees described an inclusive marae where people’s whakapapa is well known but not a barrier to participation, so the relationship between mana whenua and maata waka was characterised as “almost seamless”. The recent example of the first Marae Women’s Committee nomination of a non-Māori is illustrative:

I didn't say anything but I too was like did I hear that right and she got nominated. You have to be there and the nominations come from the floor and when I heard her nominated I thought how is this going to go down and it went through, she was supported and brought on. Now that was a big thing, it's a big thing for us because it's fine, we've got lots of Maata Waka involved in things and that and have been for years but we've never had one of the community who’s non-Māori.

## Impact of CLDP in the community

In Whananāki, relationship-building and supporting change have been mutually reinforcing: the distinction we make here is not as clear-cut on the ground.

CLDP has enabled the community to experience success sooner and to a greater degree than would have happened in the absence of that funding and support. In particular, showing trust – with appropriate support – has built their faith in themselves to the point where they are expressing confidence about their transition out of the programme.

### Building relationships

Developing and deepening community connections is at the core of Whananāki’s CLDP – their vision is of a “culturally connected community.”

Above and beyond local initiatives, interviewees consistently cited a greater sense of connectedness and shared understanding of the benefits of working together to achieve results as the most significant impact of CLDP.

I mean I think there's more connection there than there was before. I think that community-led development and the principles of community-led development, there's a better understanding of that, and so there's probably a growing sense of people actually being able to make the change they want in terms of their community and those that are involved are very much involved and are right behind the Kaupapa. So I think, above any of the sort of initiatives and the sort of tangible stuff that's gone on, I think that's probably where it's strengthened community, I mean they've always been a sense of community purpose and being able to do it but I think it's just given them a bit more of an understanding of what they're doing and how to do it. And I guess collaborating and working together to achieve some of the stuff that they want to see.

As relationships grow, change is happening. Crucially, the divide between the beach and the valley is gradually narrowing:

Along the way we realised, well at the Marae end, how can we encompass the wider community in the transformation of the Marae and I think vice versa. Like the Beach Hall saying, “Oh no oh well okay, the CLD is all of us so the CLD doesn’t pay for the use of the Beach Hall.” So little things like that are happening.

### Supporting change and innovation

As the list of activities above indicates, the community has launched a wide range of initiatives over the past 4-5 years. At this point, the largest initiatives are the native nursery, which is currently employing four people via Jobs for Nature, and the progression of plans for a community hub.

But perhaps the longest lasting enabler of innovation has been community’s burgeoning self-confidence. Interviewees said the lead adviser seemed comfortable with an iterative approach (“learning as we go”) that supported innovation:

He would often refer back to the [CLD] principles and that and then when we’d get something wrong he’d say, “Well it is about learning as we go,” and that's become a big thing for us, learn as we go.

Now the community has a body of experience that ‘mistakes’ can be a platform for improvement.

## Learning to date

### Key learning

Hope was captured as a key success of CLDP in Whananaki, and the benefits that flow from that:

I guess the biggest learning is that from this initiative … it created hope, that's the biggest thing. Hope creates opportunities but it just gave us a little hope, just enough to capture and have a little bit of self-belief

### Enablers of success

The **attributes, skills and experience of the lead adviser and coordinators** were mentioned often.

Along with them, interviewees pointed to a **strong, diverse leadership group** that spans both the valley and the beach –

Whilst we do have the community in a wider sense, the core leadership group without them sort of at the forefront leading it, I don’t think we could do it. I think that's number one, most definitely, is the core group.

**Reliable volunteers** – a dedicated band of volunteers turn up faithfully for weed eradication, native planting, and other working bees. This is both an enabler and an indicator of success:

If they didn't it will literally be like the coordinators, had a couple of the leadership group doing all the mahi but we've got some awesome volunteers that turn up to all of our things.

**Money** - to pay coordinators and to get things done. Although there were times when the existence of a putea seemed to create tension between individuals, mostly the funding – especially for coordinators’ time – was said to give momentum to community efforts.

**Open community hui** – anyone can attend and decisions are made there – and a **written and visual community “path plan”** have helpedkeep the community moving in the same direction.Alongside that, however,is an attitude of **going where the energy is** and **taking time** to work through disagreements.

### Challenges

Some projects have **taken longer than expected** to get off the ground. On the one hand, interviewees accepted that it takes time to reach agreement. For example, with regard to the community hub:

You take the time and then you'll get much better ownership and it will be much smoother for the long haul.

But on the other hand, there was a sense of frustration about the slow pace of some projects - the waka does not (yet?) move swiftly.

Despite progress, **building engagement** across the community is an ongoing challenge, especially reaching those at the beach end who may be suspicious of CLDP because they see it as a marae initiative

As little things happen I think more people get an understanding of what it's about and … I think what we've found too is that there's a lot of misconception and miscommunication of what CLD’s about too. Unless you're one of the people that are regularly involved, I think what we've found is that getting the message out there is probably where there's probably a bit more work to do in terms of what it's about, getting clarity about what CLD’s about and what the marae’s about, that it's not the marae because there seems to be still the sense that it's about the marae but it's not

The community has had to confront the **question of how far to move from the initial plan** – what is sensible flexibility and what threatens the original vision? This tension falls most heavily on the coordinators since they are the people who know what is in the budget and what that money is earmarked to do. Left unattended, disaffection can build and people can feel disenfranchised because their good ideas cannot be embraced, but at the same time these good ideas can divert resources from the community’s larger projects.

In Whananāki’s case, the lead advisor suggested that the leadership group request funds to respond to one-off community initiatives. The group successfully requested funding for up to ten one-off community events (at $1k per event), and activities such as a road-side clean-up, snorkel day, and paddling up the awa, have been supported in this way. The expectation is that a community member (not a coordinator) will organise the event. These events help build relationships, draw in different people, and diffuse potential tension as more and more community members start to see themselves in the CLDP.

To date the **community’s vision of economic success from social enterprise** has not been realised. Covid-19 has slowed the progress of the community’s ecotourism efforts. The community hub had originally been planned to have a cafeteria and hospitality facilities to cater for cruise ship tourists (as well as independent travellers). The community is now looking to the native plant nursery as the primary social enterprise, with the hub as a community space. Regardless of future developments, the economic development work has already led to a long-lasting change because the community’s horizons have widened and they are open to doing things differently.

### Local factors influencing CLDP impact

Whananaki went into the CLDP with several big advantages:

* A skilled coordinator who had direct experience of a CLDP pilot programme
* Their “path plan,” which they had developed via five or six hui in the previous year
* Mana whenua as a driving force

As noted above, an early decision to use the marae as the venue for CLDP meetings had a positive impact. Holding the meetings on the same day as the marae committee met resulted in kaumatua and kuia attending the CLDP meetings as well.

Conversely, reliance on day-time community meetings as a main form of engagement has limited reach because many people work in Whangārei. The appointment of a coordinator with a focus on relationships signals the community’s intention to diversify and broaden its engagement.

### Improvements to CLDP

Interviewees struggled to identify specific improvements that could be made to CLDP. The following suggestions were offered:

* DIA could investigate a national level fund holder for communities who do not have access to a good local third party fund holder
* DIA could require that there be a leadership group of “more than 2 or 3” before accepting a community into the programme – because a strong, diverse leadership group of about 9 people (counting the 3 coordinators) is a strength in this community.
* The Community Matters system could be made more user-friendly. In Whananaki only one of the three coordinators uses the system. That coordinator is very familiar with the system and finds it “fine”; the others find it “frustrating.”
* Prioritise face-to-face gatherings of CLDP participants from around the country, which were highly valued by interviewees. From their perspective, the virtual gathering was less successful: “there was gold in it but we still found that hard going.”
* Get advisors together regularly to share what they are learning.
* Consider whether more flexibility is needed in a “transition package” to meet the distinct needs of different communities.

## Reflections from the Whananāki experience

Some insights with wider ramifications for CLDP across Aotearoa:

* Humility, restraint, and a preference for listening over talking are key attributes for advisers
* Strong, sustained involvement by mana whenua from the start has been critical to the development of cultural connectedness
* The importance of shared vision and a visual representation of the community’s path forward as a reference point
* While being steadfast to its original vision, this community has learnt to accommodate more spontaneous ideas and to be flexible about the timing of key initiatives by going “where the energy is.”
* The value of a neutral third party fundholder whose role is confined to providing professional finance and HR services.

# SPiCE Sandringham

Region: Auckland

Year joined CLDP: 2018

Mission: to make Sandringham an even more amazing place to live, work and play.

Kaupapa: to give our community a voice and empower our community to shape our future, following the principles of community-led development.

This summary is based on interviews with community members and the community advisor, conducted in September to November 2021, along with analysis of background documentation.

## Sandringham community

Sandringham is a diverse, multi-ethnic city-fringe suburb of Auckland with a population of approximately 12,000.

### History of the project

SPiCE (the Sandringham Project in Community Empowerment) is a charitable trust in the Auckland suburb of Sandringham. SPiCE split from a previous Transition Town group, Grow Sandringham, that was already running a range of initiatives in the area. In 2013, a group of community members expressed dissatisfaction with the local board’s consultation over a proposed upgrade to the village reserve. They formed SPiCE and secured funding for a new, comprehensive community consultation. Building on the success of this process, the council invited SPiCE to lead consultation on the village as well. SPiCE then produced the community vision plan for Sandringham, which focused on events, greening, pedestrian safety, and village appearance.

In 2018 SPiCE became a CLD partner. They were invited by DIA to apply after SPiCE delivered a presentation with Inspiring Communities. The group had some initial misgivings about joining because they wanted to continue enabling people to come and go and contribute when they wanted. In contrast, the CLDP required a more formal structure and emphasis on reporting. Ultimately the group decided to join for financial support as SPiCE volunteers were exhausted. On top of fatigue, however, limited understanding of the CLDP may have contributed to attrition at this time:

There was quite a lot of group drop off at that point and I don’t think probably people understood the opportunities that the partnership was going to give Sandringham.

### Leadership and governance

SPiCE is led by a core group of local residents (trustees) with volunteers contributing to individual projects. The project employs two part-time community facilitators. Their first employee started in 2019 (18 months into the CLDP), and the other joined in late 2021, as our interviews were taking place. There are five trustees, four of which have been involved from the start, and a treasurer. All members live in the community.

### Project implementation

SPiCE has continued events and projects, such as the floral carpet festival, that it started before the CLDP.

With the appointment of a community facilitator, SPiCE has broadened its range of projects. Interviewees felt this was critical to engage with and bring together the different groups making up the community.

Due to COVID-19 and subsequent lockdowns, some momentum has been lost with many larger projects cancelled. However, SPiCE were able to continue some initiatives online, along with smaller scale community projects like Spoonville. Spoonville is a community art and connection project where residents were encouraged to decorate wooden spoons as people, and then add them to the spoon ‘village’ on their daily walk or bike ride.

The little tiny bits of fun and joy that come from just the cool little things we do like the Spoonville and the events, maybe it’s not earth shattering but for some people, it is just a bit of fun and joy that they might not otherwise have.

## Relationship with Hāpai Hapori

The partnership between SPiCE and Hāpai Hapori, while positive overall, was described by SPiCE members as ‘hands off’ and evidently took a long time to become established. Despite good relationships with advisors, the group have not always received the guidance they would have liked to make the most of their time in the CLDP.

### Contribution of Hāpai Hapori to project

The **significant time and energy required** of a group of volunteers who were somewhat burnt out following the considerable effort of community consultation/plan development and securing the CLDP was a challenge for this group, who also held lingering hesitancy about DIA involvement. The group felt as though they needed more support from Hāpai Hapori, particularly initially through this challenging establishment phase.

Because it wasn’t until we signed on the dotted line and it was approved but getting to that part took a really long time… and energy.

**Initial advice and support –** with two more years in partnership remaining the community advisor encouraged SPiCE to increase output and to start projects they wanted to happen. The trustees only then realised how much financial support was available to them and wished in hindsight it could have happened sooner. Interviewees agreed that the appointment of a community facilitator created a positive change, increased community engagement, and allowed more projects to happen.

Because they really feel that there’s an advantage to having actual people paid to focus on this instead of doing it in their sort of spare time.

**Self-sufficient -** the current community advisor usually attends the trustee meeting once a month, and keeps in regular contact with the community facilitator. The Advisor commented on the group’s self-sufficiency where advice is offered but they are not relying on the DIA for support. Likewise, the community facilitator reflected on the great relationship that they had with the community advisor and welcomed her insights and constructive feedback. SPiCE can see the benefit of being community-led and having autonomy in their decision making, although there was initial difficulty.

It’s hard though, isn’t it, because I guess they want to respect the community and having it be community-led but I personally think they could be slightly stronger and a bit more hands-on in what they’re asking of the trustees, in particular.

**Consistency –** SPiCE have had three community advisors in three years. While all have had a good relationship with the community, this turnover has presented challenges for the partnership. Relationship building takes time, and each advisor has brought a unique approach and understanding of the CLDP. Each one has provided different advice, especially around funding.

So there’s a little bit of confusion around I guess different advisors and given us a little bit of different advice at different times which kind of created a little bit of confusion and we always thought we needed to be quite specific about what the money was for right down to quotes and where it’s exactly going which turns out it doesn’t need to be which does save quite a bit of time at our end.

**Experience -** The community felt the experience of the advisor could limit or expand what the group could achieve with CLDP. Interviewees sought guidance and support from the advisor, so found it challenging when assigned an advisor at the beginning of their partnership who was new to community-led development. A community member explains:

[First advisor] was pretty much learning on the job at the same time as we were so that was a little bit perhaps with someone who had a bit more experience or knowledge of the programme and maybe with a bit of time under the belt maybe we would have got a bit more guidance at the beginning.

**Broader connections with Hāpai Hapori -** The community have valued the opportunities presented by the CLDP hui forum to meet and connect with people in a wide range of roles within Hāpai Hapori for discussion and advice.

Having that hui forum I think is really good, as a communication base for the DIA to just renew that partnership I guess all the time just to every year you feel like you're understanding the partnership again almost.

Due to Covid-19, the forum has moved online. This means new members have not been able to meet with the wider team at Hāpai Hapori. The Covid experience has highlighted gaps in hand-over documentation and induction processes:

I've been working to give information about how we work because I don’t know if… the community really knew how we work, that we have a panel that does the funding and we have a different panel that does the initial partnerships and we have teams and… it was my mistake assuming that that information had already been given.

### Alignment with CLDP principles

The five principles of community-led development were seen as important to keep in keeping SPiCE grounded and to ensure the community is at the core of every project. There was consensus across the group that the principles were fit for purpose in this respect.

The thing I like about the CLD kaupapa is that it’s very clear, there are five principles, you can have them in your mind all the time. You can check them off, you’re forced to think about it when you apply for funding.

The SPiCE vision report guides the community’s work. The leadership group and staff update priority areas by collecting community feedback at events, community meetings and via social media.

Building diverse leadership was seen as the most challenging of the principles. Interviewees acknowledged the limited diversity in the leadership group, and agreed on the importance of seeking community input on ideas to ensure they reflect community aspirations.

They're primarily from a Pākehā background… the big disadvantage is that because of the way it's happened, a lot of the community feedback tends to be from that community. So bringing in other ethnicities has proven to be quite a challenge within that community.

## Community self-determination

### Supporting self-determination

Interviewees said a large amount of energy is needed for community engagement and to continue with CLDP. The main challenge with self-determination is getting volunteers to participate and take on leadership roles in initiatives.

The big disadvantage with community-led is that takes a lot of volunteer steam and not all communities have the capability.

Despite this, interviewees felt that CLD was the best approach to enable self-determination.

For larger initiatives, however, SPiCE has butted up against the fact that not everyone uses a CLD framework. For example, in order to improve the appearance of the village footpaths, SPiCE had to seek approval from Auckland Transport who work outside a CLD framework. The process of seeking approval from such agencies is very time consuming and costly even for small requests. These constraints also limit the group’s ability to follow their vision report as it includes greening and pedestrian safety, projects that are heavily dictated by government and local council’s approval.

If they were doing it then I think it would be fantastic cos we’ve got funding to work like that but they do not operate like that.

### Funding model

The fundholder agreement is with the trustees and reportedly working well, although was a time-intensive process to establish. The model was considered as high-trust due to the leadership groups’ collective decision-making. The system being described as ‘slow but trustworthy.’

There was high praise for the funding model with the facilitator commenting on the fund’s flexibility and limited constraints. Flexibility has been crucial for this group during the Covid-19 pandemic, as funding could be moved from one project to another as required. For example, funding earmarked for an Innovative Street programme was moved to the Sandringham festival, but when that was cancelled, the funding was used for a tactical urbanism project.

I feel so privileged to be able to work with decent funding where they’re not checking every two minutes or constraining what you do or constraining who you do it with, just amazing, I’ve never come across anything like it, it’s very freeing.

A point of learning involved knowing the best way to apply for grants. The current advisor encouraged the group to apply for larger grants within one area rather than small specific grants. This reduces administration and provides greater flexibility, and is working well for the group. Community stakeholders reflected that they would have liked to have known how to best structure grants earlier on in the partnership.

With the funding it's more been that we think we're doing the right thing and then they go actually no you need to do this… I don’t know whether that's because it's changed internally at their end or whether we got the wrong end at our end but again it probably goes back to that whole thing at the beginning, had we had a little bit more clear advice.

### Community capacity

Interviewees mentioned that they had a large group of volunteers involved with SPiCE and that having two facilitators will further build capacity in community engagement. They have also built capacity with younger members in the community, SPiCE-Y.

SPiCE is now focused on how to best use the current funding and support before the partnership period ends. At the direction of their Advisor, SPiCE intends to do a separate evaluation in early 2022 to grow capacity in this area, identify strengths and weaknesses and plan for long-term sustainability. The group are looking forward to reflecting on the ‘big picture’ of their work in the partnership, and beyond.

The evaluation will link into those other things, so that's again just trying to take a step back from what they're doing on a day-to-day basis and think back about the principles and what they originally wanted to do and what originally were their strengths and remind them of those.

It was noted that Hāpai Hapori have not facilitated any relationships between SPiCE and others (services, experts), with relationships and connections driven by the group. With a community facilitator there has been further emphasis on building relationships and utilising skills within the community.

The community is still a significant way from having sufficient capacity to continue initiatives without CLD partnership. One member notes the reliance on facilitators to drive and deliver initiatives, in the absence of people in the community stepping up to lead, and the work required to grow this energy and ownership.

I feel like a lot of people think of SPiCE is just fun events and stuff which is a shame. Not bad cos fun events are cool but be great to get more people involved in it properly… I think that requires one‑on‑one engagement, actually talking to individual people. I’d really love people to come and say, “I wanna run the floral carpet and I wanna do it like this.” I’d be like, “Great you can do it, I’ll support you.” Instead of me running it and trying to bring other people in… It’s just making those connections

High property prices and rents in Auckland was seen as a further challenge to sustainability, because an office or space to develop a social enterprise is so costly. Interviewees were also unsure whether they could attract funders who are willing and able to work in a community-led way.

Intellectually, I can’t see how that will deliver CLD, the funding is the key. If the funding comes with any strings – strings of time period, strings of who you work with, what you do and how you do it then immediately it’s not CLD. CLD constrained by those, tied up within those strings whatever they happen to be.

The leadership group already has skills in governance, management, and finance. The new facilitator has skills in graphic design and experience applying for funding from other sources, which will be important for transitioning out of CLDP.

## Equity and Te Tiriti

### Role of Te Tiriti

Te Tiriti was not explicitly considered at outset of the programme, although the principles are incorporated in the kaupapa of SPiCE. It has been acknowledged by the leadership group as an area they want to improve in and SPiCE have recently run a Te Tiriti workshop to help improve the cultural competency both within the group and wider community.

We're doing very exploratory sorts of things especially with Te Tiriti rather than have really achieved what we would aspire to have achieved.

### Mana whenua involvement

There is no mana whenua involvement with SPiCE. Sandringham does not have a local marae and has a low Māori population when compared to other areas in New Zealand. The group have reached out to Māori outside the area, but their experience has been that they are busy and lack connection to Sandringham. Efforts to engage with the Te Reo emersion kura in the area have also not been fruitful.

They really don’t consider themselves part of Sandringham, their kids come from all over and they’ve told us, “We’re not part of Sandringham, we’re not interested in Sandringham, it’s not a thing for us, we don’t wanna do anything with you unless you’re speaking Te Reo the entire time,” so of course that immediately knocks out anything we’re doing.

Community stakeholders mentioned that they have reached out to Hāpai Hapori for support on how to build a relationship with mana whenua, acknowledging they need help in this area as they have no connections. The facilitator commented that she reached out to a previous advisor for support to engage with mana whenua, the response from Hāpai Hapori was that they were ‘too busy’.

An interviewee commented that there needs to be acknowledgement that mana whenua involvement looks different in some communities and those communities need support to help build a relationship.

…definitely something the Department can support a community like this with when they don’t have a strong mana whenua presence is how [to] support that. Equally we need to acknowledge that again that looks different in each community and we need to be respectful of what the mana whenua want to do as well…

### Other diverse communities

Sandringham has a diverse range of communities including a large Southeast Asian population. SPiCE projects such as the Diwali lights and the floral carpet festival have fostered relationships across communities and groups, including local schools and the business association. One example is a Southeast Asian community member’s work teaching Mt Albert Grammar students henna art. These young people then participated in the floral carpet celebration by painting designs for women attending on the day. Local schools, temples, community gardens and individuals were also invited to grow marigolds for the successful event.

Engagement with diverse communities has improved, even though representation at leadership level is lacking. Interviewees felt this improvement is largely due to having a facilitator on the ground who is a known face and can foster engagement with and between groups in the community.

So they had a committee meeting a while ago and about half the people in the room were not of European background and my understanding is that that’s the first time that that has happened for community meetings that had such a large multicultural representation and so these are I mean really great strides and steps that they've made and steps that they've made.

## Impact of CLDP in the community

### Building relationships

Developing community connections was seen as fundamental to SPiCE’s CLDP. Interviewees reflected that these relationships take time and the beginning of the contract involved establishing these connections.

Exciting initiatives such as SPiCE-Y, the youth group, has brought a deeper level of connectedness and new relationships into the network. One trustee reflected that seeing connections being made was the best part about CLDP, and the key benefit of the SPiCE partnership.

The connection it's made between the schools on a different level to an education level, the difference it's made between different people in the community, it's kept people connected as well, not just made new connections but it's also kept you all connected and it's definitely brought connections.

The Advisor also described relationship building as key to the partnerships work.

Quite a broad range of things… and all quite distinct projects but a lot of what [facilitator]’s brought to it is actually bringing together the different groups to work on things together.

### Supporting change and innovation

SPiCE has undertaken a wide variety of projects during its partnership. SPiCE-Y, which grew from a desire to ensure the presence of youth voice within SPiCE, is fostering young leaders and leverages one facilitator’s extensive experience working with young people and schools. The creation of SPICE-Y is supporting young people to identify what matters to them and to lead change, particularly in the creative and sustainability spaces.

Unfortunately, Covid has stalled some projects such as the Repair Café driven by students in SPiCE-Y. However, some projects have been created during times where community connection has been difficult such as the Sandringham Spoonville.

I think that has definitely worked well for getting young people involved but I really just want to grow it now so I think our next meeting will be around them coming up with ways to attract more people.

## Learning to date

### Key learning

The importance of building and maintaining relationships was an important learning discussed by interviewees. The importance of having a dedicated worker to build those relationships and not to rely solely on volunteers was also highlighted. However the demanding nature of the delivery work associated with the facilitator role was also noted, along with its isolating nature for those working alone or with governance groups that are time poor. At the time of interviewing the facilitator was looking forward to having a colleague to share workload and help to keep energy levels up and grow community connections via events.

It's just building those connections, building community. People are aware of SPiCE. They want to get involved. They know when SPiCE events are on, they look forward to SPiCE events.

### Enablers of success

The following were identified as enablers of success:

The **process is truly community-led**; decisions are made by SPiCE with the support of Hāpai Hapori to improve ideas. No application for funding has been declined to date.

Hāpai Hapori’s **Community-led principles** are clear and effective guides in the work.

**Having employees increases capacity**, avoids losing momentum by solely relying on volunteers, and allows for more community engagement that includes the diverse communities in Sandringham.

**Good relationships** – both within SPiCE and between the group and their wider community.

A high trust, flexible **funding model**.

### Challenges

For those leading SPiCE the biggest challenges included the **establishment of the CLDP**. More support could have been provided in how to streamline processes. The advice to employ a community facilitator could have been stronger, and provided earlier on. The community also felt that more information could also have been supplied about the amount of funding available and the grant application process.

As noted above, **delayed employment of facilitators** has slowed progress. It took some convincing from community advisors for a facilitator to be employed, leaving a lot of work to build relationships and deliver on projects in the remaining years of partnership. Although there are now two facilitators demand for volunteers remains high.

**Cultivating broad community energy and engagement** is still one of the bigger challenges to overcome. The employment of facilitators has bolsteredefforts to increase engagement with clear successes. However this work has been hampered by Covid-19 and lockdowns which have stalled many planned projects.

There is not universal clarity on where the **decision-making** lies in SPiCE, with some asking whether it lies solely with the trustees, or should include input from facilitators.

**A lack of diversity within the leadership group** has been a further challenge, leading to concerns that the voices of diverse community groups may not be sufficiently represented in decision-making.

The continued **struggle to build relationships with mana whenua** and lack of support from Hāpai Hapori in this regard is a further area of tension.

### Local factors influencing CLDP impact

The trustees hold the community’s funds and while the trust establishment was somewhat complex and time consuming this model has worked well for SPiCE.

There are very few urban affluent communities involved in CLDP and the community have felt they cannot compare themselves to others within the programme, seeing themselves as outliers. It was noted across community and advisor interviews that the context of CLDP is different in rural and urban communities but this is not recognised within the current programme. Consideration of how to engage with Māori when there is no active mana whenua presence in a community is one such example.

A further contextual factor has been the absence of a clear community priority and area of focus for SPiCE. This was seen to be in contrast to many other partnerships, established in order to address a particular challenge, hardship or commonality, such as isolation, deprivation, or an event. One community member expands:

Whenever we have training and I feel like this about a lot the sessions at the hui – they don’t address my specific situation. They never talk about affluent urban areas ever, never. I don’t know a single other CLD partner in the world that’s come from an affluent urban area.

### Improvements to CLDP

Suggestions for improvements reflect the challenges the group has faced with CLDP such as support in establishing the partnership and advice on the most effective way to apply for funding.

**A clear and comprehensive induction process** for all partnering communities and employees was suggested. This could include an induction pack with information on expectations around grant applications and reporting, as well as pointing community members to useful resources such as the Inspiring Communities website, relevant online groups and forums. A mentorship or buddy system between experienced and inexperienced community employees between CLDP groups was seen as a further component.

Better **fostering of connections between the CLDP partners** was a further suggestion. Opportunities to connect with and learn from other partners were highly valued, but had to be sought out by communities themselves. The in-person huis were seen as valuable and a good learning tool to get a wider perspective in how Hāpai Hapori operates, and effort to maintain this connection even during lockdowns would be beneficial.

Support from Hāpai Hapori to build networks and relationships that are hard to establish in some communities was requested. **More clarity is needed on what mana whenua involvement looks like, especially in some urban areas**.

A further suggestion was that Hāpai Hapori **promote community-led development more beyond the department**. It was felt that a road show or similar to convince more organisations, especially other central government departments, local government and related government organisations (such as Auckland Transport), and other funders of the value of CLD would allow for better cooperation between organisations for the benefit of CLD initiatives

## Reflections from the SPiCE experience

Some insights with wider ramifications for CLDP across Aotearoa:

* Importance of having employed staff to maintain energy levels and to improve community engagement
* The role Hāpai Hapori can play in establishing the partnership with the community to allow the community to maximise impact and achieve more during the five years.
* The challenge of building relationships with mana whenua in some urban communities, and the role of Hāpai Hapori – which is an agent of the Crown (Treaty partner).
* The value of the community partner being the fundholder; no significant issues have arisen to date.
* The costs and benefits to a CLDP of Advisor turnover.
* Make up of steering group - highly skilled but busy professionals with families that can be time-poor.

# Randwick Park

Region: Auckland

Year joined CLDP: 2017

Community vision: Empowering local/grassroots individuals, families and groups, providing them with the skills and opportunities needed to affect positive holistic development of Randwick Park

Current situation: Project is in its final year of CLDP.

This community profile has been developed following analysis of background documentation, and interviews with community coordinators, lead advisor and a member of Randwick Park governance. Interviews were conducted from August to October 2021.

## Randwick Park community

### History of the project

The Randwick Park project formally started in July 2017 with contract signing, as one of the first five communities in the programme. The aim/vision of the project is ‘Empowering local/grassroots individuals, families and groups, providing them with the skills and opportunities needed to affect positive holistic development of Randwick Park.’

The Randwick Park community has a history of innovative action spanning more than a decade, when a residents’ group was formed in response to a local shooting. Local community leaders had spearheaded a range of local initiatives, including community and employment programmes, managing a local sports and community centre, and parks maintenance.

The entry of Randwick Park was through a collective of five local organisations representatives (four of the five representatives were local Randwick residents) who came together to form a leadership group. Whilst many had worked alongside each other, they had not worked together closely before.

Within those five groups they had actually worked alongside each other before… The difference was they hadn't had to work and make decisions together… So they came together, they signed the agreement but then as they went to sign the partnership they said well before we start doing the work out there, there was a couple of them that said actually we want to know more about each other.

Randwick Park was one of the first communities to apply to the CLDP from the public notification of the programme, and there were neither pre-contact nor existing relationships in place with Hāpai Hapori. However, their established community relationships, and having previously been awarded ‘Community of the Year’ evidenced their community relationships and successes to date.

In the case of Randwick Park, the usual readiness assessment did not take place. Usually the lead advisor will meet with community members and discuss the extent to which principles of community-led development are present in the community; this is seen as an important process because it helps build understanding, connection and trust within communities. Because of family bereavements affect the lead contacts from the community, this was not able to happen with Randwick Park inside the preferred DIA deadlines. DIA instead relied on the supplied documentation to approve involvement in CLDP. In retrospect this meant that there may not have been a full understanding of the programme and partnership expectations, which may have contributed to the governance challenges that later arose.

### Leadership and governance

At the time of interviewing, two project coordinators had been involved for some 18 months to two years. Both however were not seeking to renew their contracts. The first coordinator joined the project in 2018, with a wide-ranging job description. It became evident quite quickly that the scale of the role required another coordinator, who joined some six months later who had been a resident for some 18 years and previously on the Randwick governance. The collective also agreed for the lead advisor to meet regularly with workers to finalise the community plan and workplan; this also supported the advisor to liaise between governance and workers.

Governance had been led by a group of local residents, but at the time of interviewing this had largely disbanded and a new governance group from outside Randwick Park had formed.

### Project implementation

In their time in their roles, the project coordinators established or built on networks across the community, and identified community champions to be involved in and to lead local activities.

Funnily enough the ones that seem quite small on the surface have been the most significant. So I’m starting with most recent is our community cuppa’s that we were having on Friday which it became make a pot of soup and come together and just talk and from there lots of really strong connections have been made, neighbours are friends with each other now who didn’t know each other and so it’s grown.

Activities undertaken through the project include the following:

* Operational costs that include salaries for an evaluation specialist and a project support worker
* Sewing and crafts classes
* Raranga (weaving) classes
* Netball team
* Street barbecues
* Celebration of a new community playground
* A fitness trail in its planning stage
* Capability building of community leaders
* Matariki festival activities (this was reportedly the only one hosted in South Auckland that year)
* Pātaka building (local food cupboards)
* Community engagement, communications and marketing
* ‘Brown Buttabean Motivation’ Boot Camp and cultural activities (e.g. Samoan Siva dance)
* A community ideas resource that is being shared with other CLD communities.

Some of the simplest local activities were seen to be some of the most significant. For example, ‘community cuppas’, where people simply gather to enjoy soup has become a base for forming strong local connections. However, motivating people to take part in community activities was described by one interviewee as an ongoing challenge throughout the project.

An evaluator working with the community for six months collaborated in the development of a resource for designing, implementing and evaluating community projects, which has supported a range of activity.

## Relationship with Hāpai Hapori

### Contribution of Hāpai Hapori to project

There was a general sense, particularly among the community coordinators, that the activities undertaken by the Randwick Park project would not have been possible without the CLDP and the relationship with Hāpai Hapori. Funding requests were quickly processed and released to enable community activities to happen.

I don’t think that we could have done half of what we did without the CLDP I think. I mean any organisation, it’s always the fight for funding, and it takes so long to get funding and unless you have a track record they won’t give you a decent amount of funding and stuff and yes we had done some cool stuff together but we didn’t really have an organisation that we could just go to… But this has allowed us to be really responsive

Related to this, and more generally, a lead advisor noted the importance of CLDP in being able to fund more than just community coordinators, but in directly supporting activities to happen in the community.

That's one of the beauties with the Community-Led Development Programme is that it's got those monthly [funding] meetings, … so if things do come up within the community, then we’re able to be a bit more responsive and quickly get some resourcing in there to build on that energy in the community

There was general agreement that the relationship was one of a partnership. The main community advisor working with the project was also seen to offering useful advice in supporting funding applications and general guidance on activity. Hāpai Hapori were also seen to be regularly available for advice, and made connections with funding sources, and organisations and agencies that could support the project, including Auckland Council.

The lead advisor was proactive in staying across project content, budgeting and working with the community coordinators to managing dynamics in the project. The lead advisor held on-on-one meetings with each governance member to further manage dynamics and to build alignment to CLD principles.

Hāpai Hapori also provided access to mediation when governance relationships broke down. Advisors at different levels in Hāpai Hapori were seen as regularly available and supported with developing work plans and community plans. Participants felt that the relationship with Hāpai Hapori grew and became stronger over time.

### Alignment with CLDP principles

The five principles of community-led development were seen to be deeply embedded in the project and guided day to day activity.

The community plan was a pivotal document for the project, as it created the ‘tangible document around what the community wants and what the community’s trying to achieve.’ As such, it provided a key reference point for all activities that unfolded, dialogue with the community on the project, and funding requests.

## Community self-determination

### Supporting self-determination

There was only a limited sense of the Randwick Park project working in a way that was seen to be self-determining. A range of community-initiated projects had been implemented, and relationships were built between the coordinators and community members, but the governance challenges (discussed later) were key impediments to progress. Relationships were seen as important to achieving self-determination, but if relationships are fractured, it is difficult to make substantial progress in this regard.

### Funding model

The funding model was common to many projects, where a local trust held the CLDP funds, and employed the coordinators. We understand from discussions that the fundholder was also on the project governance, and decisions about use of funds and the independence of the coordinators became ongoing points of contention in the project.

The approach of fundholding being held by an organisation working within the project was known to have created tensions in other projects as well. A supporting advisor noted that in some other areas, fundholding is undertaken by an organisation entirely outside the project, with no vested interest in the project delivery, and is instead there to ensure good financial and human resource management.

For instance down in Featherston, they have a group called REAP who is a kind of a fundholder and they're external to the community, … So they virtually act as like a bank really, so there's none of the perception of organisations gaining from the approach or individuals getting profit from this approach

Although there has been significant change over 2021 in governance, the fundholding organisation has continued in that role, but with the leadership in the programme now separate.

### Community capacity

The community coordinators valued the opportunity to meet coordinators from other areas and reflect on activity and development from other projects. They were also able to build capacity in evaluation and community engagement through their roles. An attraction of the project for the governance interviewee was the opportunity to become involved in community governance and learn on the job, but it the relationship challenges of this project appeared to make this a steep learning curve.

## Equity and Te Tiriti

### Role of Te Tiriti

Te Tiriti was not seen to have an explicit role in the Randwick Park project. It was thought to be implicitly incorporated by way of the CLD values and in particular partnership and inclusivity.

### Mana whenua involvement

Whilst Māori are involved in project governance, including in the current governance roles, mana whenua have not been substantially involved in the project. It was noted however that mana whenua were present at the signing of the partnership.

### Other diverse communities

Outside of mana whenua, mataa waka have had involvement in Randwick Park activities; for example, the chair of the Papakura urban marae has regularly supported activities, including karakia and whaikōrero at community facilities and events.

There was a clear intention by community coordinators to involve local people in projects that reflected the many different cultures of Randwick Park. Some local activities reflected the diversity of Randwick Park, for example, Samoan Siva dance sessions. It was noted that the project struggled to involve many of the local Indian community, but at the same time, the local Sikh temple was playing a key role in bringing food to local people during lockdown; this suggests the potential for connections are clearly there, but have not always been able to be activated through the project.

## Impact of CLDP in the community

### Building relationships

CLDP was seen to be making a difference through enabling the development of connections and relationships in the community. The coordinators were of the view that relationships can be slow to build, and although getting people involved was a constant challenge, in the past six months before being interviewed, momentum was thought to have grown significantly in community relationships. At the time of interview, in the midst of an extended COVID lockdown, these connections were crucially important.

For me it’s probably the connections that are made between people that wouldn't normally be connected. For me, a really important aspect of building community is to have people who know each other …, especially in times like this, I've had people from community who just message me and go, “Hey Marie can I have some lemons,” “Have you got some wool,” “How can I get hold of a food parcel,” like its building those relationships to be able to not fix the issues but to be able to come up with solutions for these challenges that people are having.

New relationships as unintentional outcomes that from local projects were raised by the lead advisor, and which has supported bridge-building between different parts of the community. In Randwick Park, the ‘super-localised’ nature of activity was seen to be bringing people together in ways that would not have occurred otherwise.

One of the recent projects … was around where they just brought in some dumpsters into a street for people just to chuck their rubbish because they’ve been kind of illegal dumping at one of the reserves nearby… But it wasn’t just around the environmental outcome when people are throwing things into the bin, they’ve got to connect with their neighbours, and they also put on a barbecue at the reserve to try and bring people together. So just a simple rubbish throwing event was able to unlock a lot of connection and neighbourliness

### Supporting change and innovation

The opportunity that CLDP gave the community to try new activities that are relevant to the community’s needs and aspirations was appreciated. It was also noted that different initiatives had flow-on effects for networking and community connection, and new avenues for local people to support others in their community.

And how high tea plates led to me teaching a class in school, in the primary school and then they said how can we repay you and I said you can repay me by your sewing class making hot water bottle covers to give out to people who are cold.

## Learning to date

### Key learning

A key learning from Randwick Park was the centrality of relationships and the importance of maintaining relationships. Through relationships, it is possible to build among community members a sense of belief that they can make change happen. It was suggested that projects should not be evaluated by the number of people involved but by the depth of relationships that developed, and the impact that these have had.

Personally for the coordinators, both spoke of the personal learning that has come through their involvement in the programme, including connecting with people, running events, building relationships and evaluation.

### Enablers of success

Relationships clearly were both enablers of success, and in the absence of constructive relationships, emerged as critical challenges. The interconnection between community activities creating relationships, and their flow-on into new ways for community members to connect and support each other was highlighted as an important enabler of success.

CLD is not about just a whole heap of individuals and a whole heap of individual projects, it’s about everyone mixing, its messy but it’s cool

The value of CLDP in creating the environment for the ‘community to try anything’ was highlighted as an important feature that enables success. This was seen as giving communities the opportunity to test ideas, and be open to them not always working, to learn from experience and to try alternative ideas

The five-year operating period of a CLDP partnership was also seen as an important strength, particularly in building relationships and momentum.

### Challenges

Governance has been a key challenge for the Randwick Park projects. Accounts from participants indicate that the original governance group fractured, particularly over the fundholding and employment arrangements with a local trust, and governance group members were unable to resolve their differences. At the same time, the coordinators felt constrained in what they could achieve locally as many significant funding decisions could not be agreed by the governance group. Key areas of difference among the governance group arose in a range of areas, including having paid workers versus using the funds for community activities; competing organisation agendas; and different views on implementation.

One area of feedback was that at times Hāpai Hapori erred towards the community-led philosophy, when with governance it may have been useful for Hāpai Hapori to have more actively participated in resolving issues. We note however that the lead advisor sought to engage regularly and directly with governance to try to resolve differences, and the supportive relationship with Hāpai Hapori advisors was important to the community coordinators when they felt in the midst of governance challenges. A lead advisor noted the challenge of avoiding both being too distant from communities where they feel they’re being left to themselves, and being too close and directive; this is a constant balancing act for advisors. Taken together, these highlight a challenging role for advisors in balancing these different interests in a community project.

Eventually Hāpai Hapori stepped in and set up an independent mediation process. Following mediation, it was mutually agreed that the situation couldn’t continue, and the governance group disbanded. It was noted that all brought genuine good intent to the partnership, and were willing to step aside to ensure that the project could continue and the resources available could be activated for the good of the community.

A new leadership or kaitiaki group was established, but which is now predominantly led from outside Randwick Park. At the time of writing, the reporting arrangements to the new governance group is more formal and distant, with only written reports submitted by the coordinators and no in-person reporting. In the face of these challenges, the original coordinators decided not to re-apply for their positions.

A new coordinator is being appointed at the time of writing, and there is optimism with the governance representative interviewed that the project will be able to get back on track. However, with only one full year still to run for the project, rebuilding momentum and working towards self-determination will be a challenge.

### Improvements to CLDP

Areas where CLDP could potentially improve, as noted above, are in building governance capability and being more attuned to challenges within communities and supporting their resolution. It was also suggested that building connections between community coordinators where issues encountered can be more fully discussed and reflected on would also be helpful.

Within Hāpai Hapori, it was noted that the original lead advisor was at times isolated in their role, amidst the pressure of escalating tension. Since then, Hāpai Hapori has looked to ensure two or three advisors are available to communities, both to reduce isolation and to bring a diverse set of skills to each community.

Notably, the Randwick Park project is one where the challenge of a single large-scale CLDP model may have contributed to the challenges being faced. Currently within CLDP, the model is a full-scale approach where communities go through a selection process and then are able to receive funding for some five years. It may be worth considering a more scaled approach where communities can receive seed funding to establish or test a community vision, and then work towards full investment at a later stage.

Potentially [communities] need something earlier than the programme to help facilitate those really early stages, so then they can get to a stage where they can have that time and space to be able to set a vision for their community … Just being able to pay them for their time to do some facilitated conversations within their community, to maybe give them some money to plan out an approach and then a little bit to put on hire a venue or get some food in or have a little event, just so they can start having conversations with the community.

## Reflections from the Randwick Park experience

Some important insights from these discussions, with wider ramifications for CLDP are:

* The value of CLDP in catalysing action and building relationships locally
* The importance of process and bringing partners together from the outset on what a community-led development approach entails and understanding their readiness for the project
* The importance of shared vision and community plans in guiding local activity and bringing shared collective purpose
* Setting a clear expectation across CLDP that community workers will be employed
* Challenges that fundholding arrangements can present, particularly where it is held within the community and the tension this creates in governance
* The challenges that urban CLDP projects can present that are distinct from smaller rurally-based projects
* Relationships as the building blocks of change and development
* The value of ‘quick wins’ in generating small-scale local activity for building momentum

# Raglan Naturally

**Region:** Whaingaroa, Waikato

**Year joined CLDP:** 2020

**Community vision:** Building on our values and the unique character of our community, five key opportunities have emerged; protecting our natural environment, employment for locals and having a balanced approach to tourism, leading and setting an example as a community – nationally and internationally, equity, safety and looking after those in need, and to be led by our values and create solid foundations as we plan and grow as a community.

**Current situation**: Signed their contract in 2020. They have completed their plan and have recently hired two co-ordinators.

This summary is based on two separate interviews with a community member and the community advisor. Interviews were conducted between August and October 2021.

One of the interviewees is an iwi rep and also the co-chair for Raglan Naturally. The other interviewee has over 20 years working in government and advocacy roles.

## Raglan Naturally community

The benefit of Raglan Naturally is that you're not competing against anybody. What you're doing is you're all trying to come together for the greater good ………we're all working together for the same purpose and it's for community benefit.

Raglan Naturally is based in Whaingaroa, a small beach town on the west coast of the North Island.

### History of the project

There were phases to the development of the Raglan Naturally community. Initially a committee was set up to support the planning and facilitation of community engagement and the development of a community plan in 2008. The partnership with DIA and being part of the CLDP is relatively new. However, the community have been working together and planning for a number of years prior to engaging with DIA.

So prior to myself and the other trustees coming on board there was actually a Raglan Naturally Committee that worked together to bring together the Raglan Naturally plan which is our foundation of the Raglan Naturally Trust. My understanding is that there's been a lot of………community engagement, there's been a lot of hui, there's been a lot of focus groups around education, Local Government, the environment, business, it’s quite far and wide because everybody had different ideas of what the community plan would look like I think and so in order to kind of focus those efforts a bit more there had been some focus groups, there had been the Committee, the Raglan Naturally Committee, there had been a lot of drive around what are the next steps in creating this community plan and what would it look like, what are the aspirations for Whāingaroa, how do we get there and just marking out the pathway.

Recently Raglan naturally have pivoted to a Trust governance structure as they begin to implement the plan. A new set of people are coming on board to support this, including the community interviewee that spoke with the evaluation team.

With regard to funding, Raglan Naturally had applied for other funds but the CLDP is the largest that they have received.

We have had a number of funding applications to DIA but this is definitely the most substantial but it's been kind of bite sized, like a couple of thousand here, ten thousand there and then it's just been bit by bit by bit. I think at the beginning was just trying to understand who was responsible for the plan and then it’s come out that it was going to be a CLDP project

The Raglan Naturally CLDP Partnership Agreement was signed 17th August 2020. They currently have a two year contract with DIA.

### Leadership and governance

Raglan Naturally are led by a group of community representatives that showcase the diversity of the community. This includes five iwi and hapū representatives on their board.

The leadership team are all community appointed and come from different pockets of the community.

We have a number of other trustees that have been brought on board. Some of them have been appointed as representatives for the Council, for the Waikato District Council. Another has been, and others have been appointed by the community and, like Louisa. Louisa’s been appointed by the community and so have some others and then there's myself and our hapū rep. So it's really a mixed bag to be fair of different people from different backgrounds that have kind of come together for the one kaupapa of progressing Raglan or Whāingaroa in a positive way.

Leadership includes strong Māori representation. There is a growing strong presence of hapū on the Raglan Naturally leadership team.

So we do have a bit of a co-governance kind of model happening here and in that respect it's really around having hapū representation in decision making and so we've got three, nearly four hapū representative positions and having, it's not 50:50, it's not equal which is what you would ideally want but it's moving towards that, it's heading in a really positive direction and I think hapū having a voice in the Raglan plan and the implementation of the Raglan plan and on Raglan Naturally I think is a really positive step for the community of Whāingaroa and it means that everyone can come together and share their visions and their aspirations for Whāingaroa

There are two coordinators, who have recently been recruited by the community. One coordinator is to support the inclusion of iwi and hapū voice in activities and decision making.

### Project implementation

They are in the planning and implementation phase currently as the community thinks through and plans initial projects and activities. Some activities spoken about by the interviewees as areas that the community looks to explore, include:

* Matariki events
* Te Tiriti training workshops in the community

It's been an experience because other, whenever you take on something and you're new to it, what you have to offer and the group of people that have come on board with you, might have something to add to what the others have previously hoped or aspired to and I think that's what we've done with the Raglan Naturally Trust is that we've taken the whakaaro from the community and the Raglan Naturally plan that's been developed and the Raglan Naturally Committee and then we're just building on it. They've created a good foundation for us and we're just really building on it and growing it and hopefully with the aim for it to be sustainable.

### Importance of a community plan

One of the interviewees spoke of the importance of having a community plan and including community voice.

The plan’s been, as I mentioned, like it's been a foundation for us because if we didn't have the plan we would have to create all of that ourselves but the path has already been set in terms of this is what the community wants, these are the aspirations that the community at large have had, these are some focus areas that have, of areas that are more important than others and so we're working on our work programmes to start to align to that.

### Understanding of a staged approach

The interviewees spoke of the time, effort and expertise that went into developing Raglan Naturally and the need to pay homage to the whakapapa of the plan and community.

It was a significant moment and these were people that had been in it for quite some time, a number of years and they’ve put their blood, sweat and tears into this and I could see just the pride, I think that's what it was. It was just real pride like yay we did it. I mean if anything as the Raglan Naturally Trust we have to acknowledge the work that was done before us.

## Relationship with Hāpai Hapori

Overall, the relationship with Hāpai Hapori has been good thus far. Raglan Naturally is relatively new to the partnership and there are signs that the relationship between the community and DIA is likely to be positive.

There were initial misunderstandings around what the relationship/partnership would look like between the community and DIA, the community not wanting DIA to have a strong say or influence over the direction of the project. These misunderstandings have since dissipated as the relationship has grown and developed with time.

So I, in my every day job, I already have an established relationship with DIA. So I know Lenadeen very well and I've come to know Sue and Gaylene as we've been going through this process. The relationship with DIA and Raglan Naturally, I think while it was, there was a hope that it would work out to be a really great partnership. There's always been that hope that it will work to be a great partnership. As an outsider coming in, I think there might have been just some misunderstandings about each side…… I think there were some misunderstandings from DIA about how it was going to work and there were some misunderstandings from Raglan Naturally about how it was going to work. I think in the last six months in particular I've actually taken on the role of being the communicator with DIA and back to Raglan Naturally and I do the final results reporting to DIA. I think in the last six months in particular there's been a lot more focus around including DIA in what we do at Raglan Naturally. So if we're going to say that it's a true partnership we need to display that, we need to implement that and we need to honour the partnership that we've signed up to.

I think that there was, I think some of the misunderstanding was around if we involve DIA they might take over, if I can be honest but that's not the case and I don't think that that was clear to everybody that that wasn’t going to be the case and now I think in the last six months we have pulled down some previous barriers and I think the communication flows a lot more smoothly.

Currently, there is a general sense of trust between DIA and Raglan Naturally. Through examples of situations where DIA has been able to provide support and turn up for the community they have learned of what the relationship can look like on both sides.

The community advisor spoke of what it takes to build and develop relationships to allow for trust.

It's all in the relationships and a relationship ain’t just ringing someone up and introducing yourself, no, you've got to meet, coffee, catch up, you've got to work at it and then you've got to have meaningful conversations and you want to be genuinely engaged with that community. Now once you've built all that and that takes time and you've got to put the effort in.”

Trust in DIA is present in their involvement in community activities and supporting governance. Two DIA representatives have since been invited to be involved with and support Raglan Naturally in their recruitment of two co-ordinators.

So in our recent recruitment of our two coordinators, we had one DIA staff member come alongside us on the recruitment panel and so they’ve been really involved in helping us and supporting us and giving advice, particularly around HR and I think for us as the Raglan Naturally Trust there was some areas where we had gaps and HR was one of them and so we acknowledged that and then we reached out to DIA and said can you come alongside us on this recruitment so that we can make sure that there's no gaps. So they came in with their wealth of experience having done a lot of CLDP mahi before and a lot of HR contracts and things like that.

The above quote also highlights the input that DIA provides to the partnership. That they bring in skills to support communities that are currently missing. The community advisor is of Māori descent, has whakapapa to Ngāti Mahanga and brings years of experience in te ao Māori, advocacy and government spaces to the work with Raglan Naturally.

Furthermore, the community interviewee spoke of the importance of government representatives having an understanding of the community and their aspirations so that they can serve as advocates when called on.

Yeah, it's really beneficial for us to have the layers of the people that we've got and the reason why is because whenever we go for funding or something like that, those people if they're able to know and be invested in your project then they can easily advocate for it and so we've found that because we have presented to them that we've shared what we're doing, we've shared our aspirations, those sorts of things, that it's easy for them if they're in the room and there's conversations about oh what's Raglan Naturally doing, they can actually tell people what's happening because they're so invested and that's really good for us.

### Contribution of Hāpai Hapori to project

One of the interviewees spoke of how the partnership and having readily available funding shows a commitment from the government to supporting communities to make change.

It's amazing because what it does is it shows the commitment of the Crown to the communities…….to have this CLDP little niche and it is a niche because not everyone can get in it, it can only be one of the however many people across Aotearoa. It's amazing and so being able to access this funding, being able to access the resources from DIA, the wealth of experience, advice, is truly amazing. I'm enjoying it because you don't have to fight as hard as you would if it was openly nationally contested.

### Support as a feature of the partnership

Representatives are aware of the changing situation within the community and had contacted them about whether they wished to adapt. This, to the community leadership, was greatly appreciated. It suggested a degree of partnership and buy-in for the wellbeing of the Whaingaroa community.

One of the keys things, well one of the most recent things is that DIA came back to us recently and said hey we know that there's an outbreak of COVID in Whāingaroa, is there anything that the Board want to look at rejigging to look at the resources that might be needed in the community. That sort of thing speaks volumes to me because they’ve recognised the need.

This was an example of whakawhanaungatanga and building trust between DIA and Raglan Naturally. The interviewee also spoke of the efforts of the community to build relationships as well.

So I personally have been working with DIA for a number of years, they know me, they know my work and so I think that's why there was a level of trust but equally I think that had Louisa stepped into this position that she would have been able to nurture that over time as well.

### Opportunity to learn from one another

An interviewee spoke of how although the CLDP has yet to facilitate relationships with other agencies and supports, through the programme Raglan Naturally has connected with other CLDP communities. This has provided an opportunity to learn from those that have been with the programme for a longer period of time.

I definitely know that we have had other CLDPs who have been in the neighbourhood, that have been or visited Whāingaroa and they’ve met with another one of our trustees. I know that recently our trustee Craig met with some people that came from somewhere else and they were visiting Whāingaroa and so he met with them and showed them around and interacted with them while they were there

### Alignment with CLDP principles

The five principles of community-led development appear to inform Raglan Naturally’s kaupapa and activities. The community also spoke about pushing this further, building on the principles. Specifically drawing from local tikanga and principles that best align with Whaingaroa.

So CLD principles are probably, are something that we operate from but our expectation on ourselves is probably higher than that. so in Whāingaroa we have, because of what we're trying to do with bringing in our hapū and bringing in the community as a whole, I think that probably takes the CLD principles just that bit further.

## Community self-determination

### Supporting self-determination

There is some sense from the interviews that being part of the CLDP is supporting the community towards delf-determination.

Although it took time, there appears to be growing trust and the community making use of DIA skillsets to support their development.

### Funding model

One of the interviewees spoke of being very appreciative of the high trust model that DIA and CLDP are promoting

I think it's highly flexible. I think that there is a high trust model and I say that because we've made a recent application to DIA. We were successful. It's a sizeable amount and the reason why I say it's a high trust model is because in other areas that I've seen Government money be distributed in grants and what have you, it's distributed in either progress payments or in instalments or something like that and it's based on making sure that you've done an accountability and all of that sort of stuff.

The interviewee further spoke of how they were successful in a large application for funding through CLDP earlier in the year. This allowed for more focus on activities, the community and ensuring that the work gets done well without the distraction of multiple funding applications and burden of regular reporting requirements.

### Community capacity

Although at an early stage in the CLDP partnership, the community have been working together for a number of years to develop a community plan that aligns with the knowledge and values of the community.

## Equity and Te Tiriti

### Role of Te Tiriti

The interviewee spoke of the mixed understanding of the importance and relevance of te Tiriti within the Whaingaroa community. Part of the focus of Raglan Naturally is to grow understanding within the wider community of the relevance of Te Tiriti especially as it relates to mana whenua.

I think Whāingaroa is a good pilot case and I say that because there is perception in the community that Te Tiriti o Waitangi is very 1840 and it's not and so at the moment we're working on (indistinct, 49:23) claims, the Marine and Coast Act at the moment. We're also working on the Treaty Claim Settlements for Whāingaroa for our respective hapū and that's in line with Waikato Tainui and Te Arawhiti. So while there is a historic component to Te Tiriti o Waitangi, there's a very practical and relevant component that's happening right now. In our application to DIA, what we wanted was to hold a series of Te Tiriti o Waitangi workshops in Whāingaroa. So that's going to be happening in the next two years

The advisor also spoke of the responsibility to te tiriti and local iwi. As Whaingaroa is in part of the Kingitanga rohe, the advisor prompted the need to be accountable to iwi, hapū and the kiingitanga. The below quote spoke to the advisor considering whether to be involved in the partnership.

If I get involved in this then I'm, the Māori community are gonna hold me to account and so is your leadership group open for, just in case we need to be prepared have you guys talked about Treaty, where that sits, I says cos we’re in the heart of the Kīngitanga and I just know Angelina if she turns is gonna ask us some questions and we need to be ready and if I'm sitting next to you she's gonna target those towards me. So I just said have you been having those conversations with your group, with Raglan Naturally and what's their thoughts. In the end, Jenny and I sort of worked with them and they, yep, they wanted to imbed somehow the Treaty and it’s really early days so the discussions have been yes we want to commit to that.

### Mana whenua involvement

The community interviewee spoke about the involvement of local hapū in Raglan Naturally. They have five hapū representatives on the trust and a co-ordinator that specifically focuses on ensuring that mana whenua voice are included in the Raglan Naturally plan and their activities moving forward. They are also looking to have a Te Tiriti governance model.

Obviously, the co-governance part would be 50:50, we're not there yet but we're definitely making our way towards it. So it's an aspiration for us and I think just being at the table is a good start.

The interviewees spoke of being intentional in their decision to recruit two community co-ordinators. The role of one of the co-ordinators is to connect with and engage local hapū in the delivery of the program.

Their role is to make sure that the hapū are engaged with the Raglan Naturally plan. Their role is to make sure that they've got a space, their role is to engage hapū within the Whāingaroa rohe. So I think it was quite clearly identified that while we had a Raglan Naturally plan, not everybody in the community was contributing and so what we have done is we've created this role of a Hapori engagement coordinator, their role is to make sure that hapū are engaged with the plan, their role is to make sure that we have more consultation involvement in the projects that we lead out on, their role is to make sure that any aspirations that the hapū have are brought back into Raglan Naturally as a whole

### Other diverse communities

The community is looking to include a variety of community voices while also having a strong hapū presence.

You've got understand that in Whāingaroa there's just a lot of different, there's a lot of different entities or groups within Whāingaroa and they all have their own dynamics, even within hapū. I mean we're all sitting at the same time and we're all friends but then it can just, it can turn like that and it's the same in Whāingaroa. You might be, like we might all be friends at Raglan Naturally Trust but then you take that hat off and you put on a hapū hat and it's a different story.

## Impact of CLDP in the community

Raglan Naturally has worked hard to include the voices of the community and develop in a way that works for them.

### Supporting change and innovation

Interviewees spoke of being action orientated and driven. One of the key achievements to date- for the community- has been the development of the community plan that aligns with the values and cares of the community.

I think creating the Raglan Naturally plan, the community plan was a huge achievement because that meant a lot of time spent engaging with the community and getting input and getting feedback and having different focus groups and a lot of input, that's hard to coordinate, that sort of stuff is hard to coordinate and then it's hard to put into something bite sized. So although you see the Raglan Naturally plan, the amount of conversation and hui and hours and planning and all of that that went into it doesn’t necessarily reflect in the plan but there was a lot of hard work and so I take my hat off to the Committee

Whāingaroa is a community that has a history of advocacy and innovation. There was learning for DIA to reflect and develop to allow for a community like Raglan Naturally to thrive and truly develop innovatively.

It’s been a lot of work working through stuff and they're pretty savvy. Raglan is I think does some cutting edge stuff, some out of the box stuff and we needed to understand that too on our side of the fence cos they didn’t want to be boxed in too much and we have a tendency to box, we put some real rigid framework around groups but I must say we’re starting to move those, to widen and broaden ourselves.

## Learning to date

### Key learning

Importance of Te Tiriti and leadership that is local, with local values and representatives from local hapū and iwi.

### Enablers of success

The following enablers of success were identified by interviewees:

* Openness, transparency and availability of advisors builds trust and mutual understanding
* Having a flexible and low stakes funding model allows for the development of trust between community and the Crown. It also allows for the community to start on activities and developing within community without the constant need for milestone reporting and funding applications.
* Having hapū representatives on the trust ensures hapū voice is considered and the community is implementing their responsibility of partnership under Te Tiriti ō Waitangi
* The CLDP model is flexible and suits community characteristics

That's probably my bigger thought is that it's so broad that you can kind of make it whatever you want to make it and that's an opportunity for us to be able to make the CLDP principles and how it all works together for our programme and Whāingaroa work it's because it's not hard and fast, it's flexible and I think that is the real benefit of it is that it is flexible and you can mould it and you can mix it up in a way that suits you and your community.

### Challenges

The following challenges were identified by interviewees:

* Reflections on the nature of the partnership and what it means to be a partner when one side is in control of the purse strings
* There is a lack of recognition that the Crown is in a position of power, and that communities may naturally act to protect themselves.

### Local factors influencing CLDP impact

Raglan Naturally went into this partnership with many strengths, including:

* Years of input and wānanga on what the community is looking to achieve.
* An agreed community strategic plan
* A community leadership structure that is representative of the diversity of Whaingaroa
* A strong orientation to getting things done on the ground
* Strong and capable leadership
* “Being in it for the right reasons”

I think everybody is wanting the best for the Whāingaroa community. I think that we're all trying to understand each other and work together as best as we can towards a greater purpose

### Improvements to CLDP

Interviewees spoke of being happy and content with the partnership so far. The advisor suggested that the partnership was not long enough and that true change could only occur with longer partnerships. Further, they spoke of the model being boxed in and that to develop further it needed to be more flexible to support contextual differences.

What I'd like us to do is that we had been given some advice from Inspiring Communities not to box our, what we thought would be CLDP, not to box it in, and I think we've boxed it in a little bit, so we don’t really take their advice and I think when we start to put, make it a bit more rigid, that's because of money.

## Reflections from the Raglan naturally experience.

Some insights with wider ramifications for CLDP across Aotearoa:

* The importance of whakawhanaungatanga, building trust through actions and being present
* The need to be conscious of the inherent power imbalance between the Crown and community
* Development over time. Many hands coming together to create the Raglan Naturally community

# Katikati Taiao / Whirihia te ara ki mua

Region: Bay of Plenty

Year joined CLDP: 2018

Community vision: Katikati is a community of place – of a common location, where we live, work and play, and where people enjoy the environment for recreation.

This summary is based on interviews with community members and the lead advisor, conducted in August to October 2021, along with analysis of background documentation.

## Katikati community

Katikati is a town of about 5,500 people in the Western Bay of Plenty, about 30 minutes’ drive from Tauranga. It promotes itself as New Zealand’s Mural Town (almost two dozen murals), and Avocado Capital (about two-thirds of the country’s avocado production).

### History of the project

Katikati Taiao became involved in the CLDP on the initiative of Hāpai Hapori. The process proved fraught, but is worth detailing as it contains lessons for Hāpai Hapori’s future dealings with new communities.

#### 1. A new organisation

Enviro Katikati Charitable Trust, known as Katikati Taiao, arose in response to a proposed state highway bypass.

In 2017, Katikati Taiao secured Lotteries Community Sector funding for a participatory action research project, led by a local researcher. Called Hearts & Minds, this research investigated residents’ concerns and tested some responses.

At the same time, a Rotorua-based Hāpai Hapori advisor was looking for a suitable organisation to lead a CLDP in the town. The advisor approached Katikati Taiao, which put in an expression of interest in mid-2017. It formally became a charitable trust at around the same time.

The Katikati Taiao CLDP Partnership Agreement was signed on 1 September 2018.

#### 2. Conflicting expectations

It was a Taiao view that we really had been betrayed

The newly-minted relationship almost immediately hit a “really, really, really bumpy patch” occasioned by very different understandings of what would happen from here.

Key people within Katikati Taiao expected that CLDP funding would be forthcoming from the start. Interviewees said they had collectively put in thousands of volunteer hours setting up the charitable trust, contributing to the Hearts & Minds research, negotiating the agreement with Hāpai Hapori, and running their own community projects. They were exhausted, and looked forward to hiring some paid support. They also felt that the Hearts & Minds report had “nailed it” in terms of expressing community priorities, even though there were gaps in the research. They wanted to do more community engagement through, and during, some funded projects.

But Hāpai Hapori told them the Hearts & Minds report was insufficient; they had to engage the community more widely and create a community plan first. Meanwhile, the local Community Board announced its intention to create a community plan. Katikati Taiao were in an invidious position, and it appears that the Hāpai Hapori advisor had misjudged community capacity to take on more voluntary commitments: “we didn't have the resources or the time to do, to work at the pace she wanted to work.”

#### 3. Drawn-out process

We already knew what the community wanted, let’s just get on with starting it. It's like more bloody procrastination and bureaucracy getting in the way.

It took 12 months of “very combative, non-productive time” to sort out the relationship. Interviewees felt that senior managers at Hāpai Hapori had been slow to grasp the issues. Community members still have a sense that issues were allowed to fester, and they point out the imbalance in power and resources when the matter finally reached mediation:

When you end up with mediation you spend a whole day, eight people from Katikati volunteering their time for six hours negotiating and working with high level DIA staff who are paid. There was a huge discrepancy in … what we were committing to.

#### 4. Rebuilding community confidence

Katikati Taiao received its first funding from Hāpai Hapori in October 2019. Early funding was allocated to some quick wins, and on sharing the Hearts & Minds research more widely with the community. In June 2020 Katikati Taiao employed its first paid staff member.

### Leadership and governance

Katikati Taiao is the backbone organisation and CLDP fundholder. Governance is by up to six trustees, and a non-trustee secretary/treasurer. Currently the CLDP funds three paid positions: Manager (new position), Community Activator (an experienced community development worker with a strong engagement focus), and Insights and Information Administrator (admin and social media).

Initially, Katikati Taiao trustees set the direction of the CLDP, but then set up Whirihia Te Ara Ki Mua – intended to be a broad-based community steering group for the CLDP. Whirihia holds open public meetings once every six weeks and includes representatives of all the CLDP-supported projects.

The magic in all of the CLD projects is actually networking across the projects, if we can involve youth and environmental projects or that's where the magic is and that's where that Whirihia sits and they're sort of the panel that should be the decisionmakers but that's taking a while to get going.

Whirihia has recently become the official steering group for the CLDP. CLDP staff but none of the Katikati Taiao trustees are on the steering group, thus achieving formal separation of fundholding and direction-setting.

### Project implementation

The Hearts & Minds report illustrated Katikati’s past, present and future with reference to a kawakawa tree. It identified five branches, which have become the touchstones for subsequent CLDP activity. These are: youth well-being, service to the community, mana whenua, natural environment, and intercultural connection.

They’ve kind of set up a constellation model which kind of frames out I guess that vision and then in the constellations you can see all the different sort of … themes or work areas and you can see people who align into different constellations so they're not kind of overlapping, they're independent there, but they all feed into … making that town a better place to be.

Community members have been able to propose projects to Whirihia using a standard project template. Whirihia (with Katikati Taiao) has then decided whether to support an application to the CLDP Funding Panel at Hāpai Hapori. At this point, however, Whirihia has paused new ideas in favour of consolidation. Hāpai Hapori has indicated that Katikati has almost exhausted its fair share of CLDP funding (although there is no officially-specified limit per community).

The CLDP Community Activator and Manager are responsible for keeping in touch with projects.

The CLDP is currently supporting six projects. All of them involve community collaboration, but the list below highlights how CLDP resources are being used.

* Mana whenua action plan: funding for two part-time positions (one a hapū member) to support aspects of Ngai Tamawharuia’s 100-year plan, alongside Takarangi Research.
* Re-Naturing Katikati: coordinator position whose responsibilities include the weekly volunteering for the Uretara River and Katikati foreshore. Along with the CLDP, partners in this project include Western Bay of Plenty District Council, Bay of Plenty Regional Council, Project Parore, Tharfield Nursery, Trees That Count, Whitebait Connection, All-Terrain Chipping, Katikati Lions and others.
* Grow On Katikati: funding for a part-time position to coordinate this food security initiative, whose activities include three collaborative gardening groups, a Harvest Festival, and a children’s Seedlings Club. This work is also supported by Kings Seeds and Project Generate.
* Kai Noke Katikati: developing a social enterprise model using organic waste in Katikati.
* Positive Pathways for Rangatahi: including part-funding for Katikati’s first Youth Employment Coach. This initiative is co-sponsored with Tamawharuia Health & Social Services and Katikati Community Centre.
* Chrome Collective: seed funding for a social enterprise where people with disabilities sell their wares.

Katikati Taiao also worked with other community organisations to set up a shopping service for vulnerable residents during lockdown.

## Relationship with Hāpai Hapori

Perseverance, on both sides, through the difficult first year has paid off and the relationship with Hāpai Hapori is now much improved. Despite this, interviewees were divided about whether it is a genuine partnership.

### Contribution of Hāpai Hapori to project

I certainly feel like this wouldn’t have happened without them and that I mean really the best thing we've received from them is funding and [the current advisor].

Interviewees noted two key contributions of Hāpai Hapori to the project:

#### 1. Funding

Resourcing is making a real difference. Interviewees particularly mentioned the added momentum provided by hiring contractors for the projects, where they had previously relied solely on volunteers or not been able to forward an idea at all.

I can't think of one [project] that isn't working well.

#### 2. Community Advisor

The second advisor is described as “a constant presence.” He attends Whirihia meetings, liaises with key trustees, and responds when asked: “he's a very easy person to trust and like.”

The other thing I've noticed is that he does fire good ideas to us that he's seen in other places like “Hey what about this.” That's where the, I guess that's really good in terms of not duplicating mistakes.

Despite this, one interviewee described a lopsided relationship:

We do all the work. They provide money and if we ask we get information but I don’t, it doesn’t feel like it’s a proactive, and especially the fact that he's now been seconded and that was a little time ago and that they haven’t appointed someone.

There was also a desire to see the advisor more often in the community. Not only is he based outside Bay of Plenty, the Auckland lockdown has restricted his ability to travel.

Such comments illustrate the tightrope a community advisor must walk. The current advisor talked about seeking the “Goldilocks zone,” not too close and not too far:

You don’t want to be too far where the communities kind of just feel they're left by themselves, but you don't want to be in there that you're kind of guiding and directing and making the decisions, so kind of in that Goldilocks zone … and sometimes you have to oscillate in and out.

### Alignment with CLDP principles

The five principles of community-led development appear prominently in the Katikati Taiao Annual Report (2020-21). Interviewees say the principles are reflected in the projects funded through the CLDP, despite some difficulties with one contractor. It was felt there was still room for growth in the practice of using existing strengths and in building diverse and collaborative local leadership.

## Community self-determination

### Supporting self-determination

One interviewee challenged Hāpai Hapori to clearly articulate what self-determination means to them:

DIA need to know what a successful DIA community, CLD community looks like

It was suggested that Hāpai Hapori should exercise some flexibility in funding limits and the length of partnership agreements depending on how a community is tracking towards this goal, with an interim review of progress “perhaps at years three and a half”.

The Katikati CLDP has chosen to support seed funding for projects (mostly to hire contractors), with the expectation that this will buy projects the time and skills necessary to attract external funding for the longer term.

### Funding model

Katikati Taiao is the fundholder. This has caused friction in the community because they are not simply performing accounting and HR services: “they kind of were seen as the organisation who were controlling and running things.”

Whirihia Te Ara Ki Mua now acts as a community steering group. Its meetings are open to the public, so anyone can attend and put forward a proposal. The group considers whether a project aligns with one or more of the strands of the Hearts & Minds report, and recommends projects for CLDP funding. Project sponsors fill out a template, and the funding application is formally put together by Katikati Taiao.

There was a perception in the town that that group, the Taiao, was kind of trying to take over all the projects and the initiatives and try to become kind of the be all and end all over town. People kind of got upset around that so the creation of this new collective that is independent of the Taiao has kind of helped to mitigate some of those challenges.

In Katikati, people working on projects are contractors. Compared to other community projects, this approach reduces the fundholder liability for staff where it has little or no influence over the work programme, health and safety, and other HR matters.

### Community capacity

At this point (late 2021), none of the interviewees felt Katikati was ready to transition out of the programme. One felt that more work needs to be done to give effect to the CLDP principle of encouraging strong, diverse local leadership.

Hāpai Hapori has extended the CLDP agreement for an extra 12 months, to 2023, and Katikati Taiao is now concentrating on how to become self-sustaining.

It is not yet clear how Hāpai Hapori will be supporting the community’s entrepreneurship, outside the allocated funding for Katikati Taiao staff. Experience elsewhere suggests that currently hinges around the expertise, interests and networks of the advisor – and Katikati’s current advisor is being seconded to another role.

In the meantime, interviewees mentioned the following ways in which the CLDP is building community capacity:

* Attracting and retaining skills by employing or contracting people to work on CLDP projects.
* The Positive Pathways for Rangatira project has hired one professional mentor for young people in Katikati who are not in employment, education or training, and is seeking outside funding to expand.
* Upskilling hapū through the Mana Whenua Action Plan.
* CLDP funding for Chrome Collective, a social enterprise involving people with disabilities.

## Equity and Te Tiriti

Katikati is not unusual in harbouring racism, and no CLDP can ‘fix’ such deep-seated prejudices and systemic biases. What is unusual about Katikati is that the community (or at least the CLDP) has started to face up to the problem and explore solutions.

### Role of Te Tiriti

In 2023, Katikati Taiao aims to have a workshop on Te Tiriti relevant to CLD in Katikati, and will be starting conversations with the marae about that shortly. Longer term, there is a desire to explore “shared governance” of the CLDP, guided by Te Tiriti.

This offers Hāpai Hapori the opportunity to explore what it takes for a community to successfully develop a Tiriti-based co-governance model, and especially how it can best support a community on that journey.

### Mana whenua involvement

The CLDP has benefited from the dedication of a local kaumatua who is also a Katikati Taiao trustee. He acts as a bridge between the organisation and mana whenua.

The Hearts & Minds research project, which preceded the CLDP, was a breakthrough moment for some Katikati residents. Some Pākehā went onto the marae for the first time.

There's been a lot of bridge building within the town I think through the Community-Led Development Programme, … they often have the meetings at the marae now

One of the members that the Whirihia group said that before they got involved in Community-Led Development they'd never been to the marae and never been down to where the local hapū live and it's always been seen as kind of a no-go area but then they held a meeting there at the marae and then they were like wow this is a place, it's not scary, it's quite a friendly and lovely place and we can now see how people are really struggling there cos a lot of the houses are quite sort of run down in that area and once they saw that it gave them kind of a different perspective and more of a, more empathy I guess for the local hapū that live there and more of an understanding of their challenges

The CLDP includes a Mana Whenua Action Plan, where Ngāi Tamawhariua are working with Takarangi Research on a 100-year vision. In concrete terms, the CLDP contribution is to fund two part-time contractors to support the project and upskill hapū members. Here the CLDP meshes with mana whenua involvement in Project Kāinga, a multi-year, MBIE-funded research project led by Paora Tapsell (Takarangi Research/Otago University) to identify and mitigate risk associated with climate change and sea-level rise on vulnerable Māori communities.

For the Hearts & Minds report, a Māori researcher worked with mana whenua, identifying and articulating their aspirations and frustrations on their own terms. One interviewee said the emphasis on mana whenua telling their own stories has continued into the CLDP and helped build understanding between Māori and Pākehā in the town:

These two communities were very separate and never kind of connected regularly but through this process they’ve now kind of built relationships and connections there and there's more understanding between the two communities or the two sectors of community

### Other diverse communities

Katikati has significant Pasifika and Indian communities, often associated with kiwifruit and avocado industries. Interviewees generally felt that the rest of the town did not yet connect strongly with them. Hearts & Minds started some work here, and the Community Activator employed under the CLDP has been making progress on relationships with Pasifika.

## Impact of CLDP in the community

### Building relationships

Interviewees encountered some resentment and suspicion from people in some (but not all) of the town’s more long-standing community groups for attracting such a significant amount of public money. Despite this, they said the CLDP was “definitely” building connections across organisations:

That's the CLD component is that we all do our bit and together we make more than 100%.

I think some of the greatest outcomes are just those relationships and just the change of approach from more of that competitiveness and more of a how can we work together.

All projects rely on relationship-building for their success. The CLDP’s contribution to the Positive Pathways for Rangatahi project, for example, has enabled the project leader to connect the community organisations interested in helping young people, and funding streams for youth development.

As another example: Re-Naturing Katikati has a social media following many times larger than its active volunteer base, serving to connect the wider community with the ecological restoration of the Uretara River.

More generally, Hāpai Hapori has assisted with communication about community-led development. The community advisor did a public presentation, and the CLDP has sponsored an Inspiring Communities CLD workshop in the town.

Katikati Taiao interviewees recounted how they have come to realise the need to build relationships with other groups first before expecting those groups to collaborate. This realisation shows a deepening of local leadership capacity.

### Supporting change and innovation

Katikati is now just over halfway through its funded CLDP. At this point, it is largely a story of incremental change, as community volunteers benefit from paid help on specific projects.

Two areas where the community is exploring potentially transformative moves via the CLDP are: Tiriti-based shared governance, and an organic waste enterprise that advocates hope will provide ongoing core funding. In those cases, Hapai Hapori’s contribution is in providing the money and framework where community members can explore options. They will need to look elsewhere for specialist advice.

## Learning to date

### Key learning

Listening pays dividends. Community members and Hāpai Hapori have displayed willingness to change tack when things weren’t working.

### Enablers of success

The following enablers of success are discussed in the narrative:

* The skills, experience and attributes of the two different community advisors have been pivotal to the relationship. The Katikati case illustrates the importance of a good match between advisor and community.
* The significant sum of money available through the CLDP is giving momentum to projects.
* Interviewees appreciated the face-to-face hui with other CLDP communities.
* The CLDP has created impetus for some Pākehā to go onto the local marae for the first time. The physical experience of place has created conditions where connections can be made between people.
* The determination of key community members to stay in the CLDP.
* It was noted with approval that Hāpai Hapori supports its advisors to do the work of relationship building, whakawhanaungatanga, in contrast to their peers in some other organisations who are expected to tie every hour in the community to a specified outcome.

### Challenges

The following challenges can be seen in the narrative above:

* Lack of broad community engagement about CLDP before the arrangement began.
* Resentment and suspicion from longer-standing community organisations.
* Misunderstanding about expectations, especially the community plan.
* It is not clear how Hāpai Hapori will support the community with its plans to create a successful ongoing organic waste business, especially given the secondment of the current advisor to another role.
* Katikati now appears to be nearing its (informal) limit for funds under the CLDP.

### Local factors influencing CLDP impact

The early history of the CLDP, detailed above, has delayed impact by at least 12 months. This has been compounded by the Covid-19 pandemic.

As a new organisation, Katikati Taiao had to establish itself and the CLDP simultaneously. Crucially, interviewees felt they did not really have community buy-in for the CLDP at the time the partnership agreement was signed. It was clearly frustrating to feel they had nothing to tell the community during the first year after signing.

The initial structure, with Katikati Taiao as both the fundholder and decision-maker, had advantages in the reported lack of administrative hiccups, but disadvantages in the perception that the trustees were pushing their own agendas. Splitting the two functions appears to have improved community ‘ownership’, although better communication about CLDP and getting some runs on the board will have helped too.

Despite the rocky start, there is a sense that Katikati community members are determined to make the best of the CLDP.

### Improvements to CLDP

Interviewees had a few specific suggestions in light of their experience:

* A CLDP Manual, e.g., including examples of partnership agreements, so communities aren’t having to develop all documents from scratch.
* A pre-CLD hui to workshop the process, clarify expectations and avoid common mistakes, “cos that’s where the juice gets sucked out of people and you lose enthusiasm for it.”
* Hāpai Hapori advisers could work more in teams so that communities have the benefit of more diverse skillsets and personalities.

## Reflections from the Katikati experience

Some insights with wider ramifications for CLDP across Aotearoa:

* The skills, experience and aptitudes of the advisor are a critical success factor in CLDP.
* The importance of regular engagement kanohi ki te kanohi: It is more difficult for communities to ‘gel’ with an advisor who has to travel some distance to visit them.
* Hāpai Hapori may need to look beyond its current networks and traditional strengths to be really effective as communities seek to be financially self-supporting.
* Listening is a skill that cannot be over-valued.
* The intention to explore a Tiriti-based CLDP model presents a learning opportunity for Hāpai Hapori and other CLDP communities.
* By extending the CLDP timeframe, in recognition of the initial difficulties and funding delay, Hāpai Hapori has given the community a change to regroup.
* It takes time and effort to build an understanding of community-led development. Even within the initial leadership/steering group, it is vital to get a shared understanding of what a CLDP can and cannot deliver, and clarify expectations on both sides.

# Tatau Pounamu

Region: Rotorua (Bay of Plenty)

Year joined CLDP: 2017

Community vision: Te Oranga Nui Rāwhiti Mai: to make Eastside Rotorua a safe place where every tamaiti (child) reaches their potential.

This summary has been prepared after hui with members of Tatau Pounamu between December 2021 and January 2022, along with analysis of key documentation and an earlier hui with the Community Advisor.

## Tatau Pounamu & the Eastside Rotorua community

Figure 1: Tatau Pounamu Visual Strategy
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Tatau Pounamu Collective (TPC) is located in eastern Rotorua, known locally as Eastside. This area is within the rohe of five hapū: Ngāti Uenukukōpako, Ngāti Te Roro o te Rangi, Ngāti Tuteniu, Ngāti Hurungaterangi, and Ngāti Hinemihi. TPC comprises hapū, local people and organisations who work together to achieve their shared vision of a child-friendly Eastside.

The name gifted by a local kaumatua, ‘Tatau Pounamu’ is a metaphor for a safe place. Translated, it reflects a greenstone door, which historically was a place of security for those injured during battle or seeking protection.

Oranga or wellbeing is the starting point for the Tatau Pounamu Strategy, depicted in Figure 1 above. The dual hulls of the waka represent the wellbeing of te taiao, the environment, and hunga-ao, the people. The waka is also guided by ngā hau e whā, the four winds, reflecting the four pou or values of whakapapa, whanaungatanga, manaakitanga and wairuatanga. As TPC’s website puts it, “The hera (sails) represent the many ways the Tatau Pounamu Strategy is put into action by individuals and groups supporting each other and working together to create change”, and “when the Pou are reflected in actions, the waka sails fast”.

### History of the project

The whakapapa of Tatau Pounamu extends back to 2012, when the Mokoia Community Association began supporting community-led initiatives. Since then, an inclusive and growing group have met and collaborated fortnightly, working together to design and action their community led development approach through a range of initiatives.

For example, one of the first initiatives was the development of the Aspen Place maara kai (community garden), inspired by a resident of Korotere (West Ōwhata), which TPC describes as “one of Eastside’s most vulnerable communities.” The maara kai still operates, and its role includes:

* Providing opportunities for young people to develop values such as respect for others, know your neighbour, care for the environment, and be proud of who you are
* Building a close-knit community
* Being a source of pride in the neighbourhood

Initially known as the Eastside Community Collective, TPC changed its name to reflect the Tatau Pounamu strategy (see Figure 1 above), which the community collective developed.

In early 2017, TPC and Hāpai Hapori began discussing a community led development project (CLDP); the invitation to talk was extended by TPC. The Community Advisor lives in Rotorua, has worked with the Eastside community for over 20 years, and was already familiar with TPC.

The Tatau Pounamu Collective CLDP Partnership Agreement was signed on 14 July 2017.

### Leadership and governance

TPC draws together local champions who can see themselves in and seek to contribute to collective vision for the Eastside community. TPC Champions can support in many and different ways; the key is understanding why TPC is here, for whom and your contribution to this vision. TPC projects are led by ‘champions’ within the community, many are volunteers, with dedicated paid staff to action core kaupapa or initiatives.

TPC takes a collaborative approach to development and decision-making. While there is a core group of champions, fortnightly meeting are public and anyone is welcome to contribute. To enable the CLDP, Mokoia Community Association as a member of TPC, also hosts or acts as the fund holder for the Collective. With the support of the Community Advisor, TPC as a whole determines initiatives and makes decisions about what applications go up to the DIA Funding Panel to release financial resources.

To provide dedicated capacity for CLDP, TPC has invested in core paid roles that require experience in community development, open-mindedness, and the ability to respond flexibly to community need. Initially, four Pou or roles were established to support the two strategic areas, Hunga-ao (Pou Pori) and Taiao (Pou Ao, Pou Tāhu), and the Collective more generally (Pou Awhi). Current TPC have two core roles:

* Piripiri : a Community Connector who focuses on relationship building, connecting Eastside whānau to each other and supports that also growing their capability
* Pou Awhi: a Support & Coordination Lead for TPC who focuses on supporting community initiatives, from one-off to ongoing projects.

### Project implementation

There are two arms to TPC’s kaupapa and initiatives:

* The Hunga-ao strategy focuses on the wellbeing of the people from the first 1000 days of life to the later years
* The Taiao strategy aims “to protect and enhance our local natural features with a co-ordinated, collaborative and sustainable approach as kaitiaki (guardians) of the environment.”

With the global COVID-19 pandemic hitting Aotearoa in 2020, TPC have had to turn their attention significantly to their Hunga-ao strategy. The following are more recent examples of activities supported or enabled by the CLDP:

**Hunga-ao**

Early in the response to COVID-19, TPC used untagged CLDP funds, and an additional funding allocation from Hāpai Hapori, to boost their Piripoho’s response to community needs during the COVID-19 pandemic. Other funders, notably Lions and three hapū, also contributed.

The additional COVID-19 response included:

* Delivering kai to whānau during lockdown
* Age-appropriate activity packs for all tamariki within the identified area of need
* Free second-hand clothing
* Support for back-to-school supplies
* Kaumātua packs

Later, during the Delta COVID-19 outbreak, TPC, through collaboration, particularly between Ōwhata Medical Centre, Mokoia Community Association, Ministry of Social Development, and Lakes DHB, further implemented their piripoho approach. This saw a community nurse and Piripoho Hunga Awhina provided wrap-around support for whānau, such as transport to and from appointments, and attempts to be highly responsive to whānau needs. The COVID-19 response, however, extended well beyond the normal and involved intensive work by dozens of community volunteers. The TPC Piripoho approach and associated roles have extensively led the Eastside COVID-19 community response and is regarded as a successful whānau centred approach.

**Taiao**: While the initiatives within Taiao have had to dampen down during the COVID-19 response, TPC, the efforts of Ngāti Uenukukōpako, as the lead hapū for this strategic area, supported by the Department of Conservation, and three Pou established a range of activities.

Activities included:

* Working alongside rangatahi group Eco Warriors on local environment initiatives
* Riparian planting on local awa, maunga and marae
* Revitalise of maara kai (communal gardens)
* Promoting trapping between the Puarenga and Waiohewa awa - including trapping trips to Mokoia Island – and a Backyard Trappers programme open to schools, marae, and whanau.

Now, two years after the initial COVID-19 outbreak, TPC is keen to reset their hera to reignite their Taiao strategy.

**Oranga is the starting point**: Interviewees pointed out that in reality their strategies of hunga-ao and te taiao, or the initiatives that put them into action, are not separable.

In July 2021, Te Oranga Nui – Rāwhiti Mai: Eastside Community Wellness Plan was officially adopted by Rotorua Lakes Council (RLC). This is a significant achievement for TPC as substantial contributor to the plan, and the CLDP. TPC and RLC have successfully come together to ensure local government recognises and responds to the community’s concerns and aspirations, as laid out by community, for community.

Some of the actions in the plan include:

* Shared paths to support connected and safe communities
* Establishing a multi-use community hub
* Creating a community safety plan
* Improved transport links and safer access across te ngae road
* Upgrading stormwater infrastructure and potential development of wetlands
* Use of te reo māori for street names and signage.

## Relationship with Hāpai Hapori

Overall, TPC and Hāpai Hapori have a solid working relationship. Interviewees had nothing but praise for the Community Advisor.

### Contribution of Hāpai Hapori to the kaupapa

Community interviewees felt that it is not possible to put a financial value on wellbeing of tamariki, whānau or whenua. Thus, interviewees emphasised the value of non-financial and financial investments made by Hāpai Hapori. The following contributions of Hāpai Hapori to TPC and the CLDP where highlighted throughout the hui undertaken.

**Community Advisor’s role**: The Community Advisor is a consistent presence at the TPC table. Reflecting the practice of kanohi kitea – a recognised and respected face, she attends almost all the hui and is “very much in the loop”.

[She is] aware of what’s going on in really subtle ways, not just reading the minutes or hearing from someone else what’s going down.

Interviewees commented on the advisor’s informal role in keeping the community true to its kaupapa, including documenting the kaupapa of TPC for “new players” coming into the collective, mentoring staff, and quietly pushing people to work through any conflicts:

By noticing, identifying, and recognising … prompting some response … making sure that this conversation or action is happening … supporting the discussion and resolution, kind of stuff.

The Community Advisor also looks for ways to leverage relationships with other public agencies:

I often find I pose questions – who else, what else – because often you narrow down very fast. In my role I know of lots of things happening, and we want them to have this. I ask myself what I can bring to this. Then if it’s government funding then making sure it’s a good use of public funds.

One interviewee summed up the value the Community Advisor adds as follows:

I know it’s all grist to the mill in terms of, you know, this is what an advisor does, I think; it’s the thing that stands out to me is it’s happening at all different levels all the time and really constantly, not just sitting with one thing but being able to keep all the possible balls in the air.

**Funding**: Overall, the funding is nested in the hera or sails of TPC, as part of the many resources and activities required to propel TPC towards realising their aspirations. In relation to the process of accessing funding, interviewees commented that “DIA are not inflexible, but it does take time.” In the case of the Covid response application, however, both Hāpai Hapori and TPC moved fast. An application to set up the 0800 Piripoho line was written overnight, and the service was up and running the next day.

The Community Advisor also alerts TPC to funding opportunities beyond DIA as she becomes aware of them, with interviewees commenting that “if you can hit the kaupapa, she will find the investment.” In 2021, she was also “really closely involved” in writing the funding application to the DHB to extend the Piripoho service.

We framed it, you know, the thinking as coming from the collective … [Her role was] putting it together in a way that will work for that audience .. [that] experience isn’t always around the table.”

### Alignment with CLDP principles

The five principles of community-led development are clearly evident in TPC’s strategic vision and how the Collective intends to give effect to this. Interviewees said that the CLDP principles are “built in consistently,” visibly through mātauranga Māori as their four Pou: whakapapa, whanaungatanga, manaakitanga, wairuatanga. As an indigenous and community grounded approach to and reflection of CLD, this is an example in and of itself of embedding all five CLD principles.

Interviewees saw Hāpai Hapori as an integral part of TPC and said that the Community Advisor explicitly raises awareness of the overall CLD framework and tools for community engagement, strategic thinking and planning.

Despite this, interviewees noted that it is easy to lose sight of the basics. One said it would be great to have a “reusable resource” about the CLDP principles, such as a video, which they could pull out from time to time and use to reflect on their progress.

Interviewees also expressed a desire to hear directly from Hāpai Hapori about how it knows that TPC has added value.

## Community self-determination

### Supporting self-determination

This comment from one of the interviewees illustrates TPC’s commitment to being community-led:

the real skill is not to manage, is to step back and listen to the community and I think that's a really hard concept for people to retain both [individually and] within [a] collective. I've been looking at myself recently … and checking myself constantly to make sure that old habits aren't making me sound or act as if I'm telling you ‘This is what's been decided’ or ‘This is what the plan is’ – that it's always in the collaborative way saying things like ‘This is what the collective is thinking.’

The question here is to what extent Hāpai Hapori, through the CLDP, is supporting the Tatau Pounamu community’s self-determination. Overall, the CLDP has enabled TPC to respond to the unforeseen circumstances of a global pandemic, and to maintain other activities, such as predator-free Eastside, even though the pandemic has diverted resource and energy away from some longer-term projects.

That said, some felt that if the model is indeed high trust, Hāpai Hapori should release more control of CLD funding to its community partners. Interviewees felt emphasis was still on investment in projects, and that this should shift to investment in outcomes.

Nonetheless, interviewees felt that TPC has a story worth sharing with other communities. They felt strongly that community-led development is “not a cut and paste” and if other communities in Rotorua or across Aotearoa were to adopt CLD, they would also need to be appropriately resourced to adapt lessons from TPC and others to their own circumstances.

### Funding model

The fundholder agreement is with the Mokoia Community Association, which is also a member of TPC. To ensure roles and responsibilities are articulated, the fundholding agreement includes requirements for clarity about which role the association is playing at any given time.

Over the past two years, there have been personnel changes at the fundholder. Therefore, interviewees said the community association’s involvement with TPC has waned, so want to see the fundholder return to being more proactive in its support of the CLDP.

In late 2021, TPC had access to funding from Lakes DHB to provide Covid-related whānau support over Christmas and New Year, but the fundholder closes for the holidays. At the time of the hui, there was some concern about whether TPC could secure the funding in time, or whether TPC’s cashflow would cope over that period. However, TPC, responding to this potential constraint, realised the potential of trusting relationships, were able to place the funds with another TPC fundholder so they could be distributed as needed. This is an example of the complications and the way some communities can navigate within a CLDP fund-holding model.

### Community capacity

Interviewees were united in their belief that connections have been critical to building capacity in Eastside Rotorua. Indeed, building strong, trusted relationships through whanaungatanga is fundamental to TPC strategic and operational success.

Consistent with the CLD principles, TPC draws on existing strengths. In particular, interviewees said the three hapū held mātauranga and capacity and held lead roles across the different areas:

* Taiao: Ngāti Uenukukōpako
* Hauora: Ngāti Tutenui
* Education: Ngāti Te Roro o Te Rangi

Despite TPC’s achievements to date, interviewees expressed concern about whether the collective could sustain itself when CLDP funding through Hapai Hāpori is due to come to an end in 2022.

On the one hand, the COVID-19 response has brought residents, and agencies, together and provided opportunities to build links with people who previously had no connection with TPC, such as small business owners. TPC has also demonstrated that agility can be a strength of community-led development, by adapting its work programme as it discovered other needs. For example, taking kai to whānau led to developing age-appropriate activity packs for tamariki and then to referrals to social service agencies.

On the other hand, however, experiences during the COVID-19 response have reinforced interviewees’ concern about some ongoing needs in the community, especially anxiety and other mental health issues. Interviewees felt they need more time to reactivate projects that had to be put on hold during the pandemic, and expressed a sense that time is running out to build a solid platform for TPC in the long-term.

## Equity and Te Tiriti

### Role of Te Tiriti

Interviewees saw TPC as an expression of Te Tiriti in action, involving relationships and partnership between iwi/hapū, the Crown, and community, and the centrality of mātauranga Māori within TPC.

### Mana whenua involvement

Mana whenua have a significant, visible role throughout the CLDP. TPC itself started at Ōwhata Marae. Now all five local hapū are involved, and interviewees told us that mana whenua had invested “thousands of volunteer hours” to support the community-led kaupapa. This is a natural expression of the value of manaakitanga.

### Other diverse communities

TPC has the ability to involve a wide range of people in the Eastside community through its extensive collaborations (its community champions) and through Piripoho’s reach into many households. Interviewees saw “strength in our diversity”:

## Impact of CLDP in the community

Mahia te mahi he painga mō te iwi

We strive every day to work for the betterment of our people

### Building relationships

TPC is an extensive network of ‘community champions’ – interconnected individuals, groups and organisations who contribute to the kaupapa with cash or in kind. The number and diversity of these champions is testament to TPC’s broad base of relationships and track record. The TPC network includes for example, all five local hapū, Mokoia Community Association, Lions, Kāhui Ako (local schools and early childhood centres), the district and regional councils, Māori wardens, Red Cross, Plunket, Hannahs Bay Ratepayers Association, and Lakes District Health Board.

On the ground, TPC activities to foster community relationships and connectedness include:

* Informal pop-up gatherings in parks, supported by Rotorua Lakes Council Parks and Reserves team, Library Early Learning team and the Council funded Bike Ready team, Lions (barbecue), and local schools (sports equipment).
* Door-to-door visits to local businesses by the Piripiri. These visits currently are primarily to share Covid vaccination information, but they opened doors to discussion of concerns and ideas.

Interviewees commented that building relationships with agencies, especially potential funders, takes time and “a lot of nurturing.” TPC leaders see it as their collective responsibility to build relationships “rangatira to rangatira.” A current focus is on advocating for support when the CLDP comes to an end.

Meanwhile, to support their kaupapa and partnerships, TPC has held five wānanga to date. The most recent two wānanga has been an acknowledgement of the current Covid situation, review of achievements to date, reflection on the four pou, and then conversations about the future.

### Supporting change and innovation

More than nine years after the first seeds were planted, community-led development is bearing fruit in the community. As one interviewee put it:

People want to live here – it is good to be in the East

The community mobilised fast in response to COVID-19. It therefore prompted kōrero, moved people outside their comfort zone, and required people to adapt to remote, online working.

Interviewees commented that the Rotorua Lakes Council shifted from initial scepticism to official adoption of the wellness plan, thanks to some constructive hui. This generated confidence amongst residents that they can bring about positive change when they work together.

## Learning to date

### Key learning

The past two years in particular have shown the community its strength as community. Interviewees commented that change is inevitable and that the key is stay flexible, listen carefully, and respond positively to what people need.

### Enablers of success

The following enablers of success can be seen in the case of Tatau Pounamu:

* Strong, trusting relationships across the community’s ecosystem: whānau, marae, hapū, community, local, regional and Crown entities
* Partnership, leadership and guidance of mana whenua from the start, both strategically and operationally
* Flexibility on the part of TPC and Hāpai Hapori, especially in the face of COVID-19
* A skilled, experienced Community Advisor who is an ally, living locally and able to be a consistent presence in the community
* The ability of the Community Advisor to leverage relationships with other agencies for the benefit of the CLDP
* The ability of TPC roles to be at ‘flaxroots’ with whānau to provide support and build relationships “in the background”
* CLDP funding, which enables TPC to do the mahi to realise their vision
* Interviewees saw Piripoho as an approach and Piripiri as invaluable to TPC, delivering many community-building benefits well outside its core services
* Safe space to have robust conversations on the way to reaching a consensus – TPC has not had the need for a vote to date.

### Challenges

The following challenges are evident in this CLDP:

* COVID-19 has disrupted timelines, with some plans put on hold.
* Interviewees reported an increasing disconnect between TPC and the fundholder, citing delays in processing funds from the Department of Conservation and DHB as an example.
* It is a constant challenge to get residents, community organisations, and social service agencies to understand the community-led kaupapa. As one interviewee said, “I need to just keep being like a little dripping tap.”

### Local factors influencing CLDP impact

CLD is not something that someone else does, that other people do; it's happening right here

The CLDP in Eastside Rotorua has some distinctive features arising from TPC’s origins and strategy, notably:

* Emphasis on the Pou of Tatau Pounamu: whakapapa, whanaungatanga, manaakitanga, and wairuatanga
* Clarity of purpose: oranga
* Inclusivity, and authentic relationships with a wide range of organisations
* Flexible, outcomes-oriented way of working
* The development of a social services workforce through Piripoho, along with strong volunteer support
* Strong connections with hapū from the start have made it easier to incorporate mātauranga Māori.

### Improvements to CLDP

When asked, interviewees’ primary concern about the CLDP was the transition out. While the relationship with the Community Advisor will continue, TPC having been told that the CLDP partnership is ending because Hāpai Hapori have other communities to support, interviewees were seeking clarity from Hāpai Hapori about what the relationship will look like next year:

There’s a sense that ‘The Eastside is OK’ but we can’t be forgotten.

Interviewees asked how funds are spread, and how the department is educating other communities about CLD. They would also like to see many communities’ benefit from the CLDP. One person commented that “if you have a strong community, you can build a strong community.”

## Reflections from the Tatau Pounamu experience

Some insights with wider ramifications for CLDP across Aotearoa:

* The Hāpai Hapori advisor lives locally and has extensive networks in the community, so she is well-placed to be an active partner and deliver real benefits to the community.
* Mana whenua involvement from the start has been a significant advantage.
* TPC already had a clear, community-led strategy and kaupapa in place so the CLDP’s purpose was to generate greater momentum rather than build initiatives from scratch.
* Hāpai Hapori has not been able to articulate clearly what it sees as its role in this community beyond the end of the CLD partnership.

# Ūawa / Tolaga Bay

Region: Tairawhiti, East Cape

Year joined CLDP: 2018

Community vision: Ka Tipu Te Whaihanga e Hika ki Ūawa! Creativity and innovation flourished my friend in Ūawa

This summary is based on interviews with community members and the lead advisor, conducted in August to October 2021, along with analysis of background documentation.

## Ūawa community

Ūawa Nui A Ruamatua, known as Ūawa or Tolaga Bay, is the largest settlement in Tairawhiti north of Gisborne. The township has a population of just over 800, the vast majority of whom are Māori.

Ūawa has historical significance for Māori and Pākehā as the place where Captain Cook landed in 1789. Local hapū have particularly strong ties with indigenous peoples in eastern Polynesia because of the visit of Tupaia, the priestly navigator from Ra’iātea who travelled with Cook on that voyage.

### History of the project

This CLDP started with discussions between Hāpai Hapori and the chair of Te Aitanga a Hauiti Centre of Excellence. The Centre of Excellence is a local iwi-based organisation whose purpose is “to promote, advance, support, develop and maintain excellence in the cultural, social, political, sporting and academic achievement and aspirations for Te Aitanga a Hauiti whānau, marae, hapu and iwi kaenga.”

It took about a year of discussions for community leaders to feel comfortable with the proposal to be in a formal arrangement with DIA. The Ūawa CLDP Partnership Agreement was signed on 19 November 2018.

### Leadership and governance

The chair of Ūawa CLDP leadership group also chairs the board of Te Aitanga-a-Hauiti Centre of Excellence. He is an experienced public servant and iwi leader who has been involved in the CLDP from the start.

There are 12 other representatives of local iwi and community organisations.

There are six marae in the bay that affiliate to the iwi of Te Aitanga-a-Hauiti - Hauiti, Te Rawheoro, Puketawai, Hinemaurea ki Mangatuna, Ōkuri and Hinetamatea. Each marae has constituent hapū who are responsible for their corporate affairs and contribute to the governance arrangements such as the CLDP plan and other kaupapa including hauora and education

A Hāpai Hapori Community Advisor also attends their meetings.

The leadership group attracted back a local teacher who had been working in Gisborne to be the CLDP coordinator for the CLDP’s first year. The chair identifies him as one of a new generation of emerging hapū leaders. His easy manner, skills, and local connections proved invaluable in pulling together the Ūawa CLDP plan. In this process, he consulted extensively, holding numerous hui with all manner of groups ranging from the kōhanga reo to sports clubs and the ukulele ladies group.

The coordinator has now taken up a permanent teaching role at the local school – a move that was planned from the start. The CLDP has a paid position for coordinating finances and administration, but they have not hired anyone to continue the initial intensive community engagement now the plan is complete (see below).

### Project implementation

Ūawa has developed a model inspired by the Whananaki CLDP, where each project has a community champion. These champions communicate directly with the leadership group, which meets monthly. Each project has milestones and targets to achieve. When champions have buy-in from their organisations, and the leadership group agrees, a Community Advisor helps the group prepare a funding application.

Projects are a mix of quick wins and longer-term priorities, all of which was agreed by the community. The five ‘quick wins’ identified by the community are:

1. LED screen for the community, including safety announcements and upcoming events – led by the volunteer fire brigade, and now in place.
2. Marae resourcing, so that six marae between them have the essentials for major events – funding approved.
3. Construct and equip a community evacuation site for civil defence emergencies – funding approved.
4. Te reo street signage
5. Ūawa Live – internet radio & YouTube channel

The next phase of activities involves more ambitious projects, including construction of intergenerational housing for pakeke (older people), skills and knowledge development for young people not heading to university or polytech, a community sports hub, a cycle and walking track, and wananga supporting intergenerational narratives.

Further substantial projects are also on the books, although it is not clear how much can realistically be achieved by 2024, especially given interruptions due to the Covid-19 pandemic.

## Relationship with Hāpai Hapori

Overall, Ūawa CLDP and Hāpai Hapori have forged a good working relationship, and interviewees feel particularly close to the Community Advisor who led the establishment of the partnership.

### Contribution of Hāpai Hapori to project

So far, three Hāpai Hapori Community Advisors have been responsible for the relationship with Ūawa. The first created such a strong, lasting impression that she is widely regarded as whānau. Interviewees pointed to her weekly visits, and that her manager would also visit from time to time.

she’d come up for the day, we might do CLDP, that's the first thing, but then she was off to the Hauora, then she was off to the Surf Lifesaving Club and then she was off to the rugby club and all of that and so everybody knew her.

Her contribution of home-made chicken curry for a kapa haka wananga was highly appreciated, and illustrates how food brings people together.

So what does she do? She brings a big pot of curried chicken. Hungry kapa haka team we wiped it out (laughter) everything else and I go you're too much girl and everyone goes kia ora cook … and her kids come along and that's the difference, that's actually a partnership

She was the best. She even came to one of our kapa haka wananga and cooked for us. Like that's how committed she was to our community.

The former Coordinator reports an open, collegial relationship with the then Lead Advisor:

Like I've always sent emails to say … this is what's happened, this is the type of conversations we've had, how can we make improvements or can you give me any feedback, feedforward, she's always open for that and that's why I think she was real key to the success of our CLDP.

And that Community Advisors can help identify potential funding sources, if asked:

She’d always sit in the background when we had our community meetings and if anyone had any questions they're directed at her and she would definitely direct them in the right place.

When an unexpectedly large number of important Tahitian visitors said they would come to Ūawa for the Tuia 250 celebrations in 2019, and poor weather was preventing much fishing, the community turned to Hāpai Hapori for help in filling a budget shortfall. The CLDP Chair credits the good relationship with Hāpai Hapori, and the influence of the Lead Advisor “up line”, for a positive outcome:

I’ll always be thankful to [the Advisor] and DIA and because we had the partnership that was leverage.

Overall, the funding that comes with the CLDP is giving momentum to projects that people in the community had either already started or had in mind for some time:

We have a lot of initiatives within our community anyway and we're such a thriving community, so it was about wrapping support around the ideas that we already had and how the CLDP funds could really get us to start them off cos we've always had these aspirations

Although Te Atianga a Hauiti already had a 20-year plan, the CLDP process broadened this planning to encompass the whole community, and meant people had to prioritise and consider what is required for implementation alongside their big picture aspirations

Early on, the Ūawa CLDP Chair and Coordinator visited the CLDP in Whananaki, along with the Community Advisor, and say this helped inform the shape of the Ūawa CLDP.

### Alignment with CLDP principles

The five principles of community-led development were seen to be a natural fit, but have been re-expressed in terms that make sense for Ūawa.

Because we're such an interconnected community, those principles sat alongside us the whole way and it was just really easy for us to go okay these are the key principles, this is how we work and so we just unpacked each principle and we put our strengths to it and so we kind of, what do you say, adapted the principles and really made it our own

Community Advisors have supported the community’s expression of their values. One described the CLD principles as “our western framing” and said she uses them implicitly, especially looking out for who else could be involved in projects.

You can see them at play … You can see it and feel it but you don't necessarily have to point it out and whatever and you hear, you're listening for it.

The principle of using existing strengths and resources comes through strongly in Ūawa. The community’s vision, for example, draws on its history as the location of a famous wananga, Te Rawheoro, which specialised in tribal lore and the arts – a place where creativity and innovation flourished.

The key learning for me was around the vision that our community created and we used the mantra … around ka tipu te whaihanga, e hika, ki Ūawa … that is in our traditional mōteatea. So, what it means is that the township or Ūawa is flourishing, so it was about us drafting that and what does that look like for us and it's about us working to our strengths which we do have a lot of strengths and because we already had like those aspirations, how can we see it in the near future if that makes sense.

## Community self-determination

They've [Hāpai Hapori] really supported us well and they’ve given us the right pathways to try and continue with those aspirations. I think it's really up to us and how, cos we've got the key financial avenues, we've got the key people to really talk to, it's up to us in how we actually continue this journey as an iwi.

All the way along the messaging was really, really strong that this was a community opportunity. It wasn’t about one group even two groups, it was about an iwi and a community aspiration.

### Supporting self-determination

As noted above, Te Aitanga a Hauiti already had a 20-year plan. The CLDP has a broader base, but shorter planning horizons.

The Ūawa CLDP plan sets out five aspirations, named after tīpuna and a chief:

* Te-Kani-ā-Takirau: identity, language, culture
* Hinematioro: environmental sustainability
* Te Pōkai Rangatahi: knowledge and skills development
* Rongotīpare: shelter and well-being
* Hauiti: safety and communication

Underneath these, CLDP planning has focused on identifying priorities, quick wins, and who would champion initiatives. It is clear that this has been community-led.

We have a lot of initiatives within our community anyway and we're such a thriving community, so it was about wrapping support around the ideas that we already had and how the CLDP funds could really get us to start them off cos we've always had these aspirations and it's just what people wanted really and just having the whole hui around trying to choose the priorities

### Funding model

The fundholder agreement is with Te Aitanga-a-Hauiti Centre of Excellence, and interviewees did not report any difficulties with the financial arrangements.

Some interviewees felt that Hāpai Hapori’s rules had become less prescriptive over time, but questioned why a high-trust partnership model would require communities to apply for funds on a project-by-project basis.

### Community capacity

Ūawa marae and community organisations have already been in the habit of seeking non-DIA, funding for projects, and have continued this into the CLDP. The LED Screen, for example, attracted other community and private business assistance. For long-term sustainability, it is useful to have a track-record of success with external funders and suppliers.

The return of the coordinator (now local school teacher) is an example of the CLDP attracting and then nurturing local talent. The coordinator particularly appreciated the opportunity to attend training in Nelson on dealing with conflict.

## Equity and Te Tiriti

Te Aitanga a Hauiti leadership met Captain Cook and the crew of the Endeavour in 1769 and from that point onwards we have become a community that prides itself in enjoying a dual legacy and we do our very best to ensure that everyone contributes, is involved in and invited to contribute and participate in our shared future together

### Role of Te Tiriti

Mention of Te Tiriti is written in to the CLDP Partnership Agreement by Hāpai Hapori, but interviewees did not frame their accounts of the CLDP in action in terms of Te Tiriti. Instead, mention was made of Ngāti Porou standing strong despite Treaty grievances, including the Foreshore and Seabed Act 2004. When talking about the inclusive nature of the CLDP, interviewees cited the local saying “dual heritage, shared future.”

### Mana whenua involvement

Mana whenua are at the heart of the Ūawa CLDP.

There are five marae in the bay, affiliated to the following Ngāti Porou hapū: Ngāi Tutekohi, Ngāti Ira, Ngāti Kahukuranui, Ngāti Patu Whare, Ngāti Wakarara, Te Aitanga a Hauiti, and Te Whānau a Te Rangipureora.

Although Te Aitanga a Hauiti take the lead on the CLDP, other hapū are also represented on the leadership group.

### Other diverse communities

For Ūawa, interviewees said the test of inclusivity was whether Pākehā residents are involved:

So we had a representative from each marae so that covers the iwi and the hapū. We were able to get the groups, like our Pākehā whānau who, like our farmers really, so it was giving them a responsibility to try and champion an aspiration that they were really keen to get behind and support. I think yeah we're very dominated by Māori population and our Pākehā whānau who are pretty much like our farmers, some that are in our township. We do a lot of things together so we kind of know where people’s strengths and where people’s weaknesses are.

Local community groups with some Pākehā members who are involved in the CLDP include the Surf Lifesaving Club and the volunteer fire brigade.

## Impact of CLDP in the community

### Building relationships

I guess what we've done through the whole CLDP project is that they've been able to get a lens on how you can bring the various groups together and building on that it's not about any one group subsuming the mana or integrity of another one but everyone comes to the table with an equal opportunity and one of the most important things is that you have shared values and you agree on what those values are, … there's a criteria with the partnership but we've always been strong on manaaki manuhiri, manaaki tangata, kaitiakitanga, those are our biggies

The process of developing even small projects has deepened relationships. For example, the ‘quick win’ funding application for local marae cemented ongoing resource-sharing:

Six marae put together their lists of what they wanted, their need list, not their wish list, their need list and that was everything from stoves, cutlery, dishes, chillers, you name it and what, it was probably one of the most powerful, galvanising huis that we've had as marae outside of our big tangi … where we're together sitting down and we're just enjoying everyone's company saying oh hey if we get this you fellas don’t need to get this because we can share that trailer … and all of that sort of stuff.

### Supporting change and innovation

Ūawa has big goals, such as intergenerational housing and environmental sustainability, and those involved are hopeful that the partnership with Hāpai Hapori is bringing them closer.

Interviewees said that tangible successes brought with them important intangible outcomes, which form a powerful platform for further change, including confidence, community pride, and inspiration for the next generation of iwi and community leaders:

Wow look we got, we were successful with the LED screen, wow we were successful with the marae resourcing, get those invoices in cousins and then we're doing continuous celebration of positive events, so our kids are watching us, our young people are watching us and we've got smiles on our faces, we're having fun, we've got, and it's all around succession planning

## Learning to date

### Key learning

The most frequently mentioned lesson in Ūawa is the value of getting the right people involved – whether as coordinator, community advisor, project champions, in the leadership team, or as informal sounding boards (such as the ukulele ladies group).

### Enablers of success

Interviewees identified the following primary enablers of success:

* The experience, skills and attributes of the Community Advisor, especially building trust in DIA in the early days of the CLDP:

I think that's probably been the key thing with DIA is having her and her ability to connect with different groups in our community and just not being shy to be who she is and also putting her DIA hat on as well as, well we actually call her our own now so it's her being a community member.

As one interviewee put it, good Community Advisors need to be comfortable navigating “the grey space” of complexity and flux, and be a good listener:

It's that high emotional IQ kind of thing, that ability to work with relationships that's so, so key

* The experience, skills and attributes of the Coordinator, especially his local connections
* The quality of the leadership group
* Funding and ability to achieve quick wins that build community trust in the process

### Challenges

Interviewees mentioned few challenges, except that there are differences of view about priorities and projects that need to be worked through in any community. It also takes time to get people to understand how the CLDP works and what it is trying to achieve.

The Covid-19 pandemic has limited the number of face-to-face meetings, especially with other CLDP communities, but interviewees felt they had found ways around that and access to funding for Covid-related initiatives (e.g., help for kaumatua) was appreciated.

### Local factors influencing CLDP impact

Interviewees spoke very positively about the character and outlook of the community, already trying to build on its strengths. As one person put it:

Even before the CLDP came into place Ūawa had been building themselves up into these principles even before that. They had the likes of the Minister Parekura so they had people in Government … they have very good leadership in Ūawa and that leadership in Ngāti Porou sort of comes around every 20 years

### Improvements to CLDP

There is a desire in the community for more involvement with, and regular visits from, people higher up in DIA:

The ones above [the advisor]’s boss and actually and I know they’ve got busy schedules and I know they’ve got other partnerships to look at but to come and see our community a lot more, to be more visible to everyone and so that it doesn’t create that anxiety when they do come because when they hear that they're the manager or the CEO, everyone gets all, they just have a lot of anxieties, they're nervous but I think if we create that or strengthen that relationship, I think we could definitely move forward.

Interviewees also noted that other government agencies were trying to work in community development, and would like to see them working alongside DIA:

If I think now about COVID and how are the Government agencies and local authorities are leveraging off some of what's been established through our CLDP, they can see it cos they're using that network and mechanisms and relationships but that's come with years of development.

The Community Advisors interviewed felt that interdepartmental cooperation and coordination was good at a local level.

## Reflections from the Ūawa experience

Some insights with wider ramifications for CLDP across Aotearoa:

* Many communities, especially but not exclusively Māori ones, notice and appreciate when government agencies prioritise being a seen face.
* CLDP resourcing can help attract local talent home.
* Quick wins early on can generate momentum and support for the CLDP.
* Visiting another CLDP community can give a new community a head start in developing its own approach.

# Te Ara Whakamua o Whaitara

Region: Taranaki

Year joined CLDP: 2018

Community vision: A connected, cohesive community.

This summary is based on interviews with community members and the lead advisor, conducted in August to October 2021, along with analysis of background documentation.

## Waitara community

Waitara has a population of about 7,000, of whom about 43% are Māori. The township has had a reputation as “deprived,” due to high unemployment following the closure of key industries in the 1990s. It is also experiencing the intergenerational effects of colonisation, war, and land confiscation.

### History of the project

The CLDP in Waitara was first mooted by the Hāpai Hapori advisor, who saw it as an opportunity to turn the deprivation narrative on its head and take a strengths-based approach. She talked to established organisations in the town, and held a number of stand-alone hui. These conversations laid the groundwork for the CLDP.

In particular, the community identified the values that they wanted to see in the leadership of a Waitara CLDP, and invited those that had attended a series of community hui to come up with a name for the CLDP – Te Ara Whakamua o Whaitara, The Journey Forward.

Hāpai Hapori called for expressions of interest for Te Ara Whakamua’s leadership rōpū. Sixteen people put their names forward. The community then ranked them based on qualities, skills and behaviours well matched to CLDP. The result was a group of seven Waitara residents, six Māori and one Pākehā, ranging in age from 34 to 70, none of whom were community board members or district councillors were appointed as a Leadership Group.

This process took about 18 months. The Waitara CLDP Partnership Agreement was signed on 29 April 2018.

### Leadership and governance

As at late 2021, the leadership group has five members. Although only two of the original seven members are still part of the group, it remains strongly Māori in representation. The Hāpai Hapori advisor attends the group’s monthly meetings.

There are two paid full-time coordinators, who also participate in these meetings. One has been with the CLDP from 2019 and now focuses more on large projects, while the other joined in 2020 and mostly works on smaller projects and community training courses. The coordinators and advisor meet fortnightly.

### Project implementation

The coordinator and the leadership group typically take an iterative approach to any new initiatives. First, the coordinator goes back and forth with community groups (and the district council, where relevant) to clarify the idea and how it fits with the community plan. The coordinator will take suitable projects to the leadership group, who will scrutinise the proposal in light of the plan. Leaders will often take ideas back to iwi, hapū, and other community groups to which they belong. When the leadership group agrees that a project fits – it has to be a relatively new initiative, be genuinely community-led, and require collaboration across the community – they work with the advisor to submit an application to the Funding Panel at Hāpai Hapori.

At times, the leadership group will decide an idea has promise but is either not ready or not appropriate to be a CLDP-funded project. In such cases, they will usually ask the coordinator to work on it further with the community group(s) involved.

The advantage of the scrutiny given by the coordinator and leadership group is that Waitara has an excellent track record of successful funding applications. The disadvantage is they have had to turn down proposals from people who live in the same community as them. Those involved are still experiencing backlash from the two occasions when this has occurred.

Activities undertaken through Te Ara Whakamua o Whaitara to date include the following:

* Facilitated community plan development
* Community fun day
* Community murals (Beautify Waitara)
* Pump track at local school
* Men’s Shed
* Te reo and raranga classes
* Balance training for over 60s
* All Heart, repurposing used and end-of-line office furniture
* Marine Park redevelopment, with New Plymouth District Council and Te Kowhatu Tū Moana.

The CLDP has an office at the back of a commercial office. When the coordinators are in, they put a flag out on the street:

The door’s always slightly open for people just to come in and they do frequently. We go through a lot of biscuits, put it that way.

## Relationship with Hāpai Hapori

Interviewees report a strong, supportive relationship with the Hāpai Hapori advisor:

It doesn’t feel like a partnership, it feels more like a whānau and I don’t know if that's just cos we're in Waitara and like we're all connected to Waitara. It's a good thing. I think if I had someone from Wellington coming up every fortnight, I would feel differently but no, [the advisor] rocks on in like it's, well everyone does, they rock on in like it's their house and I like that cos [the advisor] is non-Māori but I feel like … she is Māori when she's here or has a connection to being accepted as a whāngai I guess to us.

### Contribution of Hāpai Hapori to project

Interviewees noted the following contributions of Hāpai Hapori to the project:

The advisor is a consistent presence:

She's very approachable. We have regular hui with her every fortnight. I don’t recall her ever missing one of them so very regular. There's been times where we've had to make phone calls to her or send her a message, she gets back to us.

The advisor keeps them informed about funding opportunities (DIA and other), but also other happenings around the town, drawing people together around common concerns or ideas.

Te Ara Whakamua would simply not have got off the ground without the prospect of CLDP funding. Money for professional community plan facilitation and the coordinators’ ongoing work has been vital to its success. Access to funds for initiatives helped the CLDP gain early momentum (e.g., community fun day, mural project, pump track). The track record of success, and the hard work on relationships with funders (e.g., via the bimonthly funders’ meetings), means community projects are increasingly receiving co-funding and solid offers of future support.

### Alignment with CLDP principles

The five principles of community-led development were seen to be deeply embedded in the project and guided day to day activity.

Interviewees say they do “a lot of clarity work,” constantly reminding people that the CLDP is not another funding body, but a group of community members leading other community members to realise the aspirations of the community at large.

Coordinators get alongside people with ideas and help them to understand how the principles work in practice – listening is key.

The first thing is actually to use my ears. So, to go in and actually just hear what they need to say or what the kaupapa of the hui is and then from there you kind of gauge it as you go. The second thing would be to ensure that, which I will normally gauge from the korero, is their understanding of what we are and if not, it becomes education around what we are and if they are treating us … as a funder cos that's the most common one, we don’t get up and leave, we just adapt our mahi.

## Community self-determination

### Supporting self-determination

The first year of this CLDP was largely devoted to the development of a community plan. The significant features of Waitara’s approach were:

* Use of a professional facilitator to guide this process from initial consultation to completion of the plan and presentation to the community.
* Overt emphasis on community strengths, following a model developed by the Tamarack Institute for Community Engagement, Canada. In each consultation hui participants were invited to identify their “gifts of head, heart and hands.” This stimulated numerous individual conversations with people about how something they took for granted (e.g., cooking for their whānau) was actually a useful skill. It also enabled the CLDP to develop an in-house database of community skills, although it is unclear how much this has been tapped subsequently.
* Face-to-face conversation. Online surveys garnered limited response.
* Going where the people are. Each member of the leadership went to meetings of groups they knew and sought their input. These groups included the RSA, churches, youth groups, kindergarten, schools and a couch on the street outside Bin Inn.
* Active use of the leadership group’s networks to open doors for the consultation.

Throughout the Waitara CLDP, the Hāpai Hapori advisor has supported the community’s self-determination by taking time rather than bustling them into the first tranche of CLDP application, then by encouraging them to do a thorough job on the community plan, and to refer back to it for guidance as they go along. The leadership group review the plan annually to check it is still relevant.

Arguably the most significant test whether the goal of self-determination has been achieved is what happens once the CLDP ends. All interviewees hoped that the relationship with the advisor would not be severed. The leadership group is in the process of considering whether to establish a charitable trust to continue the work. Interviewees generally expressed cautious optimism, with some noting that potential funders are already approaching Te Ara Whakamua, while others mentioned how much the CLDP relies on the persistence, experience, and connections of some key individuals.

Outside of the CLDP structure, interviewees believe thus far two initiatives have a fair chance of becoming self-supporting:

**Beautify Waitara:** This group formed as a result of the CLDP coordinator shoulder-tapping a young person at a local church. The group started by doing murals around the town, received District Council funding to paint some of its buildings, and then decorated roadside power junction boxes. In the process they have expanded their base from being essentially a church group to involving the high school, hapū, and wider community:

One of the murals is opposite the marae so they had some consultation up there around what they'd like to see. One of the old kuia that lived across the road passed away while that was almost finished. They adapted it and added in a purple triangle to the bottom that was her favourite colour. So, … it gave that mural a sense of community belonging to it.

**Te Reo classes:** These classes book out rapidly (demand is high across Aotearoa) and the Waitara-based tutor has received some support from outside funders.

Work also continues on an enterprise to repurpose office furniture.

### Funding model

Te Ara Whakamua is now with its second fundholder. The first fundholder over stepped their role wanting to dictate how the coordinator operated (e.g., wanting him to spend more time in the office and less time out and about) and have control over how funds were spent. When this became clear, the leadership group decided to look for an alternative fundholder.

Interviewees acknowledge that fundholders carry legal liability, which incentivises them to act counter to the spirit of the CLDP, and this is a shortcoming in the model:

I think that's really quite high risk to the fundholder and that's once again where DIA didn't really have any and still don’t, they don’t have any sort of documentation guidelines around how that should work or you know because … our second fundholder has been good but still like they say well legally we’re responsible for these two employees now but yet you expect us to be okay with a leadership group of community people sort of basically saying what they're to do on a daily basis, we don’t have any input into that but … we've got to do a performance review and do a, yeah, … do all the PAYE, Kiwi saver et cetera that goes with the employment. So that I think is quite a challenge for groups.

In terms of funding itself, interviewees report an increasingly “bureaucratic” details-focused approach by the Funding Panel.

I feel that the Funding Panel has now become quite bogged down in, each request that we have go to the Panel I feel they get questioned more and more about it.

### Community capacity

Interviewees were clear that community capacity building drives their CLDP:

It's about increasing capability and capacity as a community. So [some people] just think I got this idea, let’s get it going with money without realising well, actually, we're here to support and nurture longer term outcomes and pull more people in.

We want to see them continue, we don’t want them to fall over, we want them to keep going, so that's one of our focuses.

Capacity building is happening on a number of levels:

**Leadership rōpū:** Without much governance experience, the group have been learning as they go along. Initially, for example, the Hāpai Hapori advisor found herself doing the group’s admin because they had no experience and skills, but with the advisor’s encouragement, one group member has learnt to use electronic board management software. Training is offered to all members to upskill.

**Professional Development for coordinators:** Opportunities have included IAP2 training and Te Reo Māori language learning.

**Formal training for Waitara residents:** The CLDP has enabled local delivery of Te Reo and raranga courses, run by a qualified tutor sent to Te Ara Whakamua by the Ministry of Social Development (MSD) “to have a chat.” They have done this by leveraging their relationships to get venues and publicity, as well as using some funds to eliminate koha, which was proving a barrier to sustained participation by residents. The CLDP also supports balance training for the over-60s.

**Informal capacity-building:** This appears to be an essential part of the way the coordinators work. For example, coordinators expect a member of the relevant community group to sit with them as they prepare funding proposals so that person learns how a funding application is done. Coordinators also talked about arranging to meet residents at the Men’s Shed and gently encouraging them to learn skills from others.

The CLDP coordinators have worked with DIA staff in New Plymouth to assist the Waitara te reo tutor with his business development:

When I was talking about the guy MSD sent in with his business plan, we've tried to set him up or looked at avenues for him to create his business and we've had appointments … at the office there [DIA in New Plymouth] and they’ve helped him with some funding for some outside work and being quite supportive in that way.

## Equity and Te Tiriti

### Role of Te Tiriti

There does not appear to be an explicit, agreed role for Te Tiriti in this CLDP, nor is it clear how Hāpai Hapori would expect to see this worked out on the ground.

Some interviewees distinguished the Treaty relationship from the CLDP partnership, on the grounds that Te Tiriti is between the Crown and Māori whereas the CLDP encompasses the entire community.

Another felt that while there is strong Māori representation, Te Tiriti does not drive conversations:

I think we've got that participation but … I don’t really believe that honouring the Treaty has been at the forefront of what this group has been doing, it's more about we need to talk to the iwi and hapū and we need to ensure that Māori are engaged, but if they don’t engage, well, we’ll just engage with the people that we’re engaging with.

But others felt Te Tiriti underpins Te Ara Whakamua:

We can't unfortunately be Māori dominant or Māori led even, we can't do it on our own. Any chance that we had of doing it on our own was taken away a long time ago … [but] although we haven't said verbally or minuted anything or put it in a paper that we are living by these principles or that we are pushed by Te Tiriti, I think we naturally just are.

### Mana whenua involvement

In practice, Te Ara Whakamua has had mana whenua involvement from the beginning. One member of the leadership rōpū is the chair of her hapū, and others are very active within theirs. This has happened as a natural consequence of the community-led process.

### Other diverse communities

Te Ara Whakamua supports activities that embrace the Waitara community as a whole, but there is no evidence that they deliberately target other diverse communities.

## Impact of CLDP in the community

I know we do have a good trust from the community because I know it when you walk down the street. We're that sort of community that if they don’t like what you're doing they will come up, kanohi ki te kanohi and tell you.

### Building relationships

Projects supported under the CLDP have brought people together to address an identified community need. The children’s pump track was an early example of this:

So one of them was like the school, like there's no, they just had a field and they wanted to do a bike track for fitness for the kids, get them outside and so we worked with the school and we worked with a guy that wanted to help fix the bikes. So he wanted to teach the kids to fix the bikes and then they could have those bikes. So people were donating bikes, he would fix them up with the kids but they needed a shed to store them in so that's where we came in with the shed. So it was the kids, it was the school, it was the parents, it was us and the guy that does the bikes.

The CLDP initiated regular bimonthly funders hui, where funding organisations from around the district meet in Waitara to discuss forthcoming opportunities. These hui in themselves are a big step forward:

I think we're doing a good job because we're getting, like we had a meeting and we had all the fundholders here, so they all sat around the same table, all the ones from New Plymouth, they all sat around the same table and they all could see how they could help for one project, they were “We could do this cos that fits in our box and that one … we've got money and no one’s applying for that so we need to give that to someone.” So then they sort of formed better relationships instead of being in their little silos doing their own thing, which is really interesting cos there's a lot of people doing the same thing with the same money and not talking to each other. So I think that was a win.

This is starting to pay dividends for the Waitara community well outside initiatives that involved the CLDP:

I was having a conversation with a principal at one of the schools and she said, “You don’t know where I can find $55,000 for a couple of mentors, to keep my mentors next year,” and I was like “No I don’t.” I brought it up at the funders hui and … they’ve decided to meet next month, about four of the funders, and they are going to nut out how they can actually get this money together between them. So just those little conversations, we're not directly involved with supporting but we still can support and we can still things make things happen through our networks and I think that's a great thing that this organisation does.

### Supporting change and innovation

Interviewees were cautious about claiming lasting change has been achieved yet, although they identified “pockets of people” who have developed leadership skills and whose groups now operate with little or not support from the coordinators.

The CLDP has pushed past inertia and/or other barriers to deliver changes that the community have wanted for a long time. Interviewees say this has increased self-belief and pride in Waitara. The example that stands out is the major upgrade to Marine Park, to which the district council is now committed.

That project’s been sitting on the shelf since 2004 and nothing was ever going to be done with it and if it wasn’t for this Community-Led Programme and the determination of [the coordinator], it wouldn’t happen.

Interviewees commented favourably on how the CLDP principle of ‘action informed outcomes’ has supported change.

One thing I really like about the plan is it has some wording in there around not being afraid to get things wrong. So, to actually give things a go and just re-evaluate the outcomes and learn from doing.

## Learning to date

Rather than people doing things to us without us, now we're in a position where actually we're doing it together for ourselves and I think that's empowering for a community and with that comes more people who go “Same, I want to be a part of that and I want to be a part of that,” and I think it just really, again, just bolsters that sense of community that's already strong out here, it's just kind of stitching it together.

### Key learning

The early investment of time and effort in strengths-based engagement has stood this CLDP in good stead.

### Enablers of success

The following enablers of success in Waitara can be seen in the narrative above:

* The attributes, skills and experience of the lead advisor and coordinators.
* A leadership group and coordinators who have deep roots in the community.
* Putting priority on being a seen face, from the initial outreach by the Hāpai Hapori advisor, and the community plan consultation by the leadership group, to coordinators’ emphasis on being out of the office and on the street, and getting funders to come to Waitara rather than community representatives going to New Plymouth for meetings.
* The decision to switch fundholders rather than plugging on with an unsatisfactory arrangement.

### Challenges

The following are the key challenges discussed in the narrative above:

* Lack of governance experience in the leadership group
* Disgruntlement over the two occasions where the leadership group has turned down proposals: in a small community, this continues to be hard on those involved
* The need to communicate Te Ara Whakamua’s role, especially as larger organisations increasingly want to capitalise on its success
* Fundholding

### Local factors influencing CLDP impact

Despite being local people, many of whom are mana whenua, the leaders and coordinators of Te Ara Whakamua have faced suspicion borne of bitter history and paternalistic interventions to ‘fix’ the town:

You couldn’t pick a harder town to drop one of these programmes in. This town historically doesn’t trust Government, doesn’t trust anyone, let alone their own people, … this is where the land wars started, this is where they lost everything, trucked down to Dunedin, put in prison, everything you can think of, and then all of our street names of our town are named after the very men that took the land to remind you, that was to remind Waitara, don’t you ever take on the Queen again. There's a lot of that still hangs very heavy in the community, especially the Māori community.

Although trust is growing, interviewees said some community members still stand back, not wanting to bring ideas forward. Yet some local factors are working in favour of this CLDP:

* After decades of economic decline, the town is experiencing the ripples from rampant property price rises elsewhere: people are moving in, or back, to Waitara for affordable housing. This economic uplift brings positivity.
* The strong mana whenua presence.
* A tradition of saying what you think face-to-face brings energy to conversations.
* Although the Hāpai Hapori advisor is based in New Plymouth (20 minutes’ drive away), she was born and grew up in the town. She has strong personal connections with Waitara and already knew the community well.
* The Waitara Lands Act 2018, which dealt with the sale of leasehold land in the area, has brought some resources back to hapū and focused local government attention on the town.

### Improvements to CLDP

The following suggestions were offered:

Provide a central repository of base documents that could be adapted by different communities according to their circumstances. Interviewees told us that they have already shared some Waitara documents, because they had to develop their own from scratch.

Provide access to an untagged seed fund, or “start-up fund,” to kickstart or test local initiatives before making community groups go through the full funding application process. This is not dissimilar to the discretionary budget that some CLDPs have obtained for small events.

More support to help the wider community understand the role of CLDPs, especially of community development workers.

Provide more practical guidance on the nuts and bolts of successful models. In particular, the focus in Waitara is turning to how to make a successful transition out of the CLDP, and what extra skills they may need to have around the governance table:

We're just what I call regular people coming to a table. So I think that the additional guidance that we need probably is more in terms of exiting, that exit support, so what does that look like, what does it mean to be a charitable trust, how do we go about setting that up and what is the most important, like do we need to focus on having an accountant sit with us, like in terms of treasurer how important, how strong do they need to be if we're going to be standalone and that could possibly be support that we need exiting

## Reflections from the Waitara experience

Some insights with wider ramifications for CLDP across Aotearoa:

* Face-to-face engagement, especially the practice of going to where the people are, has proved effective.
* The problematic nature of fundholding arrangements, especially the split between liability (fundholder) and responsibility (CLDP leadership) for employment matters.
* Where the fundholding relationship is not working well, there is a point at which it is better to find a new fundholder. Arguably the limited lifespan of a CLDP, and the potential to lose good workers because of tensions in the employment relationship, means that point should come sooner rather than later.
* Groups must establish themselves as a legal entity in order to continue once the CLDP ends; they have to learn to manage finance and human resources themselves at the point of transition.
* The annual hui of CLDP communities are highly valued. There is a strong sense that the Zoom version was better than nothing during the Covid-19 pandemic, but is not a viable substitute for face-to-face contact in normal times.
* An increasingly details-oriented approach by the Funding Panel likely reflects growing scarcity of funds and consequent concern over fair distribution between groups, but it runs counter to the usual human experience (and philosophy of high-trust contracting) that, as a relationship matures, success will be rewarded with more trust and less detailed scrutiny.
* The importance of listening and learning often features in CLDP partnerships that are getting results.

# TamaŪpoko

**Region:** Whanganui awa

**Year joined CLDP:** 2017

**Community vision:** Together we will create a thriving community and environment through the development of our people and our place, now and for future generations.

**Current situation:** About to exit the CLDP partnership after five years as per planned timeframes.

This summary is based on interviews with community members and advisors between August to October 2021.

## TamaŪpoko community

Whanganui is a city in the Manawatū-Whanganui region of Aotearoa. It has a population of approximately 47,300.

TamaŪpoko is based in Whanganui and includes communities along the Whanganui awa, specifically the whānau and residents of Pipiriki, Hiruhārama, Ranana and Matahiwi.

### History of the project

TamaŪpoko was one of the first intake of communities into CLDP (2017) after the initial pilot phase. Although they had initially been invited to be a part of the pilot, a misalignment of values at the time led TamaŪpoko to not move forward with the partnership.

The community is led by an individual who has whakapapa to the Whanganui river, has a military background, and is well-connected and established within the Whanganui community. It was through this person’s connections and direction, that TamaŪpoko was established.

He was on the Council, he was [in]tourism, he was [on the] radio station, he was right into everything and he kind of became the driver, the lead person for TamaŪpoko to be considered as part of the programme.

Negotiation of the terms of the CLDP agreement was not easy. Community members pushed back against the initial proposal of Hāpai Hapori, believing that it did not align with the core focus of their kaupapa.

So we went to Wellington and we put forward what we would like and they looked at us and said okay yeah that's different and they said we’ll try.

They slashed out all the bits they didn’t like and they put in their own set of principles and own set of values like manaakitanga, whanaungatanga, all the tangas, they had all those in there, which were important to them in their practice.

After much discussion, the parties came to an agreement that was flexible and reflected where TamaŪpoko wanted to take the partnership. The TamaŪpoko CLDP Partnership Agreement was signed on the 29 May 2017. They were the first of their cohort to sign a contract with Hāpai Hapori.

### Leadership and governance

The leaders of TamaŪpoko live in their communities and leadership is spread along the Whanganui awa. There are four community coordinators, a director, a kaumatua who supports the writing and development of funding applications, and a finance officer. TamaŪpoko manage their own finances which is unusual as the majority of community partners have an external fundholder.

The community is driven by a passionate group who are working to serve their people.

My heart has always been with the people, not [only] the living but also those that have passed and the future generations and that's why I'm involved in doing what I'm doing and a lot of what I do in my role when I first started was with their guidance.

This speaks to the importance of whakapapa and of ensuring that their work is guided by multiple generations, sustainable, and endures for future generations.

Strengths of the leadership team include their cohesion and complimentary skillsets.

So we’re a good mix as you can see and we all have our own strength about us and collectively our team … it all attributes to what we do and we support one another.

The community is in a positive space. They are expanding their leadership across the community as they solidify as a rōpū, creating change in Whanganui, and looking to include more communities along the Whanganui awa.

### Project implementation

The four community coordinators are responsible for facilitating community collaboration and coordinating activities in line with each of the smaller community plans, the overarching vision of TamaŪpoko, and the needs of the people.

The shared nature of the positions is a deliberate strategy to bring in a diversity of skills and experience, to share the workload and networks, and to work locally as all members are embedded in their smaller communities.

**Developing activities**

They kind of set themselves up as this, in the gap of community to say we want to be inclusive so that includes marae but we don’t want to leave anyone behind and so they very quickly became known as if you want to get something done and you want to see progress, this is the group you go to to support you with your aspirations.

Each of the four communities on the awa work with one of the TamaŪpoko coordinators. Projects are chosen collectively, with regular community events helping TamaŪpoko to identify where the need lies.

I don’t believe anyone’s getting missed out. Like it's from our, we go to the kura and we do things with our kura rangatahi or tamariki and we like right through our kaumātua we’re always doing stuff, we invite our kaumātua to everything, any age, there's no barrier for anyone.

Activities undertaken through the project include the following:

* Waste minimisation projects
* Heritage trail at Pipiriki
* Community events including hunting festival
* Community emergency plans and
* development and purchase of emergency
* equipment
* Water quality assessments
* Community projects
* Operational costs that include three salaries, initial wānanga and hui costs, and training costs

Recently we've just done some cooking classes which is all about sustainability with what we can gather from the ngahere and rongoa, incorporating rongoa into our kai and we've been doing defibrillator training

It’s just helping to I guess guide ourselves back to some of those ways of old, which were very simplistic and so the first lot of projects up the awa were about, they were very simple projects, things like, things that you saw next door like getting together, having a hui, getting people together, having fun, creating activities and learning basic things like yeah, it’s all those different mahi that we've been, yeah, the … Marae have.

## Relationship with Hāpai Hapori

Overall, this community had a good relationship with Hāpai Hapori. There have, however, been challenges around communication, transparency, and high turnover of Community Advisors.

### Presence of Community Advisors

The community has had four Hāpai Hapori advisors over the course of their four year relationship with CLDP. Interviewees found the many changes somewhat disruptive but acknowledged that the process for change-over allowed time for the community to meet and get to know the next advisor.

We had Wiki first up and then Wiki brought James across and James would often come over with Wiki … , he would be her photographer. So we got to know James”

Wiki was their initial advisor and brought with her a strong interpersonal and rapport building skills as well as a background in te ao Māori.

….just really had a personal touch with everyone too, like the trustees felt really comfortable just to call her when they needed to ask something that they were unsure of. She was real hands on, Wiki was.

When talking about the skills needed to support and work well with communities, another advisor mentioned Wiki’s commitment to Whanganui and TamaŪpoko:

I remember right from the beginning Wiki used to have the conversation, she always had to be one step ahead of the boys, do her homework, do her prep before she visited them and think of all the what ifs or the ifs of how she could you know if they ask this question what’s the different options. So she was very strategic, she built a real sound relationship and she still has a sound relationship with the boys but she was very strategic, very, strategic covers it really, she knew how to direct them, she was still an advisor but she knew where that start and stop sort of thing.”

### Further Engagement with DIA and Hāpai Hapori

TamaŪpoko were invited often to attend gatherings and give advice to DIA around their experience and CLDP.

So I know TamaŪpoko they felt elevated, they felt that oh we’re part of the CLD programme, they were invited to hui, they had special gatherings set up for them, so it was this kind of you guys are in this with us, that type of thinking. So I do think they felt special when elevated in that space of being a partner and I think that was good and they felt, I always felt like they were secure in having a voice.

### Alignment with CLDP principles

The five principles of community-led development were seen to be deeply embedded in the project and guided day to day activity.

## Community self-determination

The structure of the CLDP helped to facilitate independence and allow for the community to thrive.

### Leveraging relationships and further funding

Having a large contract in place and the commitment of DIA as a partner has strengthened this community’s hand with other funders, government agencies, and their local council. The community spoke of being thankful to the fund and DIA. Interviewees felt that without the partnership they would not be where they are now.

There are a lot out there, a lot of organisations and agencies that want to contribute and so in terms of leverage, we've been able to bring people in and sit at the table and say hey you have an obligation and responsibility too. … they don’t know how to engage and interact and to get things moving. It’s hard, it’s not easy. … there was a roading project beside one of our marae, it was unsafe for our kids and [TamaŪpoko] had to say to the Council look if you do this it’s gonna cost us about 70 grand. Through our relationship with DIA we've already got 20K. So … we’ll be able to put in 5K or 10K, so and so and then put in, Council said we can do this part.”

From developing these relationships, the TamaŪpoko leadership team have been able to get collaborative financial input for projects from a variety of sources. An example of this was in the planning and development of a local playground:

30K to contribute towards a playground by the Whanganui River and then Sport Whanganui threw in another 10 and then they will contribute from DIA and then Council

### Funding model

The community is managing its own funding and have the personnel with the right skillsets in-house to make this possible.

The CLDP funding model is flexible and has allowed for the community to access funding throughout the year without the need to keep submitting applications. This certainty of funding has meant the leadership has been able to follow through on activities and development projects that are in line with community need and wants.

There's a baseline, for the CLDP there's a baseline right and … say ours was averaging say 300K a year, that's roughly, that's, and then so we pushed it further last year when we wanted the training, It went to 350, they gave us an extra 50 to run the training but they couldn’t do it this time. But that is the baseline for most of the communities.

### Community capacity

The community spoke of building up the skills of their advisors and having a team with a variety of complimentary skills and strengths.

So that's a big part of my role when I've come on board has been to help … make sure that everything is tika and pono in terms of our accountability, our management of our finances”

Other members have expertise in facilitation and, most importantly, are based in and have knowledge of community.

A combination of knowledge and skills allowed for TamaŪpoko leadership to work well, especially when the broader community is also working together to realise their aspirations.

## Equity and Te Tiriti

### Role of Te Tiriti

The community interviewees mentioned the centrality of Te Tiriti o Waitangi to their work. They spoke of serving as kaitiaki, caring for the whenua and awa to allow it to be there for the generations yet to come.

Freedom means different things to different people. But I tellyou, we hold on to the Treaty of Waitangi for me is that from a hapū perspective is about guardianship, it’s about how you look after this, cos that’s what truly matters ….to be there for our mokos and you know so there’s that part

This CLDP community has a te ao Māori focus where the ideas and dreams of Māori communities were normal and privileged.

## Impact of CLDP in the community

CLDP has enabled the community to experience success sooner and to a greater degree than would have happened in the absence of that funding and support. It has given momentum to projects directly, but also indirectly because TamaŪpoko now has a track record of success, which it can use to leverage relationships and other funding options with other agencies.

### Allowing for the people to dream again

The positive outcomes that arose from being a part of the CLDP have included providing opportunities to bring communities (nannies, young people) together to dream.

because they don’t always get to connect and that's becoming like few and far between now I think a lot of the time living in isolated areas. Like some of the nannies who live in Ranana, they said they haven't seen the ones from Pipiriki some of them in years, that sort of thing, even though it's only up the road but yeah I think that's been a really important thing

Furthermore, the CLDP funding has enabled the community to hope and dream for change, wānanga, and then see these ideas and dreams realised.

The most valuable thing is being able to make things happen for our people. Our people were oppressed spiritually, physically, mentally, emotionally, they were oppressed and CLDP has been a tool that's been I would say a taonga that's been given to us to be able to help live that fricking cloud of oppression off cos, that's been the biggest thing for me that CLDP has done, like what I see has been an instrument is to be able to help our people to come out to lift the fricking thing off because, and now we’re able to do stuff that they can see and it's by, it's helping them to be able to, … to be able to dream again”

### Supporting change and innovation

As the list of activities in the community description indicates, the community has launched a wide range of initiatives over the past 4-5 years.

But perhaps the longest-lasting enabler of innovation has been community’s burgeoning self-confidence and sense of autonomy that their ideas can effect change.

### Moving forward

The community began the project with the end of the CLDP relationship in mind. This was primarily due to the skill and experience of the primary facilitator and the community’s long-term plans.

The community recently hosted a wānanga with representatives from other agencies.

All the communities brought in heaps of other agencies: DOC, MSD, TPK, Whanganui Partners, they just brought them in to have a kōrero about what they can offer the communities so that they can think of ideas what they want to happen in the their villages, asked their own questions…… that was over a five day period too.

Since the community has grown, developed and facilitated tangible change in Whanganui, they have been able to connect with other fundholders and broker relationships to maintain TamaŪpoko into the future.

They’ve built and developed and proven themselves, those agencies or those people have come back to the table saying yep we’re ready to play now, which is really great. Like they’ve got contracts from Sport Whanganui to provide a worker up the awa for like older people’s exercise programmes or you know sort of, there's lots of variety things going on, and MPI are putting money in there as well and yeah quite a lot of providers are coming to the table.”

## Learning to date

### Key learning

The key learning that has facilitated success and wellbeing for this rōpū and wider community has been that they are driven with the wellbeing of their people in mind.

Another key learning was the importance of strong leadership and a complimentary leadership team to enable the rōpū to connect with community and to action moemoea and aspirations for community.

### Challenges

**DIA’s restructure** posed achallenge for the community. Communication was a challenge during this period and the community stated that they lost eight months while the government department were restructuring. They felt that they were not able to fully engage with the partnership during this time.

**Covid-19** was another challenge during this time and stalled progress by TamaŪpoko towards their overarching community vision.

**Lack of clarity** **and structure:** What did not work, according to community members, was that the programme wasn’t set up to step them through the entire relationship. There was no exit plan and that was evident as the community progressed.

I think the DIA or CLDP that you know I've got here a guidance strategy plan and what I'm referring to is that from entry to exit, say for example, it was quite fortuitous that with my previous background, as soon as we were told we were successful, I was already planning for the exit, what this had looked like, you know and all of a sudden it comes up on your phone, okay you're out. So this is where I held DIA accountable because they set us, you could be looking, they set us up to fail, they didn't give us, they didn't look after us. If you think about it like that. We’re gonna give you this money but by the way in about five years’ time when it creeps up okay you're out. You can, that's not, it’s like a parent with a child. You prepare them to leave the home. That wasn't done for us.

### Local factors influencing CLDP impact

TamaŪpoko was founded by members who had strong leadership expertise. They enabled the community to develop well, and also fostered broader relationships. They came into the partnership with:

* A strong grounding in their community and Te Ao Māori
* A leadership group who live in the community and know the people they are working with
* A shared drive and passion for their community

I suppose the key is it goes back to the vision and that’s what our people have realized because for so long they have a vision and they can’t make the intangible tangible but that’s, people don’t, and that in itself is key.

The overarching focus of TamaŪpoko is building the hauora of the community. The little and the big activities are done in line with that overarching kaupapa.

But all of the projects … they are examples of heading towards the vision. Little bites eh. Some here, some here, but we’re all part of contributing to that bigger wellbeing hauora vision.

## Reflections from the TamaŪpoko experience

CLDP has enabled TamaŪpoko to be the hub with the resources to go out into the communities, listen, and gather up people’s stories and aspirations, in order to support action and change.

Some insights with wider ramifications for CLDP across Aotearoa:

* Having a strong end-goal and continuity pathway supports success and good decision -making.
* Match Community Advisor skills and background with the needs of the community.
* The importance of local connections, skills and being able to use relationships to support community development.
* The importance of shared vision

It should be relationship-based as opposed to outcomes-based and let me quantify by saying this. As we’re building our team now and why I know this say is for me is about, it’s about exposing [community coordinators] to like for them have a better understanding of local regional and national bodies and hooking them up with relationships because it’s all about people. So, have them out to understand like for the Council, hey here’s the roading guy from up the river … because then they're empowered, then they start to understand the bureaucracy but they’ve got a strong link into the Council and that's their speciality … so that's more important than an outcomes based, if you truly think about it.

Relationship-building is both helped by and itself enhances an understanding of the history of a community. Lingering mistrust and trauma from past bad behaviour and the impacts of colonisation should not come as a surprise to government agencies. Building relationships, establishing trust, and ensuring that promises are kept, helps minimise the potential harm that can come from introducing yet another government programme and not following through on promises.

You absolutely have to make sure you do that, … to the promises that you're making, cos the people have been let down by Government for years and years and they're still mamae there from Treaty breaches, lost land, killed whānau.

### Conclusions and moving forward

TamaŪpoko are looking to continue their work along the Whanganui awa after their CLDP partnership ends, and is seeking further funding from Hāpai Hapori to maintain their successful trajectory.

They're in their last year, so the Department’s agreed to give them a soft exit mid-June next year with the last lot of money and I know that they’re trying to push for, they would potentially like another couple of years support from the Department

Although the community hopes for their partnering contract to be extended for another few years, if that does not happen they will continue to apply for other funding and push forward with their kaupapa.

One of the areas for change and development is to invite more communities along the awa to be involved, as well as iwi and rūnanga.

I think now cos they’re so established with the workers in each of the villages, now they’re trying to bring the iwi and the rūnanga back in to be part and how we can develop in another area type stuff.

# Whanganui Stone Soup

Region: Whanganui

Year joined CLDP: 2018

Community vision: Connected, safe, locally-led community

Current situation: Midway through the planned five years, seeking tangible gains

This summary is based on interviews with community members and the lead advisor, conducted in August to October 2021, along with analysis of background documentation.

## Whanganui Stone Soup community

The Stone Soup community covers a neighbourhood of 20 streets in Whanganui. Government and social service agencies have a long history of ‘intervention’ in the community.

Stone Soup arose in response to the death of a small child during a drive-by shooting. People were living in fear and some social services withdrew from the neighbourhood. Several local residents worked for Te Ora Hou, a national kaupapa Māori Christian organisation established in 1990 with a focus on youth development. In 2007, these residents committed to running regular community gatherings under the banner of Stone Soup with the initial intention of doing this for ten years.

### History of the project

Stone Soup had already been running for ten years before Hāpai Hapori got involved. It had received funding from some philanthropic organisations, including the Tindall Foundation, Todd Foundation, and JR McKenzie Trust. Stone Soup also had connections with a Hāpai Hapori advisor, who encouraged the coordinators to apply for the CLDP.

The Whanganui Stone Soup CLDP Partnership Agreement was signed on 31 May 2018.

### Leadership and governance

There are three coordinators, who are employed by Te Ora Hou.

The leadership group, known as champions, meets weekly. All are “active members of the community”. Joining the CLDP forced Stone Soup to formalise a previous loose leadership arrangement:

We had previously had another group that were just meeting and sharing ideas and highlighting these are our concerns but we were pushed to really formalise it and so we took the existing very informal group and we recruited and invited some more people. We wrote up terms of reference, so we were really clear about what we were about and we had an agreement between the Stone Soup champions and Te Ora Hou about what that relationship would be and how it would protect the integrity of both in the teams.

### Project implementation

Activities undertaken through the project include the following:

* Quarterly community gatherings
* Community vision plan
* Seven weekly interest groups: knitters, art, soup, boardgames, oldies, women and Man’s Space
* Champions development

The community gatherings are family events in a local park, incorporating free food, community kōrero and fun activities. These are a major undertaking:

So there’s always a lunch, there’s always maybe a topic that they talk about but it’s usually juat that the whole park is just filled with activities for the kids, face painting, or nail painting or artworks … the last one I went to was they had one of the ladies from the DHB talking about COVID and answering a lot of questions

In the case of the Covid discussion, a coordinator gathered questions from the crowd and put them to the public health adviser every half hour or so. This ensured that people could ask whatever they wanted without fear of shame or disapproval.

Discussion at the Kōrero Corner has prompted community problem-solving. For example, after a woman raised the need to support new people coming into the area, a local librarian worked with her to create welcome packs with information about essential services and an offer of a neighbourhood ‘buddy.’

## Relationship with Hāpai Hapori

Overall, the relationship with Hāpai Hapori has been rocky. Stone Soup has been frustrated by what they saw as poor communication and lack of genuine partnership. For Hāpai Hapori, the main stumbling block was a perceived conflict of interest between Stone Soup and Te Ora Hou. At times both sides wondered whether the arrangement was salvageable.

Things have improved markedly in the past six months, to such an extent that Stone Soup would now recommend other groups get involved in CLDP.

This community has been assigned three different advisors from Hāpai Hapori in three years. Each advisor appears to have set the tone, so the relationship can be seen as three phases:

**Phase 1. Partnership initiation** – Stone Soup was brought into the CLDP by an advisor who was already known to them. He was seconded to another role in DIA.

**Phase 2. Formalising structures** – A second advisor then focused on clarifying the role of the fundholder Te Ora Hou in relation to Stone Soup. Here a poor personality fit may have been exacerbated Hāpai Hapori signing partnership agreements early on (Phase 1) without thoroughly understanding the implications.

**Phase 3. Relationship-building on the ground** – The current advisor is focusing on being a seen face.

So it’s been a, I've loved the last year, initially I was quite, when I first took them on I thought I have no idea what I’m doing, it sounds funny but I just thought well I've just got to be who I am and my style is that I need to feel and taste and breathe it sort of thing, so I made the commitment that I would be there as much as possible.

The current advisor believes processes for partnership initiation (Phase 1) have improved with less room for ambiguity and misunderstanding now than in 2018:

I think it's evolved now from where I think when they take on new partners that it's not a, you just sign a partnering agreement and it all happens. We sit down and have a conversation around what are our values, what are your values, how do we align them, what's your world or what's my world view and how do we align or find the common ground to make it work for both of us sort of stuff.

### Contribution of Hāpai Hapori to project

Interviewees noted the following contributions of Hāpai Hapori to the project:

**Advice or funding for community activities**:

There's lots of activities happen in our community that we don’t end up own it, we might support them by making them a pānui or connecting people into whatever the mahi is they're doing and sometimes they need a little bit of advice or a little bit of funding… if other people are doing great stuff in our community, that’s a way that we can support as well and she’s been really good about it.

**Tip-offs about funding opportunities** **for Stone Soup** outside DIA but which they only hear about because of their CLD partnership.

There's some good value in that, just even for them to know, to kind of go oh there's this fund coming up over here in one of the other Crown agencies that you might want to think about, if they do a little bit here and we do a little bit here

**Connections with funding sources for other local initiatives** (outside Stone Soup), which relieves some pressure on the coordinators. For example:

Age Concern looks after our elderly really well. So instead of trying to take over the great mahi they're doing, if we can help them reach the people in our community or connect when stuff was going on, that’s doing it right by our community, …if the DIA can't help, okay try the Community House, they’ve got this funding in or try da-da-da, you know, … and that takes some of the mahi or the worry off me.

There have been **professional development opportunities** for coordinators and champions via the CLDP, and Stone Soup has been invited to be part of a community of practice, Inspiring Communities Connect, sharing insights and questions via Zoom four times per year.

The current advisor also likes to produce **visually-engaging reports** for DIA decision-makers, which builds support for further funding applications:

I’ll take a lot of photos and then I’ll put them into a Word doc and put little snippets around what it is and it doesn’t have to be a full-on thesis around what’s happening but just little snapshots and I’d make sure I share that with the Committee and my manager and what have you and the coordinator for the fund and just to keep them aware of what’s happening

### Alignment with CLDP principles

The five principles of community-led development appear to inform Stone Soup’s kaupapa and activities.

With a new advisor in place, relationships on the ground have improved, butStone Soup interviewees have residual doubts as to whether this represents a systemic improvement. They point, for instance, to some of the language used by Hāpai Hapori, including the job title ‘Advisor,’ which presupposes expertise lies outside the community:

When you come into our neighbourhood, come in and someone’s seeking to understand us first before you begin to advise, if you have to advise at all.

It is not clear to what extent Hāpai Hapori sees itself in a reciprocal relationship where it is also learning about community-led development.

## Community self-determination

### Supporting self-determination

There is little sense from the interviews that they see Hāpai Hapori as supporting them towards self-determination. Rather they describe a protracted tussle to assert their identity and mana.

[The advisor] had to fill in a report and it was really funny at the time and he said, “So the Stone Soup programme,” or something like that and both of us just like turned on him straight away and just said “It's not a programme, it's a community.” He said “Yeah, I know,” but in their thinking, it was still a programme.

The new advisor has made it a priority to be present in person consistently.Interviewees appreciate her approach and report that the community treat her like whanau now, but they were initially wary:

That took a bit of getting used to. Like for me, there was still a lot of distrust, so it was like how come she's here all the time.

They still notice comments that might centre the advisor or Hāpai Hapori in the narrative. These comments are seen as taking credit for the community’s own efforts, and failing to understand the whakapapa of Stone Soup, which precedes CLDP.

I mean she made a comment when, we had our champions meeting last night and she made a comment …, I don’t know if you picked up on it as well but it was sort of like effectively there's been such an evolution in Stone Soup in the last few years and it was like actually it's just the continued evolution that we've been on for 14 years and I mean she would attribute it somehow to her involvement, which is cool, which is nice and I'm not going to say anything about it

A telling example of how advisors can be in tune (or not) with a community is their availability by telephone, especially bearing in mind the importance of kanohi ki kanohi communication along with the prevalence of dyslexia and low literacy. Stone Soup participants say two advisors have been happy to take text messages and phone calls, but the other preferred to email and “it took a long time” to obtain his phone number.

Similar problems arose when an advisor started emailing the Stone Soup champions directly, despite being asked not to do so.

They were getting bombarded with emails they didn't quite understand … we were at risk of losing our champions but I think it probably was seen as gatekeeping.

Despite seeing a change in approach recently, suspicion of government “bureaucrats” is high, and the community participants are watching to see whether what they are experiencing is the result of a systemic shift or specific to certain personnel.

### Funding model

The fundholder is Te Ora Hou. There are overlapping employment and whanau relationships between Te Ora Hou in Whanganui and Stone Soup: key Te Ora Hou personnel live in the neighbourhood and are coordinators in Stone Soup.

This was a matter of concern for Hapai Hapori, which characterised the situation as a conflict of interest.

We walked away feeling like we were dirty, that we’d been shady. It was just horrible. Really horrible. We felt grubby. The conflict of interest that Te Ora Hou was in the community and that the, the flaw in their model is that Stone Soup community is exactly that and they wanted a funding agreement with a bunch of people who live in a neighbourhood and that bunch of people did not want any of that responsibility and we were like naturally saying well Te Ora Hou can pick that up so that we can just stayed focused.

The arrangement has survived a year of tense discussions, and continues.

The community’s first funding request was not successful. The advisor at the time had recommended they keep their application short and high level, then it was knocked back for lack of detail. As a result, the current advisor is cautious in the advice that she provides:

I encouraged them to beef up different areas, like beef up the PD for the champions, beef up the social enterprise because that's trying to build, but I had a lot of conversations with Leanne that I don’t want to set them up to put more, add more dollars in here to support this area and then they get turned down type stuff

The current advisor is also mindful that a worthy application might still only succeed in part because the Funding Panel must weigh up relative priorities:

I know the Panel are being more deliberate and trying to have a more equitable lens across all the 22 partners to make sure everyone’s got a slice of the dollars cos the dollars aren't as free as they used to be

### Community capacity

Stone Soup’s philosophy is not to duplicate what other organisations are already delivering, but to act as a bridge between the residents and that existing service. This reflects Stone Soup’s location as a neighbourhood within a city.

Recently coordinators have been engaging with the community over Covid-19 vaccinations, leveraging two essential elements: their mana as long-term members of the neighbourhood, and their skill at creating a safe space for people. Activities include: interviewing a public health representative using questions collected from the community; blogging honestly about their own fears and experience getting vaccinated; facilitating whanau conversations at home.

Interviewees noted that it takes time, skill, and intention to create a supportive environment where people are willing to say what they need and learn new skills.

If you want people in the grassroots being the connectors, you have to realise that they come with very basic skills sometimes technology wise and to create the space so that they feel comfortable joining the conversations is about upskilling and making them feel comfortable in that space.

For example, the key worker at the Man’s Space is improving his computer literacy, using MS Word and Excel.

More formal training opportunities have opened up thanks to funding via CLDP. For example, in 2021, Stone Soup ran a community conference in Whanganui. Using money that would otherwise have sent coordinators to Auckland for training, they arranged for the trainers to travel to Whanganui for a two-day wānanga with community members.

Organising that conference also proved a learning experience for the coordinators, who said they appreciated having the Hāpai Hapori advisor alongside them for support:

Each time we do something I take a little bit more like running a conference, six years ago I was a cleaner, … and I come from my neighbourhood and then I model it to other people that are working or volunteering in my team.

## Equity and Te Tiriti

### Role of Te Tiriti

There is not a purposeful focus on Te Tiriti, rather an understanding of the community and looking to cater to all who live in their community.

[A coordinator] is fluent in Māori and there's a lot of things that, karakia and there's a lot of things that they bring in through their natural who they are as people and leaders but I don't think it’s a we want to adhere to the Treaty that sort of, or we’re going to purposely engage in X sort of thing, from my understanding.

### Mana whenua involvement

The Stone Soup community is predominantly Māori, but the people are often disconnected from their iwi, hapū, and marae.

Interviewees talked about meeting people where they are at.

[There are] Māori who are high on language, high on culture, high on connected and other Māori who are for no fault of their own, do not have the connections to language, tikanga and reo and they are no less Māori, just their experience about what it means to be Māori is different and therefore the pathways to them [are different].

Stone Soup leaders do discuss proposals with iwi leaders, but described navigating iwi politics as “arduous” and expressed impatience with “talk-festing.” Coordinators will check that Stone Soup initiatives are not about to duplicate plans the iwi might have in place, but they are not going to wait for a mandate or permission from iwi (or anyone else):

We see a need and if the people are here to make the change we just go ahead and generally the response has been a really respectful one.

### Other diverse communities

Within Stone Soup, there appears to be no distinction made between mana whenua and maata waka. To highlight the importance of embracing everyone who lives in the neighbourhood, one of the interviewees talked about the experience of a community member who is maata waka when they reached out beyond Stone Soup:

It is a tricky place to reconnect especially if you're away from hapū, … like we've got a lot of Māori from Tokoroa, so it's hard to reconnect and … we've got someone here who does, their kids are, they’ve learnt great Te Reo, kids do kapa haka and stuff and they tried to do another kapa haka but it was very elite, ‘you're not whānau’ so it's hard for her to connect in there.

## Impact of CLDP in the community

Stone Soup is a resourceful community that was already engaged in community-led development.

Absent any issues, the most noticeable early impact of CLDP would likely have been to provide financial security for those activities. In principle, that should have relieved coordinators of some pressure, and provided resources to magnify what the community had achieved on its own, except:

* DIA’s concern over the contract and status of the fundholder prompted Stone Soup to choose not to draw on any of the CLDP funding for a year
* The fundholder was able to cover Stone Soup’s basic bills for that year
* Stone Soup had attracted support from private philanthropic trusts in the past

### Building relationships

Relationship-building is fundamental to the purpose of Stone Soup:

We’re a community that lives together, kids go to school together, we're growing up together, we're facing COVID scares together and us kids grow up together, our parents, some of us our older, their grandkids and my kids are going to school, that's what Stone Soup is, it's the thing building relationships and creating a safer connected community

The weekly activity groups enable relationships to develop naturally, as this example of the Gonville Knitters highlights:

They could have anything from eight to 20 women turn up every Wednesday and it's just a real hub of activity and chatter, chatter, chatter. There's no other formal structure except they sit there and knit. …a lot of them are single, older women, so [when permitted during lockdown] they broke into smaller bubbles and they still met and knitted together so that they keep that connection going

### Supporting change and innovation

Interviews did not make clear whether Hāpai Hapori’s involvement is supporting change in this community.

Reticence to share things that don’t work can inhibit innovation, and interviewees reported that they found private philanthropic trusts applied the CLDP principle of learning by doing more successfully than Hāpai Hapori.

I think we were really lucky with having Tindall Foundation and Todd and all that sort of stuff, relationships with them, … you can go to them and say we tried this and it didn't work and they would be okay with that and they're like how can we do it better and that sort of stuff. It was interesting, we went to the CLDP conference in Wellington, the one that you were at, I was laughing inside because in the end everybody was still putting their best foot forward knowing that the fund and from my perspective that wasn’t the most useful, yeah.

This is a community that has seen government agencies come and go. As one interviewee said: “When this partnership goes, whether we redo it, whatever, we're still here.” Stone Soup is now focusing on getting something tangible that they can point to afterwards, and say is a result of the five-year CLDP.

Two possibilities were talked about as a tangible legacy: one involves developing the physical infrastructure of a local park (e.g., fitness equipment, barbecues); the other would see a pre-CLDP initiative (Ka Pai Kai) develop into a viable social enterprise.

## Learning to date

### Key learning

The fit between advisor and community makes a significant difference.

The people matter, you know, like it is great working with Maggie, and her team has been amazing. I'm glad that we stayed on, I do try and let go of that old stuff because relationship does have challenging spaces and so … we haven't reflected on it for a while

### Enablers of success

The following enablers of success were identified by interviewees:

* Openness, transparency and availability of advisors builds trust and mutual understanding
* It is sensible to avoid being seen to promise what can’t be guaranteed
* Operational funding, especially for coordinator salaries, has enabled them to maintain momentum, and develop professionally
* The quarterly gatherings and weekly activity groups are strengthening community connections
* Funding for initiatives bring wider benefits, eg paying a resident to run the Man Space is providing a way to upskill him in computer literacy

### Challenges

The following challenges were identified by interviewees:

* Lack of clarity by Hāpai Hapori about partnership jeopardised the relationship.
* The strong overlap between the community and the fundholder was a source of concern for Hāpai Hapori
* But Stone Soup leadership saw the overlap as part of their identity, and felt they were being asked to give up who they are in order to stay in the partnership.
* One advisor demonstrated an inflexible communication style and apparent failure to meet the community where it was at.
* There is a lack of recognition that the Crown is in a position of power, and that communities may naturally act to protect themselves.
* Hāpai Hapori has not always created a safe space for this community to use mistakes as a learning opportunity.

### Local factors influencing CLDP impact

Stone Soup went into this partnership with many strengths, including:

* Almost ten years’ history of running regular community gatherings
* Some weekly groups already up and running
* An agreed community strategic plan
* A community leadership structure (albeit informal at that point)
* A strong orientation to getting things done on the ground (aversion to “talk-festing”)
* Coordinators who are long-term residents of the neighbourhood with skills, experience and networks in community development, fund-raising, project management, group facilitation and event organising

The community has experienced many interventions by social service and government agencies over the years, and not all of them have gone well: agencies have tended to over-promise and under-deliver, and are rarely there for the long haul. Residents know that their neighbourhood has been in the media spotlight with high profile crimes, and are sensitive to being used to ‘tick the brown box’. Given this context, Stone Soup leaders had clear expectations of what true partnership is, while DIA was still working that out. Early on, Hāpai Hapori arguably missed the opportunity to learn from savvy community leaders who already understood partnership.

### Improvements to CLDP

Interviewees did not explicitly identify what wider improvements they would like to see made to CLDP. Instead, they reflected on the significant improvement in the relationship, which they largely attributed to the new advisor and the in-person visit by her manager.

There is, however, a sense of the partnership behaviour that Stone Soup would like to see embedded in Hāpai Hapori, which would emphasise listening and respecting the community’s expertise.

## Reflections from the Whanganui Stone Soup experience.

Some insights with wider ramifications for CLDP across Aotearoa:

* Where advisors do not gel with the community over a reasonable length of time, change of personnel can help
* The importance of whakawhanaungatanga, enabling and expecting advisors to be a consistent seen presence in the community
* The need to be conscious of the inherent power imbalance between the Crown and community
* Past experiences with government agencies will shape the community’s perception of the CLDP
* Overlapping memberships, family and employment connections are unavoidable in local communities. These relationships are the natural consequence of people living their lives. Perhaps a neutral third party fundholder should be considered.

# Ka Pai Carterton

Region: Wairarapa

Year joined CLDP: 2018

Community vision: A strong, well-connected and resilient Carterton.

This summary is based on interviews with community members and the DIA advisor and lead advisor, conducted in September and October 2021, along with analysis of background documentation.

## Carterton community

Carterton is a town in the South Wairarapa District, with a population of 5,850. There are 171+ registered community groups in the Carterton area.

### History of the project

Carterton’s CLD story grew from a group called Resilient Carterton, focusing on environmental protection and sustainability. Resilient Carterton first engaged with DIA during community engagement work, attended by the local Advisor who informed them of the CLDP programme. This Advisor was very supportive and encouraged the community to apply. The group’s application was initially unsuccessful, due to concerns about insufficient community consultation around areas of focus.

This feedback was taken on board and a process of widespread community engagement followed, which informed a second application for partnership. They were tentatively approved as a partner in 2018 and funded for two years for further community consultation and development of a community plan. Hāpai Hapori also required the community to create a steering group representative of the diversity of Carterton. A key actor in this phase was one of the original facilitators from another Wairarapa CLDP, Fab Feathy, who led the process of building the steering committee:

She looked across all demographics and then also across geography because Carterton’s naturally a very wide area and whilst we represent 9,000 people, they’re stretched from the beach up to the mountains and from just north of Greytown to just south of Masterton so there’s lots of communities within that so it was trying to pull together a group that could effectively represent as many of the communities within our area.

Two Carterton community facilitators were engaged to support this and plan development process. Upon successful completion of the plan and further approval from Hāpai Hapori (DIA), the group received three further years of funding for project implementation.

I think the piece with DIA also was that Resilient Carterton wasn’t representative of the whole community; it was representative of a subsection and they wanted to open it up the wider community which was another reason why a facilitation team was brought in – to go and engage with the wider community and then understand what the needs were because Resilient Carterton had a specific focus.

Following acceptance of the plan at the end of year two, Hāpai Hapori recommended that a stand-alone entity be created to focus on CLD to represent the aspirations of the wider community. Resilient Carterton handed over responsibility, with the partnership now existing between Ka Pai Carterton and DIA.

### Leadership and governance

Governance is overseen by a steering committee, which has experienced significant change since its establishment. In its early stages, the community took a proactive approach to recruiting community members, with 12 people considered to be representative and to also hold the skills needed to support the success of the community. The initial committee comprised 12 people plus two facilitation staff and non-voting representatives from the fundholder and Hāpai Hapori.

However, numbers reduced over time, and again following completion of the Community Plan and confirmation of three further years in partnership. Interviewees reported that some members of the governance team felt frustrated at the pace of progress and that the size of the group was unwieldy.

The present group is made of approximately 10 people, all of whom have been in their roles for one year. Interviewees felt that the current steering committee is fairly representative across the varied sectors of the wider Carterton community. Members include older and younger people, the business community and the local marae. For the community members, a lack of clear information on both CLD and the role of the committee resulted in the attrition of existing members and challenges recruiting new people.

Because that information hadn’t been provided people didn’t genuinely know why they were there. We tried to make that clear in saying, “You’re there to represent that network so then you can feedback to you portion of the community and have your network buy in,” but there was no real understanding of that. It was very hard. People didn’t feel truly vested in it because they didn’t know what their purpose was and because they were one of a large number of people, “Oh, they’ll be fine,” and they step back.

### Project implementation

The Ka Pai Carterton Community Plan outlines the community’s aspirations, including: a community-based identity, vibrant central business district, spaces for collaboration (including cultural spaces), reliable infrastructure, stuff to do- a place with a variety of activities to support a variety of needs and interests, sustainability/values, and supporting local youth. Fostering a sense of town pride and identity is one key area of focus:

Identity’s the big one. People don’t really know much about Carterton, they understand what Martinborough does and the understand what Greytown does and they understand Masterton’s a service town, but Carterton doesn’t have that identity so it was about communicating who we are and trying to put a bit of a stamp on it.

The community leadership group, included in this evaluation process, were one year into their roles. They found navigating a sense of identity and direction while feeling that their community was relatively well off and spread widely with a lack of community cohesion, to be relatively challenging.

Then there was the challenge about how much can we help the community to develop cos you don’t wanna do the job for the community but because there isn’t anyone clearly jumping up saying, “I wanna take ownership of a project,” we have to find people to take ownership of projects. It hasn’t been so clear cut, it’s been a little bit vague about now we’ve got all this stuff and this information but nothing really jumped out of a really excited person or an excited group that said, “Yes, we must clean our river,” or, “We must do something.”

There is now just 18 months left to deliver on the partnership yet implementation is still in the early stages for this group.

Two part-time community facilitators are responsible for fostering community collaboration and coordinating activities in line with the community plan, while also identifying and supporting community energy and priorities as they arise. There is therefore a balance between remaining true to the Plan, and being responsive to new needs and ideas. This has presented challenges at times, with established groups seeking funding for their projects, which has not always aligned with the DIA CLD approach.

Activities undertaken through the project include the following:

* Ka Pai soup – a bi-monthly community meal and “idea pitching” event
* Consultation support for development of The Village connection space for local youth
* Food festival
* Te Tiriti training
* Local history and storytelling project
* Carrington Park co-design project

The bi-monthly event Ka Pai Soup has been a key aspect of delivery. It offers a space for the community to come together, listen to and vote on ideas. The most popular ideas receive funding from Ka Pai Carterton:

You pay $10 to come in, you eat, there are people who come and serve their ideas of saying “I need funding to maybe carve a bench that we will put in the street for people to just come and sit”. So there will be three or four people who pitch their ideas and then the community will say, will then vote to say the money that we have paid we want it to go to this initiative.

## Relationship with Hāpai Hapori

The group’s relationship with DIA has been reasonably positive, albeit coloured by different understandings of Hāpai Hapori’s role in community-led development. The Community Advisor has a strong commitment to the CLD principle of learning by doing. Community members, on the other hand, report feeling somewhat unsupported and would like clearer guidance from their Advisor. At three and a half years in, there remains a lack of clarity around Hāpai Hapori’s role and its expectations of CLD partners.

I really would’ve appreciated a lot more help in understanding what we were here for. I knew it was going to be a good thing but I didn’t know what kind of a good thing it was and I’m not really sure what kind of good we can do here. I’m still waiting to find that out. I’m sure there’s something.

Learning by doing is fine but it’s a touchy feely thing and then you all go on this path and you find out that’s not quite right and then you gotta adjust that a bit and adjust that a bit. The timeframe isn’t limitless…

While there was clearly a collaborative relationship underpinning their CLDP, community stakeholders did not see their relationship with Hāpai Hapori as a partnership by true definition of the word. This was seen to be largely due to a lack of clarity, defined parameters and information sharing. However it was acknowledged that a lack of comprehensive handover from Resilient Carterton was also a likely contributor.

With a partnership you understand who you’re communicating with and who you’re partnering with. You have a relationship and you work out the parameters and you decide between the two of you.

You can understand them wanting to step back or away from it because you don’t wanna be in there… [with] preconceived ideas of what it should be and I understand that so there is a fine line but there’s nothing wrong, I don’t think, by teaching. Teaching is not telling people what to do… it’s just giving people information so that they learn. That probably happens in a partnership, I think, you use each other’s values, each other’s strength to do a better thing than you would’ve done individually. Yes, in some ways obviously it’s a partnership but I don’t know if it’s a partnership that’s as close as I think it could be because maybe partnership is not necessarily the correct word, it’s sounds nice.

Interviewees also felt that Hāpai Hapori has at times created a sense of separation between the steering committee and facilitators. They provided an example of a meeting with a senior DIA representative where the facilitators were unable to attend.

### Contribution of Hāpai Hapori to project

Community interviewees noted the following contributions of Hāpai Hapori to the project:

**Resources** – with the facilitator positions considered the single most valuable use of money.

The advisor’s work **brokering relationships** and supporting the community to make connections. The advisor’s manager is also very engaged in the community as well, so the community has got to know two/several Hāpai Haporistaff who know their story.

Facilitating **connections with other CLD partner communities** was seen to be another important contribution. This gave the community an opportunity to learn from others.

### Alignment with CLDP principles

The community sees real value in the principles of community-led development – “a guiding light” in their work with the Carterton community.

The steering group and facilitators described using the principles as a guide in both their day-to-day work. They use the principles as a “guiding light” for prospective projects, asking ‘do they fit?’.

As facilitators we use the principles as a very, very strong guide and our seven aspirations, a very strong guide cos that’s all we had. As long as we could honour that and honour that these things were paramount in the projects and generally we felt that we were doing what we should be. We hold them really high.

The principles were also useful for identifying gaps in the overall work programme or in particular projects. There is a tension here because the principles also offer flexibility:

As facilitators we’re quite brave in how we make use of those [principles] and using the seven aspirations. I think we will always try and work and pull it an tease it to justify how that thing fits. Sometimes we get knocked back but we will always try to honour the community’s desire to make this thing happen.

An overarching lack of clarity for Ka Pai Carterton around both the theory and implementation of CLD has meant that, for the facilitators, who hold the responsibility of delivering work, the principles have been key, offering “clearly defined” focus points in the absence of other information and detail they might have wished to have. Their use as tool for reflection and evaluation upon completion of a project was also noted.

Training with Cissy Rock upon establishment of the steering group was seen to be very valuable and gave some clarification and answers. The team spoke of the value of having somebody who has worked in this space sharing how she saw the process of CLD working. The approach included presenting projects she had worked on, then asking participants to rate value of projects based of CLP principles. This gave the group clarity and brought the principles to life.

We heard that finding the energy and leadership within the community for projects has been challenging at times. Across a range of partnerships, for CLDP facilitators, steering groups, and Community Advisors, there is a tension between supporting and ‘doing for’. In Carterton’s case, this is exacerbated, by a lack of clear priorities and too few people willing to do the mahi on the ground.

## Community self-determination

### Supporting self-determination

Interviewees felt that there is a bit more work needed before being able to conclude whether the CLD approach supports the community to become self-determining. The advisor detailed how communities are given a lot of freedom “to think big, to dream”, without the set expectations or agendas of Government or other funders determining priorities.

Instead of funding an organisation [CLDP] will rather fund a community initiative where the community comes together, interact, form those connections to do what they want to do that would benefit not only them but their future generation.

But community interviewees did not feel they had a firm grasp on CLD and what Hāpai Hapori required of them as part of the arrangement.

With the changing nature of the community leadership and the partnership period in its final two years, the current members are looking at how they might change and adapt their approach to be more conducive to longevity and truly being responsive to all of Carterton, but have yet to negotiate amongst themselves on what that should look like. We understand that the community may negotiate to remain longer with the CLDP.

The Advisor has focused on brokering relationships, providing support with governance where required. However, there can be a fine line between responsiveness to community need and a lack of guidance. In Carterton’s case lack of clear policies and direction has not worked well; uncertainty has been a source of frustration and hampered progress.

The fact that this community have had experience of not meeting expectations yet have felt they lacked having clear knowledge of the standards they were expected to attain has likely added to frustration. They were initially turned down for funding, then received funding for two years of plan development before securing a further three years, with some funding applications turned down during this time.

### Funding model

Connecting Communities Wairarapa Incorporated were engaged as fundholder, in a three-year contract, and signed in 2020, following a breakdown in the relationship with their previous fundholder, REAP Wairarapa.

Issues arose after the previous fundholder had wanted to dictate how the group chose to run the programme and their use of resources. While this was beyond the boundaries of the fundholder role, the community members explained that the very hands-on approach of this fundholder did go in some ways to support the facilitators in terms of guidance in their role, as their committee struggled to formulate their own structure and job description.

Our first fund holder, was a lot more hand holding, they were a lot more, “This is what you can do in the meantime. This is how you can get on and do things. Come in here, learn this while this is going on.” With the new fund holder it’s just, “You go do your work.” What is this work? The committee aren’t telling us what it is, they’re saying, “You go find it.” There’s a bit of that.

The department took on a mediation role between the steering committee and the fundholder to support the Committee’s right to be self-determining, with the fundholder holding a purely implementational role. However, this process was ultimately unsuccessful and six months later REAP Wairarapa stepped down and new fundholder installed.

### Community capacity

Building community connections and capability has been the key focus of the Kai Pai facilitators’ work, with this clearly the greatest success of the partnership thus far. The facilitators see their roles as connectors and relationship builders. The Village was cited as one example where rather than funding, Ka Pai’s facilitators provided support in the area of community consultation.

It brings people together and [facilitator name] is doing some work like that. We’ve got the Village which is a place for disconnected youth to come and grow and become connected. We’ve got R2R which a youth group and [facilitator name] is doing a lot of weaving them together. I think there’s a lot of potential for that kind of thing in Carterton. Maybe for sharing spaces for stuff like that.

Strengthening relationships with Council has been another area of work, with facilitators supporting community members to engage and develop relationships while concurrently pushing for Council to be responsive.

Ka Pai Carterton are starting to explore what the future might look like, and the areas in which further capacity development can focus for maximum impact and sustainability. The advisor explained that the group has begun the process of asking the wider community about their priorities for capacity building and talking to other CLD partners to learn from their experience. They identified that project development, implementation and engaging with Council and other funders are areas around which the Committee “are starting to have those serious conversations”.

## Equity and Te Tiriti

### Role of Te Tiriti

Te Tiriti has not been an explicit part of the operation of Ka Pai Carterton however community members feel that knowledge of Te Tiriti and its recognition are important.

The community members interviewed shared that they are working to integrate tikanga, such as karakia to open meetings, into their ways of working to acknowledge the importance of Te Tiriti. Understanding the Māori history of the area is an important part of Ka Pai’s Carterton identity focus, which is expressed through identity and storytelling. Ka Pai have also funded Treaty training for the community, which was seen as successful and an opportunity they would like to see made available again. Therefore while the Te Tiriti does not feature strongly in the groups’ delivery, it is seen to have an important presence, driven by community interest and unfolding “naturally” rather than in “a structured way”. A park redevelopment project was given as an example of this, where the community expressed interest in Māori myths informing the design. However work was tempered by an awareness of not wanting to impose their view of how engagement with Māori should happen, or the role of Te Tirti in a project.

I think in that, as an organisation, we have put Te Ao Māori as one of our priorities as one of our areas of focus because there was a recognition that in the community there was a hunger for this thing. As much as we don’t wanna overstep and turn it into our view of that thing, we have tried to engage others to come into this space so that they can lead it. I think it’s very much a part of what we do… We are trying to be mindful of others but without overstepping.

Interviews included discussions around ‘community’ and the role of Te Tiriri in a community with a population that may hail from a range of different places and it was felt that a sense of inclusion and having a voice was important for all sections of the community. One committee member shared he struggles with the prominence of Te Tiriti in the CLD partnership because community comprises many different groups. We emphasise that this was his personal view, and not that of the wider group.

I feel that we’re about the community and the community represents such a huge variety that I don’t know how officially The Treaty has to be an important part. I think it needs to be a part because it’s part of the community but I personally see how wide it needs to be much more than that because we’re actually all about community. We’re not, as an organisation, I don’t think that important; we’re really just there to help the community.

### Mana whenua involvement

Mana whenua were not a part of the initial partnership. However, the advisor spoke of asserting from the beginning of the application process that the community needed to involve mana whenua, iwi and hapū for the advisor to support the application. Since then, there have been periods of engagement with mana whenua. For example, the team started out by going to and speaking with a local marae about their plans initially and went back after the contract was signed to have further discussions.

The advisor acknowledged the work of the community in reaching out to mana whenua, along with other diverse community members.

I know they’ve really tried in terms of really reaching out to everyone and making sure everyone is aware of the programme, making sure that everyone is invited to participate. I don’t know whether I could say 100% that everyone has come on board. I mean there's some people who either might be sitting on the fence waiting to see if things start working.

One very well-respected community member, who is local kaumātua and former marae chair, has been an important source of both information and connections for the group.

When he talks everyone listens, just listening with respect but knowing that someone brings that perspective, that they never thought about. So it is really, it is an asset…

This person has been actively involved in organising educational trips around the district and leading Ka Pai’s support of the local marae’s Matariki activities.

## Impact of CLDP in the community

In Carterton, the CLDP has improved relationships, and begun to build capacity and confidence in the community.

### Building relationships

Developing and deepening connections both between community members and groups, and the community and other stakeholders such as funders and the Council are clear impacts of the CLDP. The importance of “genuine relationships” were highlighted by both the community and advisor.

The skill of the facilitation team and their awareness of and connections with their community were highlighted.

### Supporting change and innovation

Serving as community connectors is an innovative component of Ka Pai Carterton. The facilitators have been able to connect up members of the community who have similar ideas for change, and support others in connecting them up with potential sources of funding. Although, the community have yet to find their footing and comfort as a partner in the CLDP, their knowledge of their community and their skills in brokering relationships have proved to serve their community well.

## Learning to date

### Key learning

Interviewees felt that the most significant lesson from this CLDP to date is the value of fostering relationships and creating connections across a community

It’s not just big projects – it’s the stuff that happens in the background.

### Enablers of success

The huge **value of the facilitator role** was clear and seen as the most important success story for this group. The facilitation team have worked hard to foster relationships and create connection and conversations in their community resulting in greater cohesion. One facilitator described this as being present, hearing what’s going on, connecting people and “joining the dots”. This was seen to be hugely important, even if tangible projects are not being delivered.

A further enabler was seen by committee to be a **separation between committee members and the on-the-ground delivery of projects**. This was seen to support objectivity and help avoid conflicts of interest.

**Connections with other CLD partners** was seen as another important enabler of success, and Hāpai Hapori has contributed usefully here:

One of the things that DIA do really well is they bring our other CLDPs together through either hui or workshops or whatever and one of the real benefits to this group has been us meeting other CLDPs and understanding their process and their project and how they became a group and each story’s completely different.

**Funding** is another key enabler, through paying facilitator wages and getting projects off the ground. But at times getting the money has become the destination in itself. This is probably a handover from previous experience of funders with more restrictive criteria. The group has found it hard to lift its own, and the wider community’s, focus above meeting DIA’s expectations to higher-level community aspirations, dream-building, and actioning their ideas.

**Evaluation** is another success factor. The group have derived value from looking at their activities against the objectives of DIA. They have undertaken Developmental Evaluations of two projects, as well as informal processes of reflection against principles, and having this reflection as part of their regular meeting agenda. The community also shared that they also regularly ask themselves “what value does DIA take from our project?” which could indicate a lack of clarity from DIA around what is expected from them. The challenges of quantifying and evaluating community building work were also noted.

### Challenges

The key challenge for the Carterton CLD has been a **lack of clarity around the CLD approach, expectations, roles, and responsibilities,** that appears to have impacted many aspects of the project and hampered tangible progress on community aspirations.

This community feel there has been an ongoing tension between a community-driven approach with DIA “not wanting to tell them what to do”, and the group wishing to be effective and make progress. Much time early in the partnership was taken up by “learning by doing” in the absence of clear guidelines. While the team feels there is clear value in this approach, to a point, they are only now coming to grips with CLD, their roles, and how to function as a team “very late in the process” with some still not sure how to make the most of the partnership.

We wasted a year trying to work out what we should be doing, and how we do it.

There’s a difference between giving information and giving instruction. I think that they’re worried that they’re going to be telling us what to do but we’re not asking for that. We’re asking for information so that we know where our boundaries are.

A contributing factor may have been a lack of handover of information from Resilient Carterton when they were succeeded by the new group.

Related to the above challenge, a further area of tension has been **ensuring faithfulness to the CLD approach** in terms of what initiatives are funded by Ka Pai Carterton. As with some other communities interviewed, **a lack of clarity and** **limited understanding of CLD and the fund** withinboth partnership group and wider community has been an ongoing challenge for this group, **impacting the relationship between Ka Pai and community members**.

There was an initiative that they wanted to come to us for funding and it was very difficult for them to differentiate between a group that's already established that works in that space that then comes to Ka Pai for funding because it's something that the community really loves. In the process of analysing [it became clear] that there wasn’t a lot of community consultation that was done for them… It's like they were given a product to say this is the food hub, this is how it goes, this is how the community will benefit… but… in the community-led space that doesn’t work.

There was initial excitement around the opportunities that CLDP funding can offer the community and people wanted to be involved, but a lack of clarity and unsuccessful funding requests resulted in buy-in and energy dropping off. Insufficient information sharing and “touchy feely” approach contributed to this situation, from the communities’ perspective. They shared that it is “embarrassing” to go back to community and advise that funding has not been approved, after going through extensive consultation and planning process, generating excitement. It was felt that clear information would have prevented this.

You can’t make good decisions if you don’t have all the information – it’s that simple.

Hāpai Hapori’s actions, in declining applications rather than working proactively to ensure that funding applications have greatest chance of success, appears to have contributed to frustration and declining community buy-in to the CDLP.

Insufficient clarity around roles has extended to the **role of the fundholder.** The initial fundholder overstepped boundaries and looked to dictate how the funds awarded to Ka Pai Carterton would be spent, and took a very active role as the facilitators’ employer. One community member described this as “messy” and underpinned by an overarching lack of clarity around roles and responsibilities.

Then they’re only acting on behalf as the employer cos they’re only legally the employer so it’s messy again. I think when there is vagueness or not great communication, I don’t think that’s optimum… because having to figure out your own role is really difficult.

### Local factors influencing CLDP impact

Absence of a clear need or priority within the community for CLDP to focus on and build around seems to have contributed to a **feeling of CLD as an uneasy fit for Carterton.**

The challenges of DIA’s version of CLD in a context such as Carterton, where it is a larger community with diverse needs, as opposed to a smaller rural community with one or two very specific, clear priorities, was frequently raised in our interviews. For some there was a sense of the model being better fitted to very small, rural communities.

With the shift from rural, simple communities to this more complex one, it was almost as though the DIA hadn’t worked out how to adapt their project and they were going to let us work it out which is a messy process. I think they needed to do a bit more work when they accepted Carterton.

The community have wondered if some of the challenges they have encountered around a lack of both clarity around the CLD approach and associated roles and responsibilities, and a sense of clear mandate from the community in terms of areas of focus, have stemmed from their position as a reasonably sizable and well-resourced community. One community member reflected on what she had learnt from speaking with other, smaller partnered communities:

It think for them [small communities] it’s worked probably a lot better because they’ve had the specific need and thought in mind and it’s been easier for them because they can just go to the DIA with, “This is what we need.” Whereas ours has been a lot broader and hasn’t been specific and has been quite generic and started off with quite some specific with Resilient Carterton potentially but then it’s just been broader.

### Improvements to CLDP

Interviewees offered the following suggestions for improvement to the programme:

* **Greater clarity around roles and responsibilities** – for both DIA and their wider community. Including guidance on board structure and roles, and on the role of fundholder. This community, along with others participating in this evaluation, wished to have access to a model to build on, rather than “creating the model”.
* Compulsory **CLD** **induction training** for all committee members and facilitators, including new appointments during the partnership period. Induction should include training around DIA and their role and could include an early session facilitated by Cissy Rock.
* **A rolling schedule of CLD and Te Tiriti training** as induction and refreshers.
* **Clear communication around ‘rules’ and expectations with regards to funding applications, including** an example funding proposal and/or template.
* A clear **funding budget** for each partnership.

## Reflections from the Carterton experience

Some insights with wider ramifications for CLDP across Aotearoa:

**Partnership structure:** the structure of Carterton’s CLDP partnership, with the initial two years of the 5-year partnership term consumed with plan development, may have added to the challenges they have encountered. This arrangement results in a compressed timeframe for project implementation. There is much less time for ‘learning by doing’, and Hāpai Hapori need to adapt its approach accordingly.

**Handover and loss of knowledge and context:** there are questions around how Hāpai Hapori can help communities retain organisational knowledge when fundholding or governance transfers from one organisation to another, and/or when a large number of the original community actors step aside due to burn out. In other communities, loss of momentum has also occurred when Community Advisors turnover.

**Definition of community**: the experience of Ka Pai Carterton raises questions as to why Hāpai Hapori wanted the community defined so widely in geographic terms, when compared to other CLD partners such as Whanganui Stone Soup or South Invercargill. In this case the Carterton community seems to have been defined according to Local Government boundaries, yet this partners’ experience indicates that these do not necessarily reflect genuine communities of interest. Did Hāpai Hapori create some of the problems encountered by Ka Pai Carterton (such as the struggle to find clear focus and mandate) by treating the community too broadly after first rejecting their application?

This may have contributed to the perception of Carterton that the DIA CLD approach is an uneasy fit for larger, more diverse and urban communities.

# Featherson – Fab Feathy

Region: Wairarapa

Year joined CLDP: 2018

Community vision: As a community, we want to fully realise the potential we can see Featherston is bursting with while retaining and enhancing what makes our town and community distinctive and great.

This summary is based on interviews with community members and the DIA advisor and lead advisor, conducted in September and October 2021, along with analysis of background documentation.

## Featherston community

Featherston is a town in the South Wairarapa District. It has a population of 2,680, with a significant portion of working people commuting to Wellington or Masterton. Featherston is more deprived than the neighbouring towns in the district and is in reasonably close proximity to Rimutaka prison.

### History of the project

Featherston’s CLD partnership was born out of a Wairarapa Community Networks (WCN) hui, at which the Hāpai Hapori lead advisor introduced the programme, and some key people from the community expressed interest. This early group included representatives from the community centre, WCN, and a local Community Board member who still sits on the committee. They spent the next 12 months engaging with the community to determine whether to apply for the CLDP and what the community would like to see more of in the Featherston region. The local Primary Health Organisation funded this consultation.

It was like the big shot community people in Featherston got together and, “Look at this, let’s do this. [group member] was really facilitating the heck out of that at that time and I think DIA, perhaps… would have been going, “Yeah, you’re worth a shot at this.

The significant and, by all accounts, very successful community consultation and “dream building” drew on the networks and facilitation expertise in the group, with support from Inspiring Communities. This included well-attended community events and a survey to which a significant proportion of the community contributed. The result was the Future Featherston Community Plan [2017].

The Community Plan covers five key areas of aspiration. These are: nurturing community; being a destination town for visitors; valuing and protecting the natural environment; having appropriate infrastructure to support creators, innovators, and businesses to invest in Featherston; and having the amenities, services and infrastructure to be a great ‘liveable’ town. There are a total of 15 themes sitting under the aspirations.

Following the completion of the plan, the community worked with Hāpai Hapori’s senior advisor assigned to the Wairarapa to apply for partnership under the name ‘Fab Feathy’. Interviewees said establishment of the partnership was straightforward due to significant consultation and energy within the community for creating change.

We’d already done the leg work so we weren’t starting from a zero base. We already had a plan and we were already starting to do stuff as a community anyway, not relying on any funding from anywhere, just basically seeing what we could do, how the community might work.

The Featherston CLDP Partnership Agreement was signed on 2nd February 2018. Once the application was successful and the partnership established, staff members were recruited.

### Leadership and governance

There has been high turnover in the group’s governance and facilitator roles over the years of the partnership.

The CLD currently employs two part-time facilitator, who play important on the ground roles for Fab Feathy. Upon establishment, three staff members were brought on at 20 hours per week each, with one of these roles being 12 month position for communication specialist who was to be focused on socialising the intent of the CLDP with the community. However, after the first year one of the facilitators left and the communications specialist was not retained. A further facilitator was then employed, with this person having whakapapa to the region and leveraging her connections during the time there, but they left the role 12 months later. At the time of interviewing a new second facilitator had just been recruited.

Governance is overseen by a steering committee, which has also experienced significant attrition over the years. The present group is made up of four people, after beginning at over twice this size, plus non-voting representatives from the fundholder and DIA. Many of the original steering group members stepped aside once the partnership was established, or left in the year following.

A lack of diversity and broad community representation in group leadership has been a challenge for Fab Feathy. There is minimal mana whenua representation in steering group. Initially there were mana whenua representatives who were part of the planning and community engagement, but this has changed over the years. A few key long-standing steering group members hold dual roles in the community. As one interviewee put it, the presence of these “unique and complicated” roles are acknowledgment of the fact that “it’s a small town and we all take on lots of roles and do a lot of things”.

The steering group is currently undergoing a rejuvenation process, at the direction of Hāpai Hapori, who identified the lack of diversity and the group’s historically poor relationship with the council as two issues affecting the long-term sustainability of Fab Feathy. Hāpai Hapori is presently not taking applications for operational funding from the group until this revitalisation is complete.

Recruiting for these governance roles has been a challenge and in response the group have recently formally engaged a “semi-external” person to generate interest in the community and “stir the pot a little bit”. At the time of interviewing this appears to have been a successful approach, with four new members in the process of being inducted and more expressing interest. Two current members will be stepping down at the end of 2021.

### Project implementation

The two community facilitators are responsible for facilitating community collaboration and coordinating activities in line with the community CLD plan. While much of the group’s work is guided by the plan, there is also responsiveness to other priorities bubbling up in the community. It was noted that some areas identified in the community plan[[3]](#footnote-3), such as elderly housing, are now seen as far too complex or are lacking community members willing to be their driving force.

Diverse activities undertaken through the project include the following:

* Funding for wages of two community facilitators
* Wairarapa Moana Recreational Trail feasibility study
* Dog park development
* Cross-cultural project comprising four components
  + get Paetūmōkai recognised as the original name of the area
  + develop a Te Reo strategy for the town
  + capture stories and waiata through video, print and audio recordings
  + commission carving of a pou in recognition of the history of the region
* Support for Featherston Booktown events to improve broader accessibility
* Bike track and bikes at local primary school
* Matariki celebrations
* Food storage initiative in partnership with local foodbank
* Firewood purchase and distribution during Covid-19 lockdown
* DoC campground clean-up and planting
* First Friday events – summer evening music and market
* Support of Pae tū Mōkai – Lake Wairarapa [area] Rejuvenation project
* Waste minimisation project to divert re-usable items from landfill

For any given project, the community facilitators identify community champions, with this person or group driving the project, and the facilitators providing support. Project implementation had a focus on going where the energy is and therefore depends on champions coming forward. Many projects are characterised by collaboration - between new and previously-established independent community groups, and between these groups and the facilitator team. Strengthening relationships with the local council has been another area of work, discussed below.

## Relationship with Hāpai Hapori

The communities’ relationship with Hāpai Hapori has been complex, characterised by changes over time, and described by the community as “a partnership, but not an equal partnership”.

The community’s experience has been that the dynamics of the relationship seem to have moved from very loose and open to very prescriptive, due in part to staffing changes at Hāpai Hapori, the make-up of the steering committee and some significant challenges in one project.

There’s a super long leash, until there isn’t. And then you’re in handcuffs.

Experiences with Hāpai Hapori advisors have varied considerably, with three relationships over the course of the partnership. The first advisor was described as very “hands off” and as having “really quite a passive role”. Relationships with the current advisor, and the area’s senior advisor (who has been in a mentorship role) are by all accounts very positive, with the advisors’ proactive approach and frequent contact seen as very important by the community. The senior advisor’s supportiveness and consistent attendance at meetings is also very much appreciated. Community members feel able to pick up the phone and call their advisor for advice and support when required.

Perspectives and experiences of working with Hāpai Hapori varied across community members we spoke to. One interviewee felt there was clear and effective decision making and information sharing between the group and Hāpai Hapori, but another disagreed.

One perspective was that there is a lack of transparency in the workings of the partnership relationship, perhaps related to upstream policy and decision-making. Beyond operational-level relationships with advisors, the relationship with Hāpai Hapori was described by this person as “vague”, with an external appearance of flexibility, but with “hidden rules” not apparent from the start. While learning-by-doing was seen to be of value, clear guidelines were also held to be important – it is possible to have both. The process of working with Hāpai Hapori was described as “tai chi”- where you don’t know when what you are doing is too little, or too much.

It’s good that things are flexible but if there’s some absolute bottom lines that could be set or perhaps some earlier guidance, earlier feedback loop, that’s a safe space as well.

More recently, the relationship with DIA “further up the food chain” appears to have become particularly strained. There has been two points of conflict, which were allowed to grow during the tenure of a previous community advisor.

The first has stemmed from one aspect of the bicultural project which has encountered significant challenges with layers of complexity. In short, the difficulty arose following two complaints of insufficient consultation, one of which was received from the local Mayor. The project quickly turned “very political”, the Hāpai Hapori relationship manager became involved, and the project was halted. The community wishes to now see the department front the resolution of conflict to facilitate moving forward on this project.

The second is a concern about lack of breadth and diversity on the steering group and potential conflict of interest.

There is a strong desire to not let the challenges around the bicultural project disrupt the community’s other work or overshadow their considerable successes. Further to the challenges noted above, the withholding of operational funding for wages and overheads “as a lever” to bring about revitalisation of the steering committee, a process that “was always going to happen” was seen by the community to be inappropriate, demonstrate a lack of trust, and has added to the stress of an already-challenging period.

### Contribution of Hāpai Hapori to project

Community interviewees noted the following contributions of Hāpai Hapori to the project:

**Resources** – flexible, accessible funding provided momentum and the ability to get projects moving fast, with the facilitator positions considered the single most valuable use of money.

**A consistent** **presence** – the lead advisor attends all community meetings in Featherston, and has been supportive of the group and CLD partnership from the beginning of their involvement. The advisor is also readily available to speak with coordinators when required. However, there have been changes in community advisors since the beginning of the partnership, with trust needing to be built and it unclear the degree of involvement that all advisors had had over the course of the partnership. Having a relationship with community advisors are currently seen as important relationships for this community. However, from the community’s perspective this presence has not always been mirrored by consistent guidance and decision-making at a higher level.

The ways in which proactive advisors **support the making of connections** with other opportunities and groups was also noted. Introductions to other CLD groups to share learning was seen as particularly valuable with potential for further growth.

When the community were setting that [project] up, we were able to talk to the people in Raglan about what they did and also talk to some people over in the Hutt around a similar initiative that’s going over there so DIA were able to make those connections for us which is really helpful.

### Alignment with CLDP principles

The value of the five principles of community-led development was highlighted by the community and were seen to be an effective guide for their work and deeply embedded in the project and guided day to day activity.

Every day, everything I think about is those five CLD principles… they guide my every decision and everything that I do at work and torment me regularly.

The community works to support groups of interested community members to form around priorities, and not to do things for or to the community.

## Community self-determination

### Supporting self-determination

The CLD approach was seen to be very effective in supporting the community to become self-determining, and has built capacity in leadership, decision-making, consultation and project development.

Facilitators see their role not as leading initiatives, but as connectors or supporters who “create spaces” for relationships to develop between interested community members or groups. At times the role can be about listening, hearing what the community wants, and reflecting that back. Despite strong success in this area, growing understanding of CLD in community is seen as a work in progress.

We saw the role as being working with the community to help the community achieve things, not doing it for the community or doing it to the community so really following the principles of community-led development very strongly and quite adamantly, too. That’s taken a bit and our community still doesn’t get it in terms of, we’ve got Fab Feathy sitting there so Fab Feathy will do this or Fab Feathy will do that and we’re saying, “No, you will do it but we will help you.” It’s just trying to change that mindset.

Overall, there was a sense of confidence and optimism about the sustainability of the group and projects in the long term, post-partnership, however it was felt that professional development, potentially from Inspiring Communities would be important. A further key ingredient would be support from the council, by way of funding for properly-resourced community development roles to continue the valuable work of facilitators.

I can see once the partnership’s finished, there’ll be a continuation of a range of things and also an understanding by the community that they can do stuff, they don’t have to have their hands held to get things done, they can just get on and get stuff done. We see that all the time now. There’s lots of other things happening in the community that have nothing to do with Fab Feathy but I do believe that they’ve taken learnings that Fab Feathy have been able to achieve.

### Funding model

The fundholder agreement is with REAP Wairarapa; an arrangement that appears to have been successful even though the relationship is less ‘hands off’ than some other partnerships. REAP are the formal employers of the two facilitators.

The fundholder is meant to be a non-voting member of the steering committee, however one employee of the organisation is also a key and longstanding member of the committee (which provides them with voting rights), and this person described themselves as the direct manager of the two facilitators. They believed their role as a fundholder was to manage the employment relationship and support the two project facilitators as the funds for their salary was being managed and accounted for by them.

The flexible nature of funding was valued by the community, who saw the simplicity and immediacy as an important, positive aspect of the programme’s funding model. This was seen to contrast with traditional community development funding models that can work to exclude certain groups for various reasons, such as the application process and/or governance structures required.

However, some interviewees did not see the model as ‘high trust’. There appears to be a lack of clarity and transparency around ‘rules’ and expectations, which has led to funding applications being turned down, despite earlier indications they were on track and in the absence of clear guidance on what would meet the Funding Panel’s expectations. There is a sense from some that Hāpai Hapori simply did not trust the steering group to know the needs of their community.

### Community capacity

As noted above, a sense of self-belief, community pride and esteem has grown from involvement in the CLDP. Groups and individuals now have the capacity to develop clear strategic plans and then a plan to reach those goals. Interviewees felt that as residents developed these skills, the town, and community groups within it, would be in a better position to retain and build on the gains from the CLDP beyond the partnership term.

The facilitators work to support community capability and connections by suggesting partnering with other groups and/or the district council. If residents are not confident with administration, facilitators will help, working with them to build up their capacity. The facilitators are able to draw on different strengths and experiences within the community.

CLD’s a great way to marry some of those high functioning funding-minded people with some of the more grass roots, more hands-on perhaps lacking confidence or lacking professional tertiary qualifications. CLD seems to be a good way to bridge those, I think.

One community member described the facilitators’ coordination role as “an outsourced brain for the community” or “central nervous system” – gaining insight into community, bringing groups together, building up relationships.

It can be very low key. A lot of these groups are already pretty good but it’s more about, let’s work with this other group, let’s make let’s make things stronger.. It’s that building up relationships with people.

## Equity and Te Tiriti

### Role of Te Tiriti

Te Tiriti is not an explicit part of the operation of Fab Feathy. There appeared to be strong mana whenua involvement in the community consolation process prior to partnership, but not beyond these initial stages. The facilitator noted that the team are always looking for PD opportunities in terms of Te Tiriti and that questioning ‘is this partnership?’ had become as an important guide in his work alongside the CLD principles.

While there have clearly been some successes in terms of working in partnership, the cross-cultural project, comprising three components, has however encountered some significant challenges and insufficient oversight and cultural competence on both sides of the partnership appear to have contributed to the difficulties. One community member described Hāpai Hapori’s decision to halt the pou project in response to two complaints as “silencing Māori voices”. An advisor noted that inexperience within the steering group of working in a cross-cultural space might have contributed to lack of oversight of this project, including community consultation and alignment with the community plan. But cultural competence within DIA to manage this complex piece of work and others like it was also noted as a shortfall in this instance and across the CLD work.

**… I’m definitely trying to learn as much as I can… but there’s a lot of stuff which is actually required, we really need someone who is either way more experienced and competent in te ao Māori or actually at best we need a Māori staff member.**

### Mana whenua involvement

Mana whenua involvement has waxed and waned for the Featherson community. Currently one person on the steering group is a member of Pae tū Mōkai o Tauira (an Incorporated Society, established to give Featherston a Māori voice on the South Wairarapa Māori Standing Committee and to support tangata whenua). The group has previously had representation of local hapū, but this is no longer the case and a priority for the current rejuvenation process.

The presence of a local woman of mana whenua in one of the facilitator roles strengthened involvement for a time, with a community member noting the ease of carrying out hapū-level consultancy for projects such as the highly successful 2020 Matariki celebrations. The loss of this team member and her local relationships are felt strongly by some.

The Matariki celebrations were seen as an occasion where the groups’ engagement with Māori was there right from the start: a “complete co‑design and collaboration”. In the absence of a marae in Featherston, the community sought guidance from the marae in Greytown and Martinborough, with Papawai Marae in Greytown leading a restored dawn ceremony celebration.

Matariki was coming around and we engaged with the local mana whenua group and we engaged with the Featherston School and Fareham House and organics and all these other groups. Pulled them in and just made a whole week long events thing, culminating in a [dawn] Matariki ceremony and we hosted it down at the moana, at the lake. … We got the Papawai Marae Kaumātua cos Featherston doesn’t technically have a Marae but we got the Kaumātua from down the road. There’s lots of overlap between these towns and they’re living here and working there. The ceremony hadn’t been performed in Wairarapa waited for over 120 years and they restored it and it was collaborative.

One person felt however that not everything the groups does has to be through a Te Tiriti lens.

With regards to engagement with mana whneua, the community shared they believe there is consultation fatigue for some groups, who were being asked to comment on projects to “tick a consultation box”. It was felt that this was “tokenistic” and that any consultation with mana whenua must be “authentic and genuine, and on things that really matter”.

Things like the dog park, council land, why would you engage with mana whenua around the dog park? That’s the sort of thing I’m talking about. If we went to say the Māori Standing Committee, “We want your view about the dog park?” They’d tell us to piss off, to be honest.

### Other diverse communities

Interviewees did not describe involvement of other diverse groups with regards to Fab Feathy.

## Impact of CLDP in the community

In Featherston, relationship-building and supporting change and community pride and confidence have been clear impacts of the CLD partnership. Interviewees talked positively about the value of working together and with other stakeholders to achieve results for all.

The partnership, and in particular the flexible and timely access to funds, has enabled the community to develop and support initiatives that they “would’ve struggled to get off the ground without a little bit of seed funding”. This funding, along with the significant resource of the facilitators has enabled significant results, from reasonably small amounts of financial investment.

We helped both of these groups just get confidence and go, “Cool, we’re allowed to ask for that. We deserve that, we should talk about that.” The irony is, is that people think of us just funders or whatever but some of the most successful stuff, like the dog park or the swimming pool, we didn’t actually fund that much… They did it all and it’s true community success, everyone’s happy, everyone’s using stuff, it’s all working but it’s also true CLD success…

### Building relationships

Developing and deepening connections within the Featherston community is at the core of the community’s CLDP. The first of the group’s five aspirations is that ‘community is nurtured in Featherston. We have fun together, we are connected, resilient and self-sustaining’.

As noted above, facilitators see their role as connectors or supporters who create spaces for relationships to develop. A substantial number of the projects listed above are collaborations, not only between Fab Feathy and community members, but between various new and established community groups, and between these groups and the South Wairarapa District Council. Interviewees in various roles shared that relations between the Featherston community, and the local board, and their council have historically been strained. This was attributed to a range of reasons, including underinvestment in the community, and personal relationships. Facilitators saw strengthening this relationship as an important part of their work, particularly if Fab Feathy was to be sustainable in the long term.

There’s been really, really bad relationship between Featherston community and South Wairarapa District Council but from the consultancy, from the research we know that Featherston people want to have a better relationship with Council. We help the community work with Council to do that.

Working with community groups associated with, or with aspirations to develop council assets have been one way this has been achieved. One example where relationships have been nurtured and improved is the development of a dog park on council-owned land, led by a kaitiaki group called the Featherston Dog Park Group. The group worked with the local college to have students build equipment and collected donations from the community.

That hasn’t required any additional funding through the Department of Internal Affairs, that’s just been a group that’s had a clear plan and has a good committee and is working towards achieving all of its goals. That’s a really good example of how Fab Feathy didn’t do it for them but helped them get to that point.

Fab Feathy then supported two community groups – the Featherston Dog Park Group and the swimming pool group – to collaborate, as they are located next to each other. The result has been a hugely successful annual ‘dogs and togs’ event where dogs get to play in the pool on the last day of the year before it shuts down. The event has also strengthened relationships and confidence engaging with the council.

That’s two community groups working together and they work together with council and they’ve done it, everyone’s happy and nobody’s bitching about the council and it’s a positive story. That’s a pretty cool one, just building up the town’s [confidence].

### Supporting change and innovation

As the list of activities above indicates, the community has launched a wide range of initiatives over the past 3-4 years. At this point, the largest initiatives using the most substantial funding, have been the bike track, which is on track to be expanded thanks to the CLD investment attracting additional funding from other sources, and the Moana Trail feasibility study.

However, these projects are in the minority, with many requiring minimal financial support through Fab Feathy, relying more on collaboration. It was felt that the communities new found self-esteem, “mindset shift” and “belief that we can achieve change” would continue to be an important driver of innovation as they look towards the future.

Interviewees have also noted the value of the project in strengthening their community as it undergoes change of its own. A large number of new people have come in to the community over recent years, including those escaping house price pressure in key urban areas. Some reflected that CLD provided opportunities to bring diverse community members including the ‘old guard’ and ‘new money’ together, and draw on the strengths and knowledge they bring.

## Learning to date

### Key learning

Involvement in CLDP is complex. It can deliver results but drain local energy, so the phase before signing a partnership agreement is critical for generating clear agreed expectations.

### Enablers of success

The attributes, skills and experience of the current advisors and coordinators/facilitators were mentioned often by interviewees.

It has proved important to have **more than one facilitator** as the role is too significant for one person to carry alone, a theme that has come through other CDL community engagements. In Featherston, the one facilitator who has been in the role from the beginning has had to work alone for some periods, which has been challenging.

I’ve been there for three and a half years now… and my kaiwhakarite partner has changed a couple of times… During those times in between, it’s very lonely and isolating to be working by yourself in this role… I really appreciate having someone to bounce ideas off.

The group have also learnt the value of hiring people who live in the community. Thecommunity care about **having a ‘local’ in the role**, with the intimate knowledge of a community that comes from this. Two of the early facilitators came from outside Featherston (from Carterton and Masterton). This may have contributed to some residents’ early reticence to engage or “standoffishness,” and posed practical challenges around travel and the flexibility required of the role.

With regard to the community advisor role, the **importance of accessibility, regular communication, being ‘hands on’ and present within the community** by attending meetings and community events were highlighted. The community appreciated their advisors’ hands-on approach and visits were seen as important opportunities for them to “see it in action”. The two current advisors are seen as people who can ‘join the dots’ for the community and forge connections when required.

**Money** – to pay facilitator wages and to get things done at pace and to give momentum to community energy and efforts – has been a further key enabler.

### Challenges

**Understanding of CLD within the community** has emerged as a challenge. The group have found themselves mistaken for the district council, or other conventional funders, and have had to work hard to socialise the concept of CLD, and it was felt that this was an area where Hāpai Hapori should take up a greater role, in partnership with communities. Some community members have struggled to understand that ideas must stem from wider community aspirations. Key to this has been managing expectations and striking a balance between supporting projects yet pushing back at expectations of ‘doing stuff for’ or being the driving force.

It’s taken a bit to help the community to understand that just cos you have a good idea, doesn’t mean to say it’s a good idea for the community. It might be a great idea that you’ve got but you actually need to have likeminded people around you as well to progress something. It’s taken quite a bit to work through that type of scenario. Of course, squeaky wheels always get the attention so we do have a group of people that have ideas but actually want other people to do it for them so we’ve been quite staunch about, “No, we’re not going to do it for you, we will support you to do it but you need to make sure that you’ve got other people around you to help you as well.”

**Building engagement** and ‘buy in’ across the community is an ongoing challenge, with growing engagement with youth a particular challenge, after a committee member with skills and connections in youth development left the group.

Closely related to the above, **attrition and a lack of diverse representation** on the steering group, including from mana whenua, has been an ongoing issue. Recruiting for the steering group has been a challenge. Contributing factors include: other calls on people’s time, lack of broad community understanding of CLD, lack of understanding of the governance role, and the logistics of making hui accessible for all of those who might wish to be involved.

It’s been really tough to line people up for the monthly steering committee hui because by nature of trying to be accessible and reach all peoples, some people work during the day, some people work during the… we’re automatically excluding somebody.

**Workload** appears to have been an ongoing issue for the facilitators, who at times have found themselves “really stretched” to meet community expectations in their allocated hours. The value of engaging a paid project manager for larger projects was noted. This was seen to allow facilitators to hold a support role rather than day-to-day delivery responsibility. Some group members felt that some facilitators may be taking on personal ‘passion projects,’ which could add to their workload and result in insufficient consultation and potential conflicts of interest.

### Local factors influencing CLDP impact

Aspects of the community that have served as advantages for the CLD include:

* A complete and comprehensive community plan, developed over a 12-month period of substantial community engagement
* Mana whenua involvement early on, in the steering group and a facilitator role is a strength that could be recovered.
* New community members from outside the area with the “energy, inspiration, and enthusiasm” to push things forward.
* A strong sense of community.

### Improvements to CLDP

Interviewees offered the following suggestions for improvement to the programme:

* Clearer communication around ‘rules’ and expectations.
* Support from DIA to grow community buy-in for CLD, from the early stages of partnership. One suggestion was that this could take the form of a ‘roadshow’ with “appeal to authority” that may help give credibility and generate excitement around the CLD project.
* Renumeration to fund holder should reflect the scale of the role and the risk and effort carried with regards to employment. It was noted that the real cost of this work was approximately 25k a year, significantly more than the 10k compensation.
* Enhanced clarity and transparency around “rules” and expectations, particularly with regards to funding proposals. This would enhance feelings for this group of being trusted to know their community.
* Professional development opportunities to support sustainability as community reaches the end of its partnership period. potentially from Inspiring Communities would be important.

## Reflections from the Featherston experience

Some insights with wider ramifications for CLDP across Aotearoa:

* **The importance of cultural competence** across the partnership, but in particular within Hāpai Hapori to offer guidance with regards to engaging with mana whenua and delivering cross cultural projects.
* **Hāpai Hapori’s conflict resolution process** has not worked for this community, who see their decision to manage the situation by stopping a project as undermining and inappropriate. From the communities perspective the situation had been mis-managed and conflict escalated. There is a strong desire for DIA to take responsibility and “front” the situation.
* **Relationships with local government** are important for the success of many CLD partnerships, and the complexity of this key relationship has come up often. The effectiveness of community advisors with councils appears is a bit hit and miss.
* **The prevalence of Bike Tracks at local schools among CLD projects**. Raises the question of why the Ministry of Education Property Division is not meeting what is clearly strong desire for this investment from communities? Is this an example where Hāpai Haporicould take a bigger role as a central govt agency collating community concerns/issues and raising them at the appropriate level, joining the dots between all these individual projects?

# Karamea

Region: West Coast, South Island

Year joined CLDP: 2017

Community vision: Karamea is a hospitable, safe, and productive community where members of the community can live, share, play, celebrate, prosper and welcome others.

This summary is based on interviews with community members and the lead advisor, conducted in August to October 2021, along with analysis of background documentation.

## Karamea Community

Karamea (part of the wider Karamea, Little Wanganui district with a population of ~700) is the northernmost township on the West Coast. It is a diverse community. As one interviewee put it, residents range from “farmers to lifestylers to homeschoolers … [it is] a rural community of lots of different opposites.” Karamea has a sizeable Area School, and is the gateway to the western end of the Heaphy Track.

### History of the project

Karamea was one of the first five communities in the programme, and the first South Island-based one. A foundation committee member with an awareness that CLDP was being established, and who had foresight to see its possible benefits for Karamea, instigated the process of joining the CLDP. Karamea Community Incorporated had charitable status, and already had some infrastructure – a place to meet and a website.

The Karamea CLDP Partnership Agreement was signed on 11 September 2017. Community interviewees said Hāpai Hapori’s approach has evolved considerably over time. They felt that processes, and the view of what is within scope for CLDP, has become clearer and in some ways less rigid since then.

### Leadership and governance

At the request of DIA, to ensure clarity of roles, Karamea Community Incorporated (KCI) became the fundholder and another committee, Karamea CLDP Partnership Group, was formed to manage and oversee the CLDP.

I think formalising it that way for our communities specifically was because in that first year there was a little bit of confusion amongst ourselves within the community as to who makes decisions on who’s applying for this money and are all things equal or is there a priority order … and I think keeping the CLDP project bits separate from the other things that KCI are doing cos they’ve got money coming in from different places for all different community projects was part of that clarification process.

Despite the formal separation of roles, the CLDP chairman also chairs KCI, and there is almost complete overlap of governance personnel between the partnership group committee and the KCI Board.

The committee has eight members with complementing skills, and the current chairman has been in the role for about four years. The number of people on the committee has increased over the years, as they’ve realised that there is “far too much” work for a small group to juggle.

### Project implementation

In late 2018, Karamea hired a Partnership Manager to coordinate the CLDP. The Karamea CLDP documentation describes the Partnership Manager’s role as “one of pollination, … out and about in our community listening to conversations, working on relationship building and watering seeds of awesomeness as they arise.”

Activities undertaken through the project include the following:

* Upgrading the Oparara Arch track and carpark
* Capability building of leadership group
* Hōkioi cultural art project – life-sized sculpture
* Clean Stream riparian planting project (CLDP seed funding, then extended via Jobs for Nature)
* Increasing the size of the new school hall so it can be used for community events and activities (with Ministry of Education)
* Rata Reserve Project
* Community garden and seasonal abundance share
* Civil Defence emergency communication system (under investigation)

## Relationship with Hāpai Hapori

Overall, the relationship with Hāpai Hapori has improved over time. Interviewees reported that departmental processes had evolved, and that its guidance is now clearer than at the start.

### Contribution of Hāpai Hapori to project

Interviewees identified funding as the most important contribution of Hāpai Hapori.

Many projects would not have happened without the CLDP investment, at least as seed funding. For example, CLDP filled a hole in efforts to re-develop Karamea’s museum because no other funder had provision to cover concept design and applications for initial consent. With that in place, the community can obtain quotes and raise the funds they need to do the work.

In particular, funding for the Partnership Manager has been a primary enabler, because she works in the community, improving people’s awareness and understanding of the CLDP, helping build the relationships necessary for projects to get off the ground, and connecting people and organisations.

Interviewees appreciate the support they receive from the Hāpai Hapori Community Advisors. Communication is easy and friendly, and there is mutual trust. At the time of interviewing, a combination of circumstances meant the Lead Advisor had been unable to visit Karamea for a year, but interviewees still felt comfortable and confident in the relationship.

Interviewees felt the Funding Panel operates in a fair and independent manner, and that they get a clear outline of the reasons for the panel’s decisions.

Trust has grown over time while CLDP has also evolved and flexed:

I think it’s changed as we've gone through it and I think it’s changed for the Department; I think it’s evolving, it’s not just one static thing. It’s been really obvious that there's been a huge element of trust … each community will have their own different flavours and their own different ways of doing things and there's been a kind of willingness to go along with that. But at the same time, when we get to an edge that they’ve not been sure about – for example you're spending some money on a sculpture, who owns that sculpture, who’s responsible for it, who needs to pay the insurance for it, new things, new questions – it was a ‘solve as you go’ kind of thing. And so I think it’s been an experiment from Government to try and work differently with communities to try and trust them with money and then at the very least, even if it didn't work, to evaluate that to see if they want to repeat it or not.

This evolution has meant that the Funding Panel’s approach to certain types of projects has shifted over time. For example, Karamea’s first application for funding for a Youth Club met with “a hard no.” A year and a half later, members of the Funding Panel recommended they re-develop their application (including for a longer period, with better links to the wider Buller district) and it was approved.

The face-to-face hui with other CLDP communities were highly valued, with Zoom hui definitely considered a second-best option. Interviewees appreciated consultation for the CLDP communities who are approaching five years in the programme, describing the transition hui as “jolly”, “light” and “really lovely.”

### Alignment with CLDP principles

Interviewees felt that the five principles of community-led development did indeed underpin the Karamea project. Their community report recounts how this has grown over time:

Working with the principles of CLD, it took some time before many people realised they could become change makers in their home town. It has been important for us to get the message out that we work from ideas/dreams/needs to creation, rather than working from the ‘big pot of money’ backwards.

The Karamea experience highlights the importance of having the right team in place, and especially the right person as Partnership Manager. To bring the principles to life, a Partnership Manager or Coordinator must prioritise them, developing the community’s strengths, and avoid taking it upon themselves to do the mahi for people.

In Karamea, when someone wants CLDP funds, the Partnership Manager refers them to a briefing document that includes the principles. The principles are also on the KCI website. Nonetheless, interviewees felt that a CLD approach had grown “organically” in the town, “and probably would even without the principles being explicity written out,” and that they would work to these principles even when dealing with projects outside the CLDP.

The support and ongoing collegiality that Karamea’s Partnership Manager gives to the Blackball CLDP was considered to be an example of the principles in action, too.

## Community self-determination

The general aim of the Karamea CLDP is “to achieve an inclusive self-supporting community culture in Karamea, ensuring that no one is left out unless by personal choice. We want to be a community where all our members flourish.” Karamea’s unique environment is common ground for the community: “it’s a beautiful place and we want to protect it and make it nice.”

### Supporting self-determination

Overall, there is a strong sense that Karamea’s CLDP is self-determining. Resourcing and support from Hāpai Hapori have helped them develop initiatives based on their values and aspirations. This is despite the fact that the Karamea group does not select which projects go forward for funding by Hāpai Hapori.

The touchstone for Karamea is its Community Plan. This was developed in partnership with Inspiring Communities before joining the CLDP. It is a fluid document that is updated every year after an annual community gathering. At the gathering, people review the community plan, celebrate what’s been achieved, and discuss where they want to go. Interviewees commented that the gathering usually features some “quite robust conversations.”

The fluid nature of the plan means the Partnership Manager and the leadership team can be led by where the energy is in the community:

We've been quite reactive really, in whatever comes it’s like ‘great let’s water that’, that's where there's some energy, let’s go with that

Something bubbles up in the community and then we help them apply and we help them with whatever resources we can wrap around that to support that to grow.

The Karamea community are very proud of their Community Plan. It was submitted to the Buller District Council as part of their Long Term Plan consultation, with a request for it to be used as a resource document for Karamea projects.

At this point, however, interviewees felt they could benefit from specific support from Hāpai Hapori during the coming transition, especially connecting the Karamea CLDP with viable funding alternatives. In that regard, they have been discussing a joint governance workshop with the Community Advisor, to help build community capacity.

Interviewees spoke positively of the future. They believe that some tasks could be taken on by community volunteers, and that KCI could help projects to develop strong funding applications even when they do not have access to CLDP money any more.

They also realise it will be a challenge to maintain activity and the enabling infrastructure (administration and coordination) at the same level once funding is withdrawn.

I've got to say that one of the other concerns is that we've built some real momentum in the first four years and it will actually be a shame to have to slow it down and I can see inevitably it will slow down once the actual relationship with the Community-Led Development Programme finishes. It is a little bit of a shame.

### Funding model

As discussed above, the fundholder agreement is with Karamea Community Incorporated (KCI), which Hāpai Hapori had insisted be separated from governance of the CLDP. Funds administration appears to run smoothly. More recently, KCI has taken on a similar role for other small organisations in Karamea:

We've actually developed other roles as fundholder for other groups and not involved necessarily in Community-Led Development Programme but groups that basically need a registered charity or someone who had bank facilities to save them the cost and effort of setting up for a small project they might be running. So it’s all developed into what I consider a very, very useful committee to the district.

Unlike other community projects, Karamea does not hold a pool of discretionary project funds itself, nor does it have a formal mechanism for screening or selecting projects before they apply to Hāpai Hapori for funding. Interviewees told us that anyone can put a project forward to the Funding Panel, although they did say that projects needed to fit with the community plan. Thus, Karamea’s approach does rely on a broadly shared understanding and acceptance of the plan and CLD principles.

Interviewees seemed satisfied that funding decisions were fair and transparent. They were happy not to be making the funding decisions themselves:

It keeps personalities, community personalities, out of it completely and nobody who has an agenda can sort of sway things any way for or against, so it’s the only way it can really work successfully.

Personally, I would hate to be saying yes or no to any project, it would be very, very hard to be impartial living in the community and I think the way that has been done here has actually worked very, very well.

It’s just sort of the way it developed. I suspect in some ways we were sort of guided down this track by the Department. I don’t know if they deliberately did it but it certainly, I know when we were trying to work out how things would function, it was always a concern of mine that personally I didn't want to be seen to be basically God and saying which projects happened and which ones didn't, so yeah, when we sort of clarified things a little bit with the Department and as I say I suspect there was a little bit of a shove in the direction that we ended up going but I mean it’s working well for us anyway.

### Community capacity

Karamea’s most recent CLDP report to the community notes: “Over the past couple of years we have witnessed an amplification of Karamea’s ‘can do’ attitude which has built capacity for local leadership.”

Examples of locally-led learning opportunities that have benefited directly from the CLDP include:

* Clean Streams nursery open day
* The CLDP Partnership Manager upskilling Karamea Community Arts Council members to refine systems using Google Drive and expand volunteer involvement
* The CLDP Partnership Manager working with Development West Coast on a CoStarters Course in Karamea to support more local enterprise development

Informally, too, the model of having a Partnership Manager support community groups and individuals to develop their proposals builds capacity in the community. The Partnership Manager also supports a community member who is offering te reo conversation practice sessions from his home voluntarily.

The Partnership Manager has valued the opportunity afforded by Hāpai Hapori hui to meet other coordinators from other areas. Aside from these hui, and inviting the Karamea Partnership Manager to help with the creation of a similar position in Blackball, however, interviewees did not report Hāpai Hapori actively fostering relationships between CLDP communities.

DIA haven’t been readily sharing information between us. They’ll communicate out to all of us but it’s more anonymous kind of. They're not linking us together; we just do that ourselves.

In that regard, the Partnership Manager uses the Facebook group set up by a North Island coordinator to get advice.

## Equity and Te Tiriti

### Role of Te Tiriti

Te Tiriti is not at the forefront of day-to-day discussions, and relationships with mana whenua are not on a partnership level due to geography and resourcing (see below).

That said, interviewees were mindful of the need to foster strong relationships with iwi, with early discussion on any cultural initiative. They felt that Hāpai Hapori could help by providing communities with more resources about Te Tiriti. The CLDP has also been sponsoring te reo lessons in the community.

### Mana whenua involvement

Overall, the Karamea CLDP has a solid project-based relationship with mana whenua, particularly from the hōkioi and Clean Streams projects. There has also been some early discussion over the redevelopment of the museum.

The Hāpai Hapori Community Advisor played a key role in engaging mana whenua over the hōkioi:

So we have a life size Hōkioi, Haast Eagle, bronze sculpture that has been funded through the CLDP as the kaitiaki for our area and we have Ngāti Waewae and Ngāti Apa ki te Rā Tō who were both around the table working on what's appropriate to be included, the appropriate moko, lots of different kind of backwards and forwards in getting that cultural stuff correct. … [The Community Advisor] was more steering I suppose which was getting those two iwi around the table and working together on something that they might necessarily not usually have done and there was a bit of healing going on there, there was a bigger piece of strata over that whole thing that she really held.

The hōkioi project was an effective way for key people in the CLDP and iwi to get to know each other. Relationships are still building as a result, and the CLDP leadership is clear that it is their responsibility to reach out to iwi. The Partnership Manager now knows some people well enough to ring for advice:

I can give him a call and say hey I'm thinking about doing this Matariki thing, I'm worried about cultural appropriation, could you give me some guidance please and he’ll very happily put me in the direction of someone to speak with.

The biggest challenges with mana whenua involvement in the Karamea CLDP are distance and the many competing calls on the energy and resources of iwi/hapū. Ngāti Waewae (one of the Papatipu Rūnanga of Ngāi Tahu) is based at Arahura marae, near Hokitika, and Ngāti Apa ki te Rā Tō has its main base in Blenheim.

The CLDP would like to help connect Māori residents of Karamea with their marae, but understand that iwi must juggle many priorities. For example, the Partnership Manager saw this first-hand on one visit to the Whare Manaaki in Greymouth:

These people, with the little funding that they have, are dealing with a homeless guy who’s popping in for the foodbank, with the mum who needs to change her kids, she's home schooling, there's a gazillion other priorities that they are having to deal with before they're thinking of their most outlying community and how they could be doing some nice cultural activities with us and so it’s not that the intention’s not there, it’s just a resourcing issue.

### Other diverse communities

To date, there has been limited specific focus on other diverse communities, with everyone included in general community activities.

## Impact of CLDP in the community

It’s helped massively.

### Building relationships

The CLDP has supported relationship-building in and outside of the Karamea community.

In addition to the annual community gathering (described above), the Partnership Manager works with volunteers to hold regular pot luck dinners. The CLDP has also supported a local Harvest Feast (with food delivered to those who couldn’t attend), annual Art & Craft Exhibition, and ‘Winter School’ - a month of free, knowledge-sharing workshops run by locals for locals.

Another relationship-building example, which does not require any funding, is Karamea’s seasonal abundance share, where people share their surplus fruit and veg during peak harvest time. This operates under the CLDP banner, and helps residents come together and welcome new people in a low-key way.

As one interviewee commented, a sense of community is built from “a gazillion and one little tiny things”.

Beyond the township itself, the Karamea CLDP has a good relationship with the Blackball CLDP, especially between the two Partnership Managers. As noted above, the Community Advisor helped broker relationships with the two local iwi, and these have developed project-by-project.

### Supporting change and innovation

The CLDP has provided momentum for change in Karamea, including the following examples:

The **Clean Streams Riparian Planting nursery** has brought new jobs to the community. The nursery received small seed funding from CLDP, and was then able to attract significant support through Jobs for Nature package. It now employs four people and at the time of interviewing had 50,000 native seedlings ready to be planted.

That project limped along on kind of volunteer energy, passion for eight years or so before we were this timing where CLDP partnership was in the community and with that, with two shots of that funding, that's what that project needed. Without that, that would just never have happened.

Longer-term, the **new school hall** sets the scene for ongoing change.Joint funding between Ministry of Education, Karamea Area School and Karamea Community (through the CLDP) has made the extensions possible.

That hall, during school time will be for the school hall but for the rest of the time that is our community base so it’s a hub right in the middle. So, there's no way we would have been able to have done that without CLDP, absolutely no way.

There is an emerging opportunity for innovation in the community’s **waste management**. The resource consent for the local landfill will run out within the next ten years, so community attention is turning to alternatives.

## Learning to date

### Key learning

Community interviewees identified two key lessons from their CLDP experience to date:

1. They could not have done it without a paid partnership manager; it is too much work for a volunteer committee to do alone.

2. It has been vital to have a leadership group who work well together, and who are prepared to work within Hāpai Hapori’s rules.

### Enablers of success

The following enablers of success were identified by interviewees and have been discussed above:

* Relationships: mutual trust between the community and Hāpai Hapori
* The right people: on the committee/leadership group and as partnership manager/community coordinator
* The funding

### Challenges

As noted above, there were initial difficulties between the committee and Hāpai Hapori, which were resolved by the split between KCI as fundholder and the Karamea CLDP Partnership Group, along with some changes of personnel at governance level. Since that time, however, Hāpai Hapori has accepted other community projects where a community charitable trust provides both fundholding and governance, so it is not clear whether these issues would arise to the same extent now.

More broadly, there is some disappointment at the extent of Hāpai Hapori’s reach and influence as part of DIA. For Karamea, the situation was best expressed as follows:

They say it’s a complete partnership and so we've tried to ask for, apart from the money, what else is there that you're bringing? … have you got some friends in high places who might give us resources, or other projects that are doing similar things that could mentor us? there's other ways that they could offer things, and in theory and in conversations face-to-face at hui, that's all been great, but in practice really the help has been the money.

We see this in several communities involved in the CLDP, though rarely expressed as succinctly.

An interviewee gave the example of Karamea’s Clean Streams project. Here there’s a sense that Hāpai Hapori is perhaps not sufficiently well-connected at a high level and/or its Community Advisors are not able to tap into the appropriate people higher up:

there's riparian planting nursery with multiple funding streams and we asked [the Community Advisor] if she could use her clout within Government to link in with even knowing what other funds are out there, because a lot of them aren’t public funds but there's money there, and also looking at other projects in a similar vein in different geographical locations and maybe we could partner. And that has been an idea she supports but hasn’t got the resources herself to be able to do that as a community advisor, and they like that idea but the mechanism within the system for that to happen is not yet set up.

Nonetheless, interviewees were cautiously optimistic that Hāpai Hapori could broker an interdepartmental arrangement to assist with the Karamea Museum renewal:

It’s probably still in its infancy, this sort of interdepartmental cooperation and … the mechanisms aren’t quite there yet but I think it is getting there and hopefully we’ll get to experience that before our contract’s over.

### Local factors influencing CLDP impact

Lack of mana whenua presence in the town means that these relationships need to be nurtured at a distance. They also need to be built with two different iwi, so there are more people to get to know and more history to learn. For the hōkioi project, the Community Advisor brokered the consultation and was able to get both iwi around the table. This gave the Partnership Manager a chance to listen and build her understanding.

### Improvements to CLDP

The following suggestions for how Hāpai Hapori could improve the programme were offered during the interviews:

* Develop a welcome pack for new communities. Resources could include: what good governance looks like, information on Te Tiriti, the basics of project evaluaton (including templates), and “where to go for this and that” (including what is offered by external organisations such as Inspiring Communities and Exult).
* Help build governance capability.
* Provide more support for connecting CLDP communities with other government agencies and external organisations.
* Facilitate better collaboration and learning between the CLDP communities.

## Reflections from the Karamea experience

Some insights with wider ramifications for CLDP across Aotearoa:

* The value of an effective partnership manager/coordinator cannot be overstated
* Hapai Hāpori’s leverage with other government agencies appears limited at present
* There are opportunities for Hapai Hāpori to help CLDP communities learn from each other more
* Mana whenua can only do so much with the resources at their disposal, and an outlying CLDP will not necessarily be top priority
* Community Advisors can play a vital role in connecting a predominantly Pākehā community with mana whenua on projects of mutual interest
* CLDP money can be highly effective as seed funding and/or to extend the impact of other government spending (e.g., Ministry of Education)

# Blackball

Region: West Coast, South Island

Year joined CLDP: 2017

Community vision: Our future is in our past

This summary is based on interviews with community members and the lead advisor, conducted in August to October 2021, along with analysis of background documentation.

## Blackball community

Blackball is a former coal mining town, just over 20 minutes’ drive from Greymouth, with a population of about 300. It is generally considered the birthplace of the New Zealand Labour Party. Over time, Blackball has experienced waves of new arrivals, and earnt a reputation as ‘the town that never dies’. Today there are new ventures in environmental and heritage tourism on its doorstep.

### History of the project

The Blackball CLDP Partnership Agreement was signed on 14 December 2017. The first two years were particularly challenging, with issues on both the DIA and community side, so there is a sense in which Blackball is still playing catch-up even though the community is now (2022) in the final year of its CLDP with Hāpai Hapori.

An updated agreement was signed on 9 September 2019 after it was decided that the CLDP needed a new fundholder. The Community Advisor from Hāpai Hapori’s Greymouth Office and Blackball’s CLDP Partnership Manager had been involved in the CLDP for about one year at the time of this report.

### Leadership and governance

Leadership issues were a major reason for the turbulent start to this CLDP, with the first Hāpai Hapori Advisor on one side of a community rift, prompting disgruntlement and disengagement by some residents.

Over a two-year period, new processes and an agreed community plan were developed. Now a project application will go to a steering group of interested community members, then out for community consultation, then back to the steering group for further consideration before it is put forward to the Hāpai Hapori Funding Panel. This process scrutinises proposals especially for whether they meet one or more of the priorities in the community plan, and comply with as many of the CLD principles as possible.

The community plan was initiated through a workshop run by Inspiring Communities, then pulled together by the Community Advisor, and since twice refined by the Partnership Manager via community engagement. Refinements have whittled down the ideas in light of the limited time left to run on the CLDP.

The steering group comprises ten members, three of whom are representatives of the original fundholder, the Blackball Residents Association Trust Society.

There are really strong members on the Steering Group that are really good communicators and really good to speak and sit down with Council. There's local business owners, there’s staff from MSD on the Steering Committee, there's local artists, there’s a really wide range of people and personalities there. There's people that have just arrived in town versus people that have been there forever.

### Project implementation

The Blackball CLDP contracts the Partnership Manager to coordinate activities. The position was modelled on a similar role in Karamea. He works to link people together, identify opportunities, showcase the CLDP projects to stakeholders, and trouble-shoots issues as they arise.

Activities undertaken, or about to start, through the CLDP include the following:

* Community Centre renovations – work done by contractors and community working bees. The intention is that the facilities can be hired out for functions, and be used for community activities such as exercise classes.
* Beautification project – purchased two ride-on lawnmowers to extend the maintenance of town grounds beyond what the council currently does (“people were using their own … mowers to complete the work and keep the place tidy”).
* Reinstatement of a historic cableway tower, with interpretation panels explaining the old aerial coal cart cableway system.
* Local park upgrade – CLDP funds were leveraged with most of the money coming from MBIE’s Tourism Infrastructure Fund.
* Conservation Plan and Archaeological Assessment for a suite of sites around Blackball – this was identified by the CLDP as the missing link in the process to create or re-open walking trails around Blackball, working with DOC.
* Visual town plan – CLDP funding for landscape architects to put together a visualisation of future Blackball, including visual concept plans for 12 key projects, to be used for community and stakeholder engagement.
* Pump/mountain bike track for local children out the back of the school.

## Relationship with Hāpai Hapori

Overall, the Hāpai Hapori Community Advisor and the Partnership Manager speak highly of each other. The Advisor is readily available to talk things through, and the Partnership Manager feels well supported.

### Contribution of Hāpai Hapori to project

After initial issues during the period of the first Hāpai Hapori Advisor, relationships have improved. In particular, the Advisor helps link the Partnership Manager with key agencies and potential funding sources (e.g., the Ministry of Culture and Heritage for an upgrade of Blackball’s outdoor museum). Communication is reported as “really open, honest.”

### Alignment with CLDP principles

The five principles of community-led development are often brought up in discussion with residents. They form the basis for the community plan and are written into the Partnership Manager’s job description.

The Partnership Manager uses the CLDP principles as a lens to see if projects fit the CLDP and the wider community plan, and if they do, he will help move these ideas forward:

When he talks to people, he gives them the nine priorities that the Blackball community have decided on and then the five principles and he says … you need to cover off how [your idea for a project] meets one or more of these things and with the nine priorities, it only needs to meet one of them but with the five principles we like to see it matching the majority of them.

## Community self-determination

### Supporting self-determination

The Community Advisor clearly articulated what, in her view, makes an initiative community-led and a good candidate for funding support, as follows

* The project is “widely wanted” by the community
* The project is “of great benefit to the wider community”
* There is a community project group, and ideally a project manager
* The community does work on the project, contributing “time and effort towards making it happen”

The CLDP has encouraged Blackball residents to seek broad support for ideas. This is challenging for some people who have tightly held influence in the past.

Even to this day people in the community still think they need to go to this one person with their idea to get it past them

This renewed emphasis on the community plan as the basis of decision-making encourages residents to focus on the CLD principles. The Partnership Manager has worked hard on improved communication of the plan:

I found the plan at the very beginning to be a document that nobody knew about, nobody understood apart from the Steering Group. And it seemed to be a document that kind of had to exist because someone had said that it had to exist. … They had Inspiring Communities come to town, they had some really good workshops, they had really good attendance at the workshops, there was a lot of good dialogue and the community plan went through two major iterations before the one that I inherited. So the process and the methodology was really strong but the delivery was weak.

The community is also trying different methods to identify whether there is broad-based support for a proposal, and to get buy-in. These include canvassing online via Google Forms, putting information in local gathering spots with the option to add your signature to show support, and taking a show of hands at community meetings (with photographs of the results).

The Hāpai Hapori Advisor and the Partnership Manager both put considerable store on strong community involvement, which is consistent with the CLD principles. This is intertwined with efforts to build community capability, discussed below. The Partnership Manager sees himself as a support person, not a project manager:

It’s not about me doing all the work for them, it’s not about me writing their applications or writing their business plans or their project plans, developing their teams. I'm not their project manager; I'm there to assist them in guiding them to put them in touch with the right people or the right information … what I'm finding we're often talking about their vision and talking about how it’s got to fit with the community plan

This approach is made more urgent by the fact that the CLDP will end in one year, and the community may have to rely on their own knowledge, skills, and commitment to maintain momentum after that.

### Funding model

Since late 2019, Blackball’s fundholder agreement has been with Development West Coast. The fundholder receives the grant funding, pays it out on invoice subject to approval by the Steering Group, and handles all financial reporting.

Blackball had some issues with their initial fundholder, the local residents association. The fundholder was proactively directing money to what it saw as areas of need in the town. While understandable, this was contrary to the CLD principles (notably shared local vision, many people and groups working together, and diverse and collaborative local leadership). Given Blackball’s small size, it was unrealistic for Hāpai Hapori to expect the residents association to act as a neutral fundholder.

There were also problems with obtaining regular financial reports – again suggesting that it may have been better to select a third party fundholder whose primary or sole interest was in providing finance and HR services.

With regard to the deliberations of the Funding Panel, there was a sense from interviewees that the committee is not always consistent in its focus or concerns (these may be shifting as money becomes tighter), and it can be hard to second-guess the committee’s rationale:

I think sometimes you do find each time there's like different questions they're asking.

This suggests the need for better communication and/or guidelines from the Panel.

### Community capacity

that's something that we are continually trying to do is build capacity because after CLDP you hope that … processes can still continue.

There is evidence of community capacity-building as a natural result of how the CLDP operates rather than via formal training courses.

The learning opportunities range in size and scale, for example:

* Residents are expected to take minutes of meetings, rather than relying on the Community Advisor or Partnership Manager to do this for them.
* The Partnership Manager is identifying less forthright residents (who would previously have been overshadowed by other well-meaning individuals) and encouraging them to lead own projects. For instance, he supported the proponent of the cableway tower reinstatement project to make a compelling PowerPoint presentation in a community meeting and then to the district council.
* The CLDP is demonstrating the value of talking to sympathetic professionals early on in the piece, which is new to many in a town that has had to be very self-reliant. For example, the Partnership Manager organised a landscape architect to come up to Blackball for a day:

people could actually speak to a professional architect and get an idea about what they actually needed to fundamentally do to make this thing happen when it came to consents, when it came to regulations because people were saying I want to do this or I want to build that and she’d be like you can’t do that. I’m going to tell you now the moment you say that to Council they’re going to want this, they're going to want that, … it’s going to cost you $200,000 and they’re going we don’t want to spend $200,000, then don’t do it like that, do it like this and they'd go oh wow.

* The community has identified the importance of involving young people, such as through the school pump track project:

The young people get wrapped up in the process and that's a legacy thing too, to understand that it takes a community to make a community.

## Equity and Te Tiriti

### Role of Te Tiriti

Te Tiriti does not appear to be top of mind in this CLDP, although there have been discussions of bilingual signage to the town.

### Mana whenua involvement

The Ngāi Tahu Papatipu Rūnanga in this part of the West Coast is Te Rūnanga o Ngāti Waewae, who are based at Arahura marae near Reefton.

Ngāti Waewae are not sitting at the table as a partner in the CLDP, but are kept informed on a project-by-project basis. Interviewees reported that mana whenua did not want an active role:

The reality is, yes, we're speaking to them, we're telling them what's going on, they're not really feeding back. … they're not really that bothered by what's going on in Blackball because it was kind of like this European mining town that became, grew out of something because there was coal there: they weren't involved in coal, they weren’t interested in coal, it wasn’t a hunting ground, it wasn’t a village and all of that. So, the projects are letting them (the local iwi) know what's happening but the local iwi aren't sort of sitting at the table saying this must happen and that must happen, we want to be involved. They're more sitting in the backseat going thanks for letting us know.

The Partnership Manager reports that co-funders, such as the Department of Conservation, will enquire about the CLDP’s relationship with iwi.

The Community Advisor has received helpful advice about appropriate process from her Hāpai Hapori colleague who whakapapa to Ngāti Waewae.

### Other diverse communities

This does not appear to have emerged as much of a consideration to date.

## Impact of CLDP in the community

We’re finally getting there …, [we’ve got] the good people that are on the Steering Group and then with [the partnership manager] we are finally getting some traction and we’re finally starting to have those good outcomes achieved

### Building relationships

CLDP funding for the Partnership Manager has ensured there is now someone whose role is to strengthen relationships in the community. He has facilitated new relationships, helped mend broken ones, and supported the maintenance of existing ones.

Basically how I work is I've got my office and everything down here in town in Greymouth and I go into Blackball for a lot of meetings I have at the Community Centre there with an office I utilise when I go to town to hold my meetings. Some of my meetings are held at that Community Centre and others might be out on location and that could be at a local park, at the school, it could be at a person’s kitchen table, it ranges.

Coordination is improving with key stakeholders, and receiving a positive response. A regular meeting has been reinstated with the Department of Conservation, and the Partnership Manager is attempting to streamline communication with the Grey District Council:

What I'd found was Council were getting really tired of getting phone calls from the various people around Blackball and they were always going who the hell is this and what the hell are they ringing me for, and I was trying to work out a coordination structure with them to not have everyone bombarding Council saying “I need you to come and talk to me, I've got a project or whatever,” I was saying “Just talk to them once and let’s get them to come out and look at all the projects on one day.”

This approach has resulted, for example, in Council support for the Blackball History Group’s aerial cableway project, where principal funding has been from CLDP.

### Supporting change and innovation

With the limited time left in the CLDP, the Community Advisor and Partnership Manager are working with the community to ensure, as far as possible, that projects can be seen through to completion.

Change is happening in Blackball regardless of the CLDP, with an influx of new/returning residents attracted by the town’s affordable housing, natural beauty, recreational opportunities and unique heritage. There has also been other central government investment in the environs, especially the new Paparoa Track. Some recent arrivals are involved in the CLDP, such as through a community organic waste initiative, and writing interpretation panels.

## Learning to date

### Key learning

Having the right coordinator/partnership manager(s) on board can give a community impetus. The importance of clear communication and being strong in documenting (e.g., writing good minutes) activities along the way was also noted.

### Enablers of success

The following enablers of success can be seen in the Blackball case:

* A strong relationship between the Hāpai Hapori Advisor and the Partnership Manager on the ground.
* The skills, attributes and experience of the Partnership Manager, including his commitment to educating, guiding, and connecting residents with stakeholders and supportive professionals.
* The ability of the Partnership Manager to listen to all sides and mediate in conflict situations.
* Continued community engagement on the CLDP, reiterating the nature of the work, community-led processes and principles.

### Challenges

The following challenges are evident in Blackball:

* Community members who want to solve things themselves and hold ownership themselves, rather than working in an inclusive way; resistance to having to take ideas through a Steering Group; and, conversely, a tendency to assume that the Steering Group, Community Advisor, and/or the Partnership Manager will do all the work. These are common issues that highlight the need to keep engaging the community about the nature of CLD.
* Vagueness from Hāpai Hapori about how much money is available has made it tricky for communities to determine the realistic scale for projects. Communities do not necessarily have their top priority project ready first, then their second priority, and so on – especially given the usefulness of getting some quick wins upfront. As the Partnership Manager in Blackball put it:

One of the things that I've found is a challenge is the question around how much is it. If they could actually answer that it would be much easier. If I could say to the people of Blackball “You've got 500 grand or 600 grand over X amount of years or whatever,” that would be easier to divvy up, it would be easier to work out which are the most important versus least important projects, which are on the list and which are off the list.

* The time-limited funding fuelled some community resistance to the community planning process in 2020. There was a sense that time was ticking away, and people just wanted to get on with stuff rather than come together to agree priorities.

### Local factors influencing CLDP impact

* Lack of mana whenua presence in the community. Blackball was a European settlement, and its history is very much that of the Pākehā labour movement. Ngāi Tahu suffered early, rapid loss of land and language under colonisation, and throughout the iwi’s takiwā, mana whenua are stretched thin.
* Lack of mana whenua involvement, and Māori generally. The other Greymouth-based Hapai Hāpori Community Advisor is mana whenua and has been a sounding board on process.
* Individuals in the community not buying into the community-led aspect
* In Blackball’s case, it appears to have been an advantage to hire a Partnership Manager who does not live in the town. He can separate himself, and the CLDP, from conflicts between residents.

### Improvements to CLDP

Interviewees offered few concrete suggestions for improvement. The opportunity to connect with other CLDP communities is highly valued, and even Zoom meetings were considered better than nothing. This is one area where Hāpai Hapori could be more proactive:

I know there's a hui coming up in March but it would be really nice if there was other networking events that were developed by CLDP and not by us as individuals

There was some concern expressed that the selection of communities for CLDP is not reflecting their levels of deprivation. On the West Coast, an example given was Franz Josef where “everything’s completely fallen apart since COVID.” Despite this, it was felt that the amount of money a community now gets from the CLDP can be a game changer so funds should not be spread too thin.

## Reflections from the Blackball experience

Some insights with wider ramifications for CLDP across Aotearoa:

* In Blackball, a high energy individual (the Partnership Manager) appears to be pivotal to getting projects off the ground. It remains to be seen how momentum will be maintained over the long-term in community projects that hinge strongly around a charismatic personality.
* Where community projects do not get off to a great start, the standard five-year limit means that communities end up with less time to plan their transition out of the programme.
* In small towns, it is unreasonable to assume a community group or residents association can act as a neutral fundholding service provider. There are two options: either Hāpai Hapori shifts away from the fundholder model, or it finds third party providers whose only interest in the CLDP is to provide financial and HR services.
* Hāpai Hapori may need to look at how it mitigates the risk of Community Advisors getting too close to one faction in a community, and protect staff in the midst of community conflict.

# Otematata – Waitaki

Region: Otago – Waitaki District

Year joined CLDP: 2019

Community vision: “To develop collaborative partnerships that will enable the creation and implementation of a strategic plan that is representative of the wider community, reflects our cultural heritage, respects our environment, allows for positive and structured growth and allows those who pass through or stay the opportunity to be part of this unique place.”

This summary is based on interviews with community members and Hāpai Hapori staff, conducted in August to October 2021, along with analysis of background documentation.

## Otematata community

Otematata is in a beautiful location with popular fishing and camping spots along the nearby hydro-lakes. State Highway 83 and the Alps to Ocean cycle trail both run through the village.

The shrink-swell of a tiny tourist town creates a distinctive community dynamic: there are about 230 permanent residents, but during the Summer peak Otematata’s population of the area (village and nearby campgrounds) is about 7000.

### History of the project

The prospect of the CLDP was raised by a member of the Otematata Residents’ Association, and was then explored jointly by the association and Hāpai Hapori.

The Otematata CLDP Partnership Agreement was signed on 16 November 2019.

### Leadership and governance

Governance is provided by the Otematata Residents’ Association committee of 14 elected community members. A working group drives the detailed implementation of the community plan, and is formally a sub-committee of the association.

### Project implementation

Otematata CLDP does not have an employed project manager or coordinator, however it does have a volunteer coordinator leading the CLDP Working group. Other members of the group then lead specific projects. Community stakeholders reflected that this provides strong collaborative leadership and appropriate accountability.

Activities undertaken through the CLDP to date include the following:

* Community surveys and planning
* Purchase of AV equipment to enhance presentation capabilities (Community Hall)
* Landscaping for community park development
* Planning of three main projects: the development of a community park; development in and around the Otematata wetland; and town beautification
* Enhanced communications to allow transparency

## Relationship with Hāpai Hapori

Overall, community stakeholders describe the relationship with Hāpai Hapori as strong, supportive and helpful.

I think it’s just been a really strong respectful relationship right from the start and that continues right through to this point.

### Contribution of Hāpai Hapori to project

Interviewees noted the following contributions of Hāpai Hapori to the project:

* A consistent presence: a community adviser attends working group meetings.
* Advice: the lead adviser was described as “a wee quiet wonder of wisdom,” particularly in how to put together successful funding applications.
* Supporting the working group publicly: for example, talking at community meetings about the CLDP’s progress was highly valued by interviewees.
* Funding: although this community’s substantial funding needs are in the future.

### Alignment with CLDP principles

The five principles of community-led development were seen to be deeply embedded in the Otematata CLDP and guided activity to the point where it “would’ve failed by now if all those things weren’t gelling into place.”

## Community self-determination

The Otematata CLDP leadership group has spent much of the past two years identifying what the community wants, and getting feedback on specific plans.

### Supporting self-determination

One interviewee suggested that achieving self-determination requires local leaders to “have that mindset” already, but Hāpai Hapori through the CLDP can create a “snowball effect” where initial success encourages more community members to invest their time and energy.

I think it’s a supporting mechanism for that through funding, through relationships and brokering and connecting … communities that are capable of self determination will achieve that without CLDP but CLDP provides them some additional resource to kind of achieve that.

Although the Otematata CLDP is only two years old, interviewees recognise the need to start talking about how to sustain development as people move on or change.

The leadership group are trying to keep abreast of other initiatives in the district, with a view to Otematata capturing some economic benefit from wider initiatives such as the Alps 2 Ocean cycle trail (now at 16,000 users per annum) and the Waitaki District Council’s geopark concept. Otematata’s wetlands project was mentioned as having educational and tourism potential.

### Funding model

For the Otematata CLDP, the community partner is the Otematata Residents Association, which is also the fundholder. A sub-committee of the association acts as the leadership group for the CLDP.

### Community capacity

The main instance of capacity building noted so far is the development of leadership skills, with interviewees remarking that some community members are now showing much better understanding of community-led development processes and principles.

Interviewees found the national hui of communities involved in CLDP extremely valuable and lamented the lack of opportunities for face-to-face contact with other groups due to the Covid-19 pandemic.

## Equity and Te Tiriti

### Role of Te Tiriti

There is a general feeling that Te Tiriti, or what were described as “the principles of the Treaty,” play an important but underlying role in the CLDP.

As the experience with mana whenua in this case suggests (see below), there are questions about the design of the programme as a whole, which is beyond the community at Otematata to address.

I think it’s been considered at quite a surface level and considered in such a way that it’s about, like what it is now, about connecting. … In developing the programme itself right at the outset, that’s where the Te Tiriti should’ve been considered

### Mana whenua involvement

The Otematata CLDP was established without mana whenua involvement, and engagement remains limited. Hāpai Hapori then tried to broker a relationship between Otematata and mana whenua based at Moeraki. Mana whenua did not regard that approach as an appropriate expression of Treaty partnership:

The initial response from Moeraki was ‘we are partners with the Crown, not with the community’ so their sense was that actually it should’ve been the department that was working with Moeraki instead of trying to get the community to work with Moeraki

Since then, Te Rūnanga o Moeraki representatives have visited Otematata CLDP and expressed their support. The Otematata working group keeps in touch by sharing documents and inviting mana whenua to presentations. It too sees the Department of Internal Affairs as the primary relationship-holder with Ngāi Tahu papatipu rūnaka.

### Other diverse communities

Otematata has worked hard to get high response rates to its community surveys in an attempt to capture the full range of community perspectives.

Interviewees suggested that Hāpai Hapori is not proactive in helping communities achieve diverse representation, instead leaving communities to work it out for themselves:

I don’t think there’s any kind of structured component of the programme that actively supports that or actively requires that. I guess it’s just a kind of expectation

## Impact of CLDP in the community

Two years in to the CLDP, the focus of activity so far has been on planning and community engagement, but there are some early indicators of impact in Otematata.

### Building relationships

Participation in the CLDP has cemented relationships within the community that interviewees report were already strong, built on shared values:

We have a governance meeting one month and then a fortnight later, we have a working group meeting so we’re having a lot of meetings but those meetings are always filled with open communication but they’re always grounded on a huge foundation of respect so there is no animosity, you know the initial values are strong within those meetings and as a result of it, we’ve got a really strong group of people, respectful group who work well as a group and I’m sure a lot of CLDP groups would be the same but I think that that must be something that would stand Otematata out.

### Supporting change and innovation

For Otematata, the direction of change is set by community engagement and reflected in the community surveys, which in itself is a new experience for the working group:

We feel that we’re a long way down the track in terms of making the changes that the very vast majority of people have wanted. In the last survey that we conducted here, we actually had over 6,000 points of contact within that survey that we were working through.

It is still early days, but interviewees report growing excitement in the community about plans for the new community park now that the designs have been presented.

Once it starts to be delivered, then that’s when we’ll start to see that kind of momentum and the belief that actually oh ok, we can really do some stuff with this partnership.

The CLDP has also enabled the residents association to update its health and safety processes.

## Learning to date

### Key learning

At this early stage, Otematata CLDP appears to be illustrating the value of the community leadership setting a firm foundation (in financial management, reporting, consultation and planning), with Hāpai Hapori maintaining a quiet presence.

### Enablers of success

The following were identified as enablers of success:

* Strong, cohesive leadership, within both the governance and the working groups.
* Clear processes and lack of problems with fundholding.
* Community advisors who are available to be a sounding-board on funding proposals.
* Good communication with Hāpai Hapori.
* Money: for example, the working group chose to hire the same landscape and urban architectural firm that were consulting to the Waitaki District Council so that the development in Otematata meshes well with the district plans – an astute move made possible by the CLDP funding.

### Challenges

Community input is highly valued by the group shown by the significant attempts to meet the needs of the community. For those leading the CLDP in Otematata, the biggest challenge has been adapting their plans in response to community feedback, e.g., lack of enthusiasm for a proposal for the rugby fields.

Given the preponderance of holiday home owners, considerable effort has been required to engage across the community, including newcomers and those who typically don’t engage.

An emerging challenge for Otematata is to find all the funding for their main projects given the CLDP funds are now fully allocated across the country. The working group has identified some potential co-funders with connections to the community.

It was noted by the advisor that a lack of back-up support from others within DIA, and lack of central resource material for advisors to draw on, means the community can only draw on the particular knowledge and networks of one or two individuals rather than an entire government department.

### Local factors influencing CLDP impact

Otematata is drawing on its strengths, including:

* Community members have relevant professional skills and experience. Those with business/financial experience have helped set up the CLDP structures, and others are brought into relevant projects, e.g., a landscape architect is involved in the wetland.
* The prior existence of the Otematata Residents’ Association as a legal entity with which Hāpai Hapori was willing to partner has enabled them to be their own fundholder.

The most significant drawback for Otematata is that there was no pre-existing relationship between the association and mana whenua. Te Rūnanga o Moeraki is based at Moeraki Marae, which is about 1 hour 40 minutes’ drive from Otematata. Community members reflected that CLDP has created an opportunity to further build a relationship with mana whenua. There is already respect and a mutual understanding between the two.

### Improvements to CLDP

The experience of those involved with the Otematata CLDP has been strongly positive so far:

We really can’t speak highly enough of what Department of Internal Affairs are doing

Despite occasional frustration with the length of time it takes to consult the community, the general sense is that is a useful learning experience and the CLDP scheme is working well for them.

The following suggestions were offered:

* Provide advisors with a central repository of resources that are commonly needed for communities in CLDP.
* Build understanding of and support for CLDP in other parts of DIA and in other relevant government departments (e.g., Ministry of Social Development), to help communities can access the other advice, services and funding available.

## Reflections from the Otematata experience

Some insights with wider ramifications for CLDP across Aotearoa:

* The value of engaging with those people in a wider community who are not normally consulted (in this case, regular holiday-makers who are not permanent residents).
* The challenge of mana whenua that their Treaty partnership is with the Crown, so they would expect Hāpai Hapori to be engaging directly with them. The community partner in this CLDP also appears to expect that Hāpai Hapori and the wider DIA already have strong relationships with mana whenua.
* Here a community partner is also the fundholder, and no significant issues have arisen to date.
* It is possible, at least initially, to use CLDP funds to hire expert consultants and contractors but not to employ an ongoing coordinator. In this case, the community leadership has substantial experience in business, and is well-versed in managing contractors. Project managers with specific expertise will be employed as required.

# Waimate2gether

Region: South Canterbury

Year joined CLDP: 2018

Community vision: Proudly Waimate – Taking the good of the past into the best of the future.

Current situation: Over halfway through the planned time in programme.

This summary is based on interviews with community members and the lead advisor, conducted in August to October 2021, along with analysis of background documentation.

## Waimate community

Waimate is an inland rural town in South Canterbury. It has a population of just over 3,500 and about 170 voluntary community groups. The town is the centre of the Waimate District, and the base for the Waimate District Council. Waihou marae is at Morven, 10-15 minutes’ drive from Waimate township.

### History of the project

The community advisor who got this particular CLDP agreement across the line, worked as the lead advisor from 3 October 2018 until 31 October 2020, but had worked for the Department of Internal Affairs in the region for over five years prior to the CLDP. Of the community’s leadership group, there is one member who was involved in initiating the project.

The Waimate2gether CLDP Partnership Agreement was signed on 3 October 2018.

### Leadership and governance

Waimate2gether has a leadership committee of seven volunteers, five of which are individuals, one position is a school position that rotates through the school principals, and one position is for a representative from the Marae. Committee members were selected after an application and interview process for which there was strong interest (ratio of applications to positions available was 3:1). The Chair has about 30 years of governance experience.

The committee meets monthly, and the Hāpai Hapori Community Adviser attends.

An iwi representative attends parts of committee meetings where possible and has a regular informal meeting with the Chair and a Project Manager.

Local school leaders also act as informal champions of the CLDP.

Waimate2gether developed a pragmatic approach to planning and prioritising proposed actions, considering (a). whether the project was do-able, (b). whether it could be achieved within the 4-5 years of the CLDP, and (c). what had the most community support. They took this whittled-down list back to the community to check its acceptance before getting to work.

### Project implementation

The project staff comprise two project managers, one operational site manager (reflecting the strong infrastructure focus of this CLDP) and a paid secretary. All staff are self-employed contractors.

Activities undertaken through the project to date include the following:

* Community consultations
* Informative website
* Disc golf – initially created a 9-hole short course, plus education programmes for school pupils and adults, and now planning a longer course
* Major upgrade of the white horse monument and its surrounds, including scrub clearing, native planting, better drainage, new toilets, new viewing platform, security cameras, and interpretation panels
* Planning of walking and cycling trails
* Creation of an art trail
* Creation of a heritage trail
* Street parties and other smaller community events
* Garden competition that runs three times per year
* Assistance with bushtown day once per year
* Supporting youth activities through scouts and establishing/ working with a local student volunteer "army"
* Volunteer acknowledgement with a paid reporter covering volunteer work
* Coordinating all the volunteer groups for signage for the Whitehorse walkway
* Art trail and heritage trail booklets that are free and are given away in shops
* Created a free issue outlining the working group and the volunteer groups that was distributed out to the community

## Relationship with Hāpai Hapori

Overall, the Waimate2gether group feels it has a good relationship with Hāpai Hapori, although there has been high turnover of community advisers (three in three years). While the first lead advisor covered the first two years of the CLDP, until October 2020, she has remained mentoring and supporting the two subsequent lead advisors, and has reviewed subsequent funding requests, that required contact with the community. This relationship has proven to be of great value and helped to minimise disruption with changing advisors.

In the main, the relationship appears to be mutually supportive.

### Contribution of Hāpai Hapori to project

Interviewees noted the following contributions of Hāpai Hapori to the project:

**Funding** – Waimate2gether focused on getting fast tangible results to build the community’s confidence in working together. The fact that the CLDP could access funds for coordination and projects meant they had completed their first main project – the disc golf course – within nine months.

**Five-year commitment** – interviewees felt that the CLDP was a step forward from disconnected project-by-project funding, particularly because it gives time and opportunity for the large number of volunteer organisations in Waimate to come together and build relationships.

**A consistent presence** – the lead adviser attends monthly committee meetings and “walks alongside them” providing advice about the implications of decisions. The high turnover of advisors has been a drawback:

Three advisors in three years, I mean they’ve got, you know, they’ve got their challenges really for building credibility amongst the community

### Alignment with CLDP principles

The five principles of community-led development were seen to guide the overall direction and project activities and were “very much what we do.” The principle of using existing strengths particularly strikes a chord as Waimate2gether does not see itself trying to fix any community problems.

It’s much better to actually build on other people’s strengths and actually enable [them] to do the stuff that they need to do.

## Community self-determination

Waimate2gether is very conscious of its limited lifespan, and explicitly consider the long-term viability of any initiative and new infrastructure they create (e.g., maintenance costs and responsibilities).

We’re very aware that the money’s gonna go and when we stop we stop.

I think one of the great things that they’ve done though is that every time they’ve discussed a particular initiative, they’ve talked about an exit strategy so where can it kind of sit once the project has finished so I really like that in their conversations. They’re thinking about not only the here and the now, in terms of getting it together, but how it could be sustained in the future.

### Supporting self-determination

Hāpai Hapori has supported community self-determination in this CLDP via the basic structure and shape of the programme nationally. In particular the sizeable operational and project funds available, plus a commitment to funding over five years, has enabled the community to tackle ambitious projects. The scale of a project such as the White Horse necessarily brings together many different groups, who have got to know each other by working on a shared goal. People are coming out of the “siloes” noted by interviewees. Strong local relationships will be the key to sustaining momentum once the CLDP finishes.

Hāpai Hapori agreed to a case for a flexible funding allocation of up to $20k for small events, e.g., sausage sizzles that double as community consultations. This means the committee can reach a wider range of community members and get better community input into priority-setting.

The Community Advisors working with Waimate2gether see themselves in an enabling role:

One of the things that we bring is that objectivity and it’s about how we walk alongside, not us telling them what they should be doing but giving that advice when they need it or just saying things like perhaps you need to consider this and that

### Funding model

The fundholder agreement is with a local provider, Community Link and was voted in by the community at a meeting prior to the CLDP commencing. The fundholder had an excellent grant history with Hāpai Hapori and had demonstrated that it had robust internal financial management and control systems.

There have however been tensions, which some interviewees put down to insufficient communication between the committee and fundholder, while others said was about service levels, especially tardy financial reporting.

Here Waimate2gether differs from some other CLDP communities: it has access to extensive financial management and business experience within its leadership committee, whereas other groups either are learning from scratch or do not have time to deal with financial reporting and HR matters.

Waimate2gether uses contract staff. It was commented that expecting a fundholder to be the official employer of CLDP staff without any oversight of their day-to-day work would be unreasonable.

### Community capacity

One distinctive feature of Waimate2gether is the way it has forged strong relationships with schools. For the White Horse project, for instance, schools are making permanent artworks for the site. The CLDP also has a volunteer programme for school pupils, which is seen as a way of fostering future leaders.

There were favourable comments about the training and development opportunities provided by Hāpai Hapori, such as the conference of CLDP communities, and an appetite for more.

## Equity and Te Tiriti

### Role of Te Tiriti

Te Tiriti is not an explicit part of the operation of Waimate2gether, and the CLDP was not set up as a partnership with mana whenua (see below), but Te Tiriti is acknowledged as important.

### Mana whenua involvement

The Waimate2gether experience is a classic example of Pākehā community leaders learning to operate with open-heartedness in the unsatisfactory space where mana whenua did not initiate the CLDP arrangements and are limited in their capacity to give time to it.

There are only so many hours in the day, and mana whenua in the district are stretched thin by ‘consultation’ on top of their professional work, whānau, marae/runanga and other community commitments.

Waimate2gether has learnt along the way:

Initially it was pretty tough. Like we did the typical Pakeha thing of just sending out an invitation, why aren’t they coming. That never worked.

Waimate2gether’s solution is to respect mana whenua’s reluctance to be a “figurehead”, and enable them to choose their level of involvement in what is fundamentally a Tikanga Pākehā endeavour. The Chair meets informally with an iwi representative on a regular basis. In the monthly committee meetings, agenda items of most interest to mana whenua are programmed for time slots when an iwi representative is more likely to be available; they can turn up to contribute without any obligation to stay for the entire meeting.

The leadership recognises that a single iwi representative cannot embody the views of everyone.

Local Iwi here themselves have got their own challenges as well like we all have and so you’re never gonna get one voice and that’s something you’ve gotta realise straight away. It’s just like trying to get one voice out of all of us, you know, we’ve always got different opinions and that is true for our local Iwi.

### Other diverse communities

Maata waka are involved as individual volunteers or through community groups and schools working on projects.

## Impact of CLDP in the community

Waimate2gether is very focused on achieving tangible outcomes to build community self-confidence. It hopes to stimulate stronger local leadership by getting community groups working together on big projects that mean something to the town. That sustainable local leadership would be its most important lasting contribution to Waimate:

Once you build those sort of working relationships between all the groups, we don’t have to be involved anymore

### Building relationships

Stronger community connection was identified as a significant result of the CLDP to date:

We’ve been the catalyst to a whole lot of those relationships within the community so we’re quite proud of that

Interviewees identified two main ways in which the CLDP is strengthening relationships in the community:

1. Active participation in projects:

The White Horse project, for example, includes Lions, Rotary, Scouts, iwi and the local schools, amongst others. An early meeting of users of the hill attracted about 50 people.

We have grabbed some of those silos and we’ve chucked them together and said ok, all of you guys can make a real impact if you wanna focus on one key event. We can all join together and display who you are rather than you just trying to do it individually and that kind of conversation I think is really empowering and we’ve had that and that’s worked really well.

1. Regular low-key community consultation:

Interviewees talked about going to where the people are, such as carpark barbecues, and how important it was for people to see the results of the CLDP as it goes along.

Where we put on food and we had meaningful events where their opinions are heard and those people can see results from. The more that we can do that the better off we are.

### Supporting change and innovation

Change is happening incrementally but with deliberate purpose in this CLDP. The successful completion of one project after another is building community confidence. That should encourage greater openness to further change and innovation over the final two years of the Waimate2gether CLDP.

There was little indication that Hāpai Hapori advisors are actively supporting innovation, but interviewees do describe them as flexible and easy to deal with. The basic design of the programme – with high trust contracting and five-year-long commitments – may foster learning-by-doing better than a buttoned-down project-by-project grant funding system. On the other hand, the leadership committee’s focus on doing what’s deliverable may mitigate risk-taking.

## Learning to date

### Key learning

The tangible outcomes from the CLDP are delivering positive community spirit and self-confidence, not just new infrastructure.

I think the biggest impact is actually on the community themselves. Not so much infrastructure we’ve put in, it’s the fact that the community now know that they’ve been listened to and that things have actually happened and they feel empowered

### Enablers of success

The following characteristics of Waimate2gether, discussed in more detail above, have contributed to progress to date:

* The leadership committee’s decision to start with quick winsand carefully select and phase projects so that success builds on success.
* Commitment to taking the community consultation to where the people are (e.g., carpark barbecues).
* Realisation that its first approaches to iwi were not working and subsequent efforts to connect in ways that suit iwi better.
* Bringing together many groups to work on a project of wide community interest (the White Horse).
* Involving the schools, which spreads the word about the CLDP widely.
* The access to funds over a five-year period that comes with the CLDP.

### Challenges

**Lack of experience and skills** – in a small town like Waimate, this was seen as the biggest barrier to change:

For change, it’s not money but it’s expertise, it’s expertise and small, relatively small towns like this, it’s all about expertise, yeah. That’s our biggest challenge.

**Fundholding** – as outlined above, there remain doubts about whether the CLDP’s fundholding arrangements are unnecessary convoluted in this case.

**Relationship with Waimate District Council** – because so many of Waimate2gether’s initiatives involve public parks, reserves, local roads and other council infrastructure, their success is dependent on a constructive response from the District Council. Interviewees are grateful for the support of elected councillors but expressed some frustration at the speed at which council staff were able to move.

**Lack of diversity of leadership** – most Waimate residents would be unable to make the heavy time commitment required for these voluntary positions. This creates an equity issue at the leadership level, it was noted that this means the community misses out on different perspectives:

I would say 5% of this community who would be able to afford to do this role and whether you like it or not, that automatically narrows you down to a certain subset of the community and that’s those of us … who are financially stable enough … there are some very capable people out there who wouldn’t be able to afford to do this.

### Local factors influencing CLDP impact

**Attributes of the Chair** – Waimate2gether is chaired by a businessowner with some 30 years’ experience in governance both as chair and as a member at tertiary institutions, community trusts and private companies. He has a clear focus, understanding of process, and financial literacy. He is able to devote a large number of volunteer hours to the CLDP each week.

**Iwi involvement** – Mana whenua were not central to the initiation of the CLDP, and there was no mention of activities at the marae out of town. The iwi representative has a tremendous number of calls on their time. It is a common experience across the Ngāi Tahu takiwā. There was reflection that the community have a commitment to improving mana whenua involvement and feel like they are getting closer to making this happen.

### Improvements to CLDP

The following suggestions for improvement were offered:

* Rather than pay a third party fundholder, allow CLDP communities to set up as a legal entity with responsibility for financial and employment matters if they wish.
* Hāpai Hapori could act as a conduit for expertise outside facilitating community development. An interviewee suggested better networks with other parts of the Department of Internal Affairs and other government agencies. In Waimate’s case, the expertise lacking was in the nuts and bolts of infrastructure projects (e.g., roading consents), for which Hāpai Hapori could have reached out to such agencies as MBIE, Waka Kotahi or even Kainga Ora, but it is unclear whether any of these agencies would have seen the matter as core business or a priority for response even if they had the skills required. An alternative approach would have been for the community advisor to notice the need for specialist skills and explore options with the leadership committee, such as hiring an expert consultant or improving relationships with the District Council.
* More face-to-face gatherings of communities involved in CLDP (although the constraints imposed by the Covid-19 pandemic were acknowledged).
* More training for communities, including: how to have difficult conversations, conflict resolution, and how to work effectively with your local council.
* There should probably be a mechanism for either side to leave CLDP if it really is not working (although, to be clear, this has never been needed in the Waimate case)

## Reflections from the Waimate2gether experience

Some insights with wider ramifications for CLDP across Aotearoa:

* CLDP offers a rare opportunity to take a whole-of-community approach, which can enable unrelated or even rival community groups to link up to achieve a common goal.
* Where a community is not satisfied with the level of service provided by the fundholder, there is currently little they can do, especially if Hāpai Hapori regard their concerns as ‘just’ a communication issue.
* The lack of diversity at the leadership level creates an equity issue. The funding model and reliance on volunteers makes this problematic.
* High turnover of community advisors generally represents a missed opportunity for Hāpai Hapori to add value to the CLDP and to learn from the community.
* Getting runs on the board quickly builds community support for the CLDP.
* Opportunities to connect with other CLDP communities are highly valued.
* Small communities need access to expertise, which will not necessarily reside with the community advisor. The advisor’s skill lies in identifying what is needed and connecting the community appropriately.
* Almost from Day One, this community has been preparing for its transition out of CLDP with a view to long-term benefit from the investment.

# Connect Cromwell

Region: Central Otago

Year joined CLDP: 2018

Community vision: a community that has the vision and takes action to influence the development of its urban and rural districts.

This summary is based on interviews with community members and the lead advisor, conducted in August to October 2021, along with analysis of background documentation.

## Cromwell community

Cromwell is experiencing the second major shift in its urban form and community dynamic in less than 50 years.

In the 1980s, Cromwell swelled in size with entire new streets built for construction workers on the Clyde Dam project. Then in 1992-3, as the dam was completed, the town was partly flooded. People were uprooted, livelihoods lost, and historic buildings drowned. The town’s retail centre shifted inland, centred around a mall. The urban design made little connection to the newly-formed Lake Dunstan.

In recent years, Cromwell entered a period of property development and rapid population growth. In 2017, it was reported as New Zealand’s fastest-growing small town[[4]](#footnote-4). Despite this, the mall has not become a vibrant town centre: “all the retail’s pretty much bailed and it’s left with op shops and real estate agents.” Entertainment options are limited: “people were saying there’s nothing to do basically.” There has been local disquiet over a council sale of public land to developers with limited community input, and fears for the future of greenways. In essence, development has exacerbated the town planning shortcomings of the 1990s, dividing rather than connecting people:

There’s a whole lot of new housing that’s all gone in one end of the town and all the old Ministry of Works housing is over the other end of town and so there's kind of these two almost separate little groups of people.

In the words of one interviewee, the challenge now is “keeping community in a time of growth.”

### History of the project

Connect Cromwell emerged from conversations amongst a group of residents, most of whom were new arrivals or returnees. The group were concerned that there appeared to be no coherent spatial planning and no broad-based community input. They felt Cromwell’s community spirit was under threat and they wanted a community-driven masterplan for sustainable growth in the town.

The group sought community input via Bang the Table, an online community engagement platform, and got a strong response.

Meanwhile, DIA was setting up CLDP. The community advisor, who is still in the role, was encouraged to find a suitable community in Central Otago. She worked with Connect Cromwell to “get them over the line.” For the group itself, funding was the main attraction – “it was hard to get anyone to actually take the reins” because of work commitments.

The Cromwell CLDP Partnership Agreement was signed on 29 November 2018.

### Leadership and governance

Connect Cromwell has an independent steering group, currently comprising five local residents, all of whom are volunteers. The number of the group has reduced over time as having too many people involved made it difficult to progress things at times. It has also been hard to get additional volunteers during Covid and with many other volunteer organisations in Cromwell.

Formally speaking Connect Cromwell was established as a sub-committee of the Cromwell and Districts Community Trust (CDCT), who are now the fundholder for the CLDP.

### Project implementation

Connect Cromwell currently employs two part-time staff, who coordinate activities. A media liaison/communications adviser is paid on contract as required.

Activities undertaken through the CLDP include the following:

* Greenways festival
* Community plan development and community consultation
* Crop swap and ‘good produce market’ online directory
* Local garden tour
* Edible garden in the mall (potentially adding community orchard)
* Winning ideas competition
* Public interest journalism project
* Greenway seating (in progress)

The Winning Ideas competition is a recent highlight. Twenty-six groups submitted ideas, and eleven finalists were selected. About 80 people turned out to support them give their presentations. Along with grant funding for the eleven projects, Connect Cromwell is now supporting their implementation by liaising with the district council over consents, and providing publicity.

The event was awesome and everyone learnt more about other groups and it was sort of what everyone needed on the back of lockdowns

Despite these inroads, implementation of the CLDP in Cromwell has not been easy. The biggest source of frustration has been the funding model (discussed below), and all parties involved have had to exercise considerable patience.

## Relationship with Hāpai Hapori

The Dunedin-based advisor travels to Cromwell at least once a fortnight. She keeps in touch by phone and email between visits. Both parties describe a friendly relationship, but each is concerned that the other is too stretched.

### Contribution of Hāpai Hapori to project

Along with funding for key workers and projects, interviewees valued their advisor’s input. In Cromwell’s case, this includes:

* Addressing issues between Connect Cromwell staff and the fundholder
* Identifying additional funding opportunities for Connect Cromwell
* Working with Connect Cromwell staff and steering group to pull together the required funding reports for Hāpai Hapori
* Connecting the Cromwell group with other CLDP communities – the face-to-face CLDP hui in Wellington was mentioned positively
* Providing guidance to the steering group

At the same time, those involved in Connect Cromwell would appreciate more clarity from Hāpai Hapori more generally about the parameters of the programme, especially what is reasonable to expect in terms of funding, where they felt they received “mixed messages”.

There was also a desire to have formal points to record and discuss progress outside of funding reports:

There isn't a platform to say ‘how is your setting up going?’ or ‘how have you found your progress, you're halfway through your programme, your project now, are you where you thought you're going to be?’ … it is a fluid thing and it does develop … but I think that would be a good platform that you could have a couple of questions to see how you're sitting and what if you need help

Further, Covid contributed to lost opportunities to connect and build relationships with other Hāpai Hapori staff than the Community Advisor. In particular, the hands on, face to face support that was provided through the national hui was valued, and while the move to an online forum for this was appreciated, it was not perceived as effective.

### Alignment with CLDP principles

The five principles of community-led development were seen as the foundation values of Connect Cromwell. Connect Cromwell is particularly invested in gaining wide community input and engagement, and developing relationships and connections with other local groups and/or bodies.

If you haven't got those relationships then you're not trusted and you're not valued so you can't get there , We are really conscious of the overlapping and weaving of community.. (such as the CLDP diagram) public sector, education, kids, businesses, elderly and those things there because we are a small community, all of those people overlap a lot so keeping those lines of communication open

It was noted that CLD was considered ‘too messy’ for some people to stay involved, which has been a challenge.

They just want a project and finish it and we’re like that is great, the end goal is that but a better goal is getting there with more people on the bus

## Community self-determination

### Supporting self-determination

Connect Cromwell worked with CDCT and Council to develop a community plan. This had previously been the role of CDCT, but no plan had been developed in the last decade or so. Previous plans had been rather lengthy and prescriptive, to the point where people did not often read them. For this community plan, the idea was to have a high level, live document that could be adaptable as projects come up. The document works as a ‘checkpoint’ for CLDP and supports lots of little things to cover off a wide range of uses within the community, rather than doing one big project collectively. There were some confusion and lack of clarity around roles and responsibilities between Connect Cromwell, CDCT and Council in developing the plan.

The steering group is mindful of the fact that they only have two years left on the CLDP. They are currently exploring social enterprise ideas and potential partnerships with other community groups to enable it to ‘stand it on its own two feet’ and not ‘fizzle out’. The Community Advisor was thought to be good at posing questions to the group around sustainability and has put them in touch with the South Alive Trust in Invercargill, which is trying to make a financial success of its deli/bulk bin store and community hub but is not yet fully self-sustaining. It was also noted that the funding panel had asked questions on this topic of sustainability in the last funding round. An upcoming workshop on the issue was also alluded to.

Despite this work however, it is not yet clear how Connect Cromwell is stepping towards self-determination. This is understandable given it took time to resolve the fundholding relationship and roles in the development of a new community plan. As a result, there are few examples of how Hāpai Hapori has directly supported community self-determination. Given the expectation that communities will find some way to sustain themselves in the future, the question for Hāpai Hapori is what expertise in social enterprise can it offer to communities such as Cromwell.

### Funding model

The fundholder agreement is with the Cromwell and Districts Community Trust (CDCT). The roles and responsibilities of CDCT and Connect Cromwell are spelt out in a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) between them. Although things appeared settled at the time of interviewing, there were initial challenges associated with the fundholding model such as a lack of buy-in to the idea of the need for a separate backbone organisation, different ideas around what the model might look like, and subsequently, agreement on the wording of the MOU. There has also been ongoing divergence in interpreting fundholder roles, responsibilities, scope and boundaries. These issues have contributed to implementation delays and challenges.

### Community capacity

Connect Cromwell and Hāpai Hapori together do not appear to have found an arrangement that fits their current capacity particularly well. There is a sense that people are doing more administration and/or more staff management than they are either equipped or mandated for.

I thought I was showing up and being a volunteer and a passionate community member … whereas a lot of the time what we have to do is managing employees and I guess admin more than what I thought we were going to have to do.

The Community Advisor noted that she had “inadvertently” taken on the role of managing staff, because of some of the issues associated with the fundholder relationship.

Looking beyond the operation of the group itself, the CLDP is building wider community capacity both informally through community events and project support, and more overtly:

We encourage learning and fostering leaders beyond just our facilitators … so we are looking at holding more workshops and bringing more community facilitators down to town and opening that up to the public.

## Equity and Te Tiriti

### Role of Te Tiriti

Interviewees expressed respect for Te Tiriti, but there is no explicit discussion of it within the CLDP at present.

### Mana whenua involvement

Mana whenua involvement in the CLDP here is limited. The population is over 90% Pākehā and there is no marae in the town. Ngāi Tahu has its own commitments and priorities. There is a drive for greater engagement and involvement towards meaningful outcomes, and Connect Cromwell hope to see more mana whenua involvement in a forthcoming project telling stories about the waterways in/around the town.

### Other diverse communities

Connect Cromwell has not yet managed to get diverse representation on its steering group, though it is said to have a good relationship with the local youth trust. Overseas seasonal workers (from Vanuatu) have been involved in the annual Christmas celebrations, and there is a forthcoming multicultural dinner to encourage people to get to know each other better through food.

## Impact of CLDP in the community

Above all, the CLDP in Cromwell is giving people confidence that they can influence the direction of their home town, albeit in small ways so far.

There have been comments lately that oh that was really cool (that we reached out to community, and got that project done (ie winning ideas) So for people to actually see it's that, it's the stuff that they can see that makes the big difference

It's also about learning that community can say things and then work towards getting outcomes together rather than just rely on the Community Board or Council …that you can be involved in your community. And then here also it's a lot about connecting all the different groups and getting them out and celebrating the community that we have.

The Community Advisor also highlighted these changes.

I think the biggest impact has been kind of giving people a sense of enthusiasm and excitement for their community. This has happened through holding events right where people can gather and people can enjoy time together … it's like that snowball effect. … people have been saying it's great what you guys are doing

### Building relationships

Connect Cromwell is having some success facilitating better connections between people in Cromwell:

We have seen an increase in activity and people coming forward and wanting to get involved in activities and in events. I think that’s going to be probably the legacy that Connect will leave is that people are more connected.

Here Hāpai Hapori’s contribution appears to be primarily money, but the advisor has also made some useful suggestions for ways to bring people together, including the Winning Ideas competition.

### Supporting change and innovation

Hāpai Hapori has supported change to the extent that the CLDP resourcing has enabled the community to fund some new initiatives.

Although Connect Cromwell was not ultimately the author of the community plan, its presence and focus on community input arguably spurred on other agencies – Central Otago District Council and CDCT – and the community plan stands to have a long-lasting impact.

Connect Cromwell also modelled forms of engagement, especially online surveys, that the community have now come to expect. Interviewees felt that Connect Cromwell had helped develop a “more digestible” updated community plan and were pleased with the result.

## Learning to date

### Key learning

Perhaps the biggest lesson learnt by those community members involved to date is one of adaptability. They have had to get comfortable with changing their plans, and have found this generates better outcomes.

Making little gains along the way, … building confidence in everyone that's involved with it, so little gains that keep it progressing, that get more people excited about the part that they can play before you get to the end result, and knowing that the end result might change and being flexible with how you get there. There might be a few tangents before you get forward but it's better to have a bit more people happy about it.

### Enablers of success

The following enablers of success are discussed in more detail above:

* Use of online engagement tools.
* Early wins, e.g., the greenways festival, and support for grassroots initiatives, e.g., crop swap, build community confidence.

### Challenges

Across the country, Hāpai Hapori has invited groups at very different levels of maturity into the CLDP. While other CLDP communities had an established volunteer base and key people with plenty of time and experience, Connect Cromwell was a fledgling group of busy professionals. Interviewees observed ruefully the time it takes to get projects off the ground and generate momentum.

This begs the question whether Hāpai Hapori appropriately assessed the community’s readiness and/or whether it has allocated the right level and kind of support to the community.

As alluded to elsewhere, the choice of another community group with its own agenda for Cromwell as the fundholder has proved problematic. Feedback also indicates that expectations about who gives staff direction on operational matters are either unclear or unrealistic.

### Local factors influencing CLDP impact

Local factors that have influenced the CLDP impact in Cromwell include:

* There being no marae in Cromwell, and a pressing demand on nearest mana whenua. This has contributed to a lack of mana whenua presence in the CLDP.
* A steering group of volunteers with professional skills but limited spare time or community development experience, compounded by difficulties finding staff who are comfortable operating in a fluid environment. In some other CLDP communities, a paid key worker was also one of the key initiators of the programme, which is not the case here.

### Improvements to CLDP

The following suggestions were offered for Hāpai Hapori:

* Brief local councils on what the CLDP is, because the success of many projects depends on council cooperation and/or consents.
* Make available templates for common functions across projects, such as fundholding MoUs, and position descriptions for key workers.
* Set up formal check-in points where communities can record how things are going and what support, if any, they need.
* Make it easier for CLDP communities to find out what each other are doing, such as via on an online database or a look-book.
* Consider alternative funding models, either setting up as a legal entity from the start or using a neutral fundholder outside the small community.
* Be more transparent about funding parameters so that communities know how much or little they can bid for.

## Reflections from the Cromwell experience

Some insights with wider ramifications for CLDP across Aotearoa:

* The importance of fundholder selection for smooth-running of the CLDP.
* The question of whether CLDP partners should be required to set up as legal entities from the start if the expectation is that they will survive past the CLDP’s five-year term.
* Recognition of local specificity should not prevent Hāpai Hapori providing adaptable templates (e.g., fundholder MoU, coordinator position description, budget for funding applications).
* It is not uncommon for communities to ask their advisors for practical advice on basic HR and finance, especially if the fundholder is not fully trusted. In such cases, advisors commonly do not get useful responses or support from relevant experts within DIA.
* Advisors who do not live in or near the community are likely to be at a disadvantage compared with those who do; they generally have shallower local networks and are not as readily available in person.
* Communities whose leaders have little spare time (e.g., full-time jobs, parenting) are likely to need more support than communities whose leaders have ample time and flexible schedules.
* Local councils can have a significant effect on the success or otherwise of a CLDP.

# South Alive Invercargill

Region: Southland

Year joined CLDP: 2019

Community vision: A vibrant and diverse community that takes the lead in its own future.

This summary is based on interviews with community members and the lead advisor, conducted in August to October 2021, along with analysis of background documentation.

## South Invercargill community

South Invercargill is one of the oldest residential areas in Aotearoa’s southernmost city. The economic upheavals of the late 1980s and early 1990s saw it gain a reputation as rough and down-at-heel – literally the wrong side of the tracks. The South Invercargill Urban Rejuvenation Charitable Trust, known as South Alive, was formed in 2012 as a community-led attempt to turn things around. Over the past ten years, the neighbourhood infrastructure has visibly improved; community pride has lifted.

### History of the project

South Alive emerged as a positive response to previously unsuccessful city council engagement. In a series of well-supported public meetings, the community discussed how South Invercargill could become a better place to live, work and play. Residents coalesced into “action teams” focused on different improvements they wanted to see. The community started searching for funds, including to pay a coordinator and run some activities.

Hāpai Hapori became involved when the community successfully sought funding for a community development worker (a three-year scheme).

South Alive bought a building with external grant funding. In 2017, it opened The Pantry, “a bulk grocery and speciality foods store with a community cafe that is designed to create revenue to fund South Alive and their community projects.”

When the community development worker funding was due to expire, Hāpai Hapori and South Alive explored whether the community was ready to join the CLDP.

The South Alive Invercargill CLDP Partnership Agreemeent was signed on 2 September 2019.

### Leadership and governance

South Alive is governed by a Board, comprising 11 trustees from varied backgrounds including a rūnanga representative.

The Trust itself was very much something that was decided upon by the community

Between them, Board members are associated with every action team, ensuring a wide spread of input from South Alive’s volunteers.

### Project implementation

South Alive employs three coordinators through the CLDP. They are based in the same building as The Pantry, where there are also community rooms.

The largest new initiative for South Alive in the CLDP is the creation of a heritage walking trail (in progress).

Other activities supported through the project include the following:

* Operating The Pantry and community hub
* Continuing South Alive’s two large annual events: South City Street Party; Children’s Day with trolley derby
* Supporting work by the action teams, such as community gardens (Fruit and Nut team) and dog park upkeep (Dog Park team)
* Civic responsibility programmes with local schools
* Pay it forward scheme: food parcels for people in need
* Friendship groups: “self-gathering people”
* Air quality monitoring in people’s homes and outside, with NIWA
* Advocating for the community, especially with the Invercargill City Council

## Relationship with Hāpai Hapori

Overall, community interviewees considered themselves in a genuine partnership with Hāpai Hapori.

I think the thing that's different with this is that partnership, that it is more a partnership and a relationship whereas a lot of other funders I think you get the fund and then you just talk to them again at the end

### Contribution of Hāpai Hapori to project

The same Hāpai Hapori lead advisor has worked with South Alive for the past seven years. He is himself a South Invercargill resident and has extensive local networks. The relationship has matured to the point where the advisor and South Alive team meet about once a fortnight, or more frequently if required. Both parties expressed respect and confidence in the other.

They're a very stable group, very committed in what they're doing and they've got three very capable staff members, so at the moment I'm letting them do what they want to do and I'm in the background supporting in any way I can.

I always feel like he's just a phone call away and very approachable to help manage that relationship.

South Alive appreciates the advisor’s ability to link them with initiatives elsewhere, but his advice on where to go for extra funding, and how to present their case, is probably the most valuable:

There is the role around how do we access funding cos at the end of the day you've got to have money to make it happen, it’s not gonna happen on fresh air.

The community advisor is seen as a quiet enabler behind the scenes:

[He is] extremely good at creating bridges for us that we don’t know about. It’s amazing how many things turn up just when we need them at times and that can even be from some advice or some direction and I'm pretty sure that he's got his finger into quite a few of those, they're just extremely timely and he doesn’t seek any recognition for it either, he's an extremely well-connected person.

That said, over the years, South Alive have developed the ability to secure funds themselves without brokering by the advisor. For example, they have a direct relationship with the Ministry of Social Development (MSD) via Food Secure Communities, and leveraged that to get other MSD funds to help their community deal with the effects of the Covid-19 pandemic.

### Alignment with CLDP principles

South Alive had been running for about seven years before the organisation was formally introduced to the five principles of community-led development. Interviewees felt the principles have always been embedded in their activities and kaupapa, and that articulating the principles has brought fresh clarity to their work.

Right back from the get-go before we were part of this partnership with the DIA, I guess a lot of what we were doing was following those five principles without perhaps having the theory behind it but then sort of following that ethos I guess.

The five principles have certainly strengthened up and sharpened my thinking a bit

Interviewees saw the volunteer action teams as a manifestation of (and testament to) the CLDP principle of taking a strengths-based approach:

It was taking the strengths and the assets of the people in our community and I think that is why those groups had sustained and had been going now almost 10 years because we talk a lot about volunteer burnout and how do we look after our volunteers and I think people stay committed and passionate about it because it’s focusing on those strengths and those assets of the community and what they're personally passionate about so they keep going with it

There was no sense of anything missing from the CLDP principles:

I think it’s been for South Alive a hugely valuable experience and one where we’ve all learnt a lot and learning a lot and it’s reframed our thinking as a Board and personally and I've looked at examples around the world and what it might mean. I think that in New Zealand they’ve got the notion fairly right.

## Community self-determination

South Alive have a community plan, which the leadership take back to the community annually for review and reporting. The plan guides decision-making and activity throughout the CLDP.

### Supporting self-determination

Interviewees expressed a keen sense of self-determination as a way of working as well as a goal.

Our mission talks about a place to live and work that engenders pride and inspire us … we take it back to the strategic goals that we've set, upgrade, community, capability, governance and sustainability and all the time the community are going ‘that part’s good’, … ‘so why don’t we do this and that.’ So they're actually feeding into the goal … the way they respond and the way that they contribute means that they feel that their needs are known and that they’re being heard and most importantly that they're being valued.

They highlighted flexible, high-trust funding as the main way Hāpai Hapori supports self-determination, describing the approach as “great” and “unique”.

It’s quite outcomes focused … You've got this budget there and as long as you're meeting the outcomes of what your community’s said and that's shown in your community plan then that's what they're going to be looking at, the DIA’s going to be looking at.

One interviewee commented that many funding pools support new initiatives, not regular or ongoing ones, thus community hopes can rise and are then dashed. South Alive’s annual street party, which started as a one-off celebration of some Council-led beautification, is sustained through the CLDP.

The community advisor actively encourages the leadership to check the alignment between opportunities and community aspirations, even when government agencies approach South Alive with offers of funding:

What you'll find is that when an organisation becomes successful, you will get other Government Departments and even the local authorities trying to engage them to do things that take on a contract or take on a role that oh here's an ideal group, let’s get them to run a … programme in South Invercargill. So what I find my role talking to them there about is where did this idea come from. … that gets them thinking about yes it might be nice to think that hey we can get 100,000 to run a … promotion or programme in our community but does the community want it and where did the idea evolve from? Did it evolve from one of your public meetings, did it come through on your surveys, did it come through on your Facebook page or from your action teams or is there some well-meaning public servant who wants to come along and think this is a great idea for a disadvantaged community?

South Alive are already considering what happens when the CLDP ends. Interviewees report some “robust discussions” with Hāpai Hapori managers, and hope the relationship will not end abruptly.

This is a five-year partnership and that's great and compared to other funders that's quite a long timeframe to be getting funding for but we are still thinking about what happens at the end of that … because if you just cut it off like that then all that hard work could of, like that could be really detrimental to a group to just cut them off.

### Funding model

South Alive does not use a third party fundholder because it was already a legally constituted charitable trust when it entered the CLDP. Interviewees felt the arrangement works “pretty well”:

They’ve got a good bunch of trustees, they hold the money if you like and they put it out to the projects around them that need to be done and they're quite responsible.

### Community capacity

South Invercargill has maintained a pool of about 200 volunteers, despite turnover with people leaving and others joining – a remarkable feat:

They're not doing something because they have to or because it’s necessarily a good thing, they're doing it cos this is what they want and they want it to come to fruition.

As well as delivering on projects, building relationships and sense of community pride, these volunteers are developing their own skills. Funding for coordinators via the CLDP helps keep the momentum going:

The community also made it very strongly known to us that they were happy to contribute and volunteer, and we’re trying really hard to grow local leadership, but they also wanted some key staff to help coordinate and develop those skills.

The CLDP is also investing in children and young people through the local schools, and see this as essential for community sustainability:

The things that they're helping to, whether that be from helping paint the dog park shelters or the coming and helping paint the mural, to look at building their own community gardens, there's a whole range of things … in practice it’s about, its sustainability but it’s in a different form, it’s not just sustainability in money, its sustainability in attitude and outlook.

Local college students have been “heavily involved” in helping the ‘Fruit and Nut’ action team in the community orchards and learning gardening skills. Interviewees commented that it is important for young people in high deprivation neighbourhoods to experience the benefits of giving to others, and students with special needs have begun to spend time in the gardens “to self-soothe.”

So it’s not only about teaching gardening skills but also about finding spaces and places that benefit your mental health.

Despite these positive experiences, interviewees were conscious that South Alive needs to keep topping up its pool of volunteers and refresh its leadership. They saw growing local leadership amongst young people – instilling in them “the importance of good citizenship” and creating a volunteering culture – as a long-term challenge in and beyond South Invercargill.

What could DIA do to actually grow local leadership because when I look at that, I'm looking at fresh blood and I'm looking at younger people coming through because, rather than using existing older people. So what can they do? I guess just giving more thought about the world of volunteering, community-led and what does growing local leadership really mean.

## Equity and Te Tiriti

### Role of Te Tiriti

Interviewees said Te Tiriti is important to them but not explicit. “The Treaty principles of participation, partnership and protection” were seen to underpin the organisation.

### Mana whenua involvement

The South Alive Trust Board has included mana whenua representation from the start. The first representative is now the Trust Patron, and another representative from Waihōpai Rūnaka has been appointed.

South Alive hold meetings and focus groups at the marae, but the extent of mana whenua involvement fluctuates depending on the project. For example, there is limited input into doing up the dog park and substantial input into the development of a heritage trail for South Invercargill.

I think ourRūnaka resource is quite stretched, so even when you're asking them in terms of consultation, in all pockets of Southland the key people are quite stretched so you have to be quite respectful sometimes and wait and actually also outside of that build the relationship which we do do quite well … They are doing their mahi, we are doing our mahi and we are consulting where we can but we’re just respecting where their resource is stretched as well.

### Other diverse communities

With regard to maata waka, interviewees say they “defer” to Waihōpai marae but have links with others, notably Te Rau Aroha marae in Bluff.

South Invercargill is also home to Pasifika and refugee communities. One interviewee commented that it is not always a simple exercise to develop relationships with communities whose leaders sometimes say “why do you want it with us for, we've got people that live in South Invercargill, they’ll attend your events, they’ll go to the parks, are you doing things that benefit us … we've got a lot to do, is this another talkfest?” The interviewee saw this as a useful challenge.

## Impact of CLDP in the community

In South Invercargill, the CLDP is building on work done by South Alive over the previous seven years, and it is not possible to distinguish precisely how much of the quality of relationships or the extent of change is due to the CLDP. Nonetheless, interviewees expressed the view that the CLDP funding and advice has indeed helped the community get to where they are today.

### Building relationships

If you didn't have relationships I couldn’t see it working.

Interviewees described how they are always looking at how to improve relationships – “how can we fit better in our community.” The Pantry (social enterprise) also functions as a community hub:

Our social enterprise does a whole lot more than just raise funds. So it is a community centre as such, lots of people meet and greet, … we have our community constable comes in, we actually have a couple of Council staff members who come in and they run sessions where they're talking directly to the community inside The Pantry and inside this facility.

In the case of problems at a local park, which was described as “like Chernobyl, … rundown, … really rough looking,” South Alive was able to advocate on behalf of the community. This is a good example of the rewards from building a strong web of relationships. South Alive became aware if the depth of community concern when the same comments were coming in via community volunteers and their Hāpai Hapori advisor. They were then able to use their relationship with the city council to get improvements, including repairs, new play equipment, and free electric barbecues.

There are instances where the Hāpai Hapori advisor has been instrumental in making connections with real benefits for local residents. For example, the advisor has connected South Alive with the Pacific Island Trust. Now when they encounter Pasifika locals in need of help, they not only provide them with food parcels through their Pay It Forward programme, but tell them about what’s available through the Pacific Island Community Centre including pandemic support.

### Supporting change and innovation

South Alive interviewees reported a non-judgmental relationship with their community advisor, where nothing was off the table. This has enabled them to learn and adapt as they go.

Regular catch ups and keeping really well involved … we've never had to pretend that things are great, we've shared the good, the bad and the ugly is the way I talk about it and so we also get advice back and different strategies and I think one of the good things is when we have different projects or events and we learn from what does work as well as from what doesn’t work and we need to sort of adjust.

One interviewee identified “looking at doing things differently” as the most important thing they’re learning by being part of South Alive. This includes trying different ways to connect with South Invercargill residents who don’t have internet and/or don’t want to come in to the South Alive building, and looking at different ways to improve the economic viability of The Pantry as a social enterprise.

Interviewees were extremely grateful for the chance to attend a national hui of CLDP communities organised by Hāpai Hapori

It was just really amazing to be in a room with all the other CLDP partners and it was just a huge learning curve and a really good networking opportunity just to see what other, how other people run their community groups. That was really beneficial.

## Learning

### Key learning

South Invercargill’s experience is of a disheartened community finding and building on its strengths. For that to happen, central and local government have had to hand over some control and resources.

A community no matter, even if it’s on its knees, there's still a hell of a lot of strength there and there's still a lot of ideas and there's still a lot of goodwill to do something. They can be right down and out whether it be through various Government policies that have impacted or natural disasters or just over years it’s been ignored but what I've found is that when they're given the right situation to come out and talk and identify what they want to do, there's a lot of resource in our communities, a lot of, they don’t need things done to them or for them, they can do things for themselves. They just need access to the resources like other communities have had, other more privileged communities have had, for many years.

### Enablers of success

The following enablers of success were identified by interviewees:

**The scale and security of CLDP funding, combined with a high trust contracting model,** has arguably made the biggest difference for South Alive:

It’s been amazing to get the bulk funding and just to know that we've got guaranteed funds coming in that we can keep staff on, that we can get our operating funds, operational costs going which is just amazing. When I first started it was a real struggle … working out of a tiny shop in the mall versus where we are today is amazing. So yeah, we’re really grateful that we've got that funding and it was very exciting the day the bulk funding turned up in the account.

The CLDP funding has enabled South Alive to hire “some really high-quality staff and retain them.” It has freed up the team to do more community-led development and less fund-raising related administration. And it is lifting the aspirations of the community:

We can focus more on, you know, engagement with the community, hearing what it is they want and supporting them.

It gives us the opportunity to look at multiyear programming and … actually raised a level of our aspiration

The flexible funding model has given South Alive the autonomy to seize opportunities as they arise, where these are in line with community aspirations. For example, while NIWA scientists supplied air quality monitoring equipment and are analysing the results, South Alive used CLDP coordinators to get the equipment into people’s homes. Such tasks, which capitalise on the CLDP partner’s networks and have the potential to benefit the wider community, could otherwise be put in the too-hard basket if administration-heavy contract variations were required.

**The quality of the lead advisor** is also significant for the community. Interviewees felt lucky there. They value his advice and his extensive network of contacts across the city. They felt he was readily available when they needed him. As a resident of South Invercargill himself, he did not have to travel to visit them.

### Challenges

Interviewees did not identify any barriers to success imposed by Hāpai Hapori or the shape of the programme per se.

South Alive does encounter challenges intrinsic to community-led development, such as how to respond to the persistent enthusiast with a bright idea and any personality/relationship issues that may arise if leadership do not ultimately support the idea. Interviewees mentioned the challenge of engaging with hard-to-reach sections of the community. They noted the importance of having a clear sense of views across the community to avoid capture by the loudest or most powerful interests.

I think one of the things we’re trying to do is sort of more intentionally engage with other groups and putting ourselves out there more rather than just trying to engage people that come to us because then we’re sort of hearing the same voices over again. We’re a community of 18,000 in South Invercargill, well that's a lot of people we’re trying to reach and understand the needs and desires of so I guess one of the challenges is to try and make sure that we're hearing the voices of a wide range of people within our community so that we can effectively prioritise.

South Alive has not yet succeeded in making its social enterprise genuinely self-supporting. This is a common challenge across many CLDP communities.

Financial sustainability [is] quite a hard ask especially with what’s going on in the world at the moment. We’re doing okay alright from a business point of view. I think without COVID I think the things that we put in place prior to it we would have been far in front of where we are now. So, we’re not going backwards but we’re not going forward at a rate that we would really like to.

On a related note, there is the ongoing challenge of sustaining the momentum, especially the need to refresh leadership, attract new volunteers, and secure ongoing operational funding.

We've been very actively looking at the notion of not being a one hit wonder and about sustainability and that's an area we’re still, I guess still we’re grappling with.

### Local factors influencing CLDP impact

South Alive had been running for about seven years when it joined the CLDP. They came to the partnership with the following already in place:

* A legal entity (charitable trust) with governance structures
* Committed, experienced leadership
* A community plan with established review and reporting timeframes and processes
* Understanding of the principles of community-led development from grassroots experience
* Tested methods of consulting their community
* A strong group of about 200 volunteers
* A good reputation, and existing relationships with key stakeholders such as the city council

As a result, the flavour of the South Invercargill CLDP is of consolidation as well as pursuit of larger projects.

### Improvements to CLDP

Interviewees had no complaints and few recommendations for improvement, but the following suggestions were offered:

* Look at the transition out of the CLDP and devise ways to avoid an abrupt exit
* Consider how Hāpai Hapori can better support communities to grow local leadership, especially amongst young people

## Reflections from the South Invercargill experience

Some insights with wider ramifications for CLDP across Aotearoa:

* Combining the roles of fundholder and community partner is not necessarily problematic.
* Retaining the same Hāpai Hapori advisor on a CLDP can contribute to a better relationship, continuity of advice, and a sense of security for the community.
* A Hāpai Hapori advisor who lives in the community is likely to have stronger local networks than one who comes from out-of-town.
* Having secure funding for five years has enabled the CLDP to focus on community engagement and delivering projects.
* Flexible funding has enabled the CLDP to respond to changing needs identified during community consultation.
* The opportunity to meet face-to-face with other CLDP communities is highly valued.

# Appendix 1: Background information on communities

The tables below details information about each participating community, drawn from programme documentation.

| **Community Details** | **Community Vision** | **Profile** | **Description of activities** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Tamaūpoko  -Whanganui River  Agreement Signed:  29/05/2017 | Together we will create a  thriving community and  environment through the  development of our people and our place, now and for future generations. | The agreement includes the community definition of who is included in the community.  “The Tamaūpoko rohe tribal boundaries are inclusive of ngā hapū, area and rural settlements of Pipiriki, Hiruhārama, Rānana and Matahiwi whānau and residents.”  The partnership agreement includes a range of values and goals related to the community and also related to Te ao Māori. This agreement is unique. Compared to the others, this one appears to strongly reflect the priorities and make up of the community. They included a 10 year strategic plan in their agreement. Their plan includes 7 pou:   * Poutama: Providing stability with flexibility to cope, respond and adapt * Tānewai: Acknowledging the inextricable connections between our River and People * Te Mōrehū: Embodying our responsibilities and legacy, and honouring our promises and commitments * Tūmanako: Keeping the needs of future generations at the forefront of our thinking and decision-making * Whiritaunoka: Striving for unity and consensus in all that we do * Ūpokotauaki: Fostering leadership, trust, accountability and succession planning * Pirekiore: Developing strategic approaches to challenges and advocating the tenet of perseverance | Operational costs that include three salaries,  initial wānanga and hui costs, and training  costs  • Waste minimisation projects  • Heritage trail at Pipiriki  • Community events including hunting festival  • Community emergency plans and  development and purchase of emergency  equipment  • Water quality assessments  • Community projects |
| Whananaki  -Northland  Agreement Signed:  30/06/2017 | A culturally connected caring community | The agreement is very standard for this programme and includes the CLDP principles, roles and responsibilities for both partners. There is little to no detail provided on the make-up of this community.  They have a fundholder. The agreement is with Ngā manga Puriri charitable trust.  The community has a co-ordination team of up to 4 coordinators. They are responsible for facilitating community collaboration and co-ordinating activities in line with the community CLD plan and the overarching CLD principles. | Operational costs that include FTE salaries,  fundholder fees, leadership training costs  and community engagement  • Community Hub feasibility  • solar panel installation  • flora and fauna project  • wāhi tapu project  • evaluation of community-led development  practice and its impact on the community  • intergenerational digital story telling  initiative  • predator control project  • ecotourism initiative |
| Randwick Part  -Manurewa  Agreement Signed:  07/07/2017 | Empowering local/grassroots  individuals, families and groups, providing them with the skills and opportunities needed to affect positive holistic development of Randwick Park. | They have a standard CLDP agreement. The agreement is very standard for this programme and includes the CLDP principles, roles and responsibilities for both partners. There is little to no detail provided on the make-up of this community. | • operational costs that include salaries for an  evaluation specialist and a project support  worker  • capability building of community leaders  • evaluation of community-led development  practice impact on the community  • Matariki festival  • community engagement, communications  and marketing  • BBM Boot Camp and cultural activities |
| Tatau Pounamu Collective  -Rotorua  Agreement Signed:  14/07/2017 | Tatau Pounamu – a place  where we can combine our respective relationships, knowledge, perspectives, and  resources to meet the  identified needs of our  residents. | The partnering agreement includes community strategies, how they have been working, who is part of the community and how they are engaging with Māori.  “The Eastside Community Collective has been working together for the last 4 ½ years on working alongside their (more vulnerable) residents on issues that they have identified as important. The Eastside Community Collective includes representation from: Ngāti Te Roro o Te Rangi, Ngāti Uenukukopako, our kura, our churches, Rotorua Safer Families, Rotorua Healthy Families, Rotorua Māori Wardens, Rotorua Red Cross, and the Mokoia Community Association. The Eastside Community Collective has also developed strong and positive working relationships with local government and social sector agencies depending on the issue we are working on. While membership of the Eastside Community Collective has a stable core of stakeholders, membership is inclusive, and it is envisaged that membership will continue to grow over time. The Mokoia Community Association is the backbone organization for the Eastside Community Collective.”  They state that the communities will provide opportunities for all to:   * Participate in positive ways * Have what they need to reach their immediate needs * Reach for their aspirations * Has the leadership they require to take them positively to the future   The agreement details the need to provide regular reporting to DIA. The doc states that a template will be provided on what is to be reported.  Mokoia Community Association is serving as the fundholder for the Tatau Pounamu Collective. The agreement with the fundholder is for 12 months, with the ability to renew each year. | • operational costs that include fundholder  fees, evaluation, capacity building and FTE  salaries  • predator-free project  • facility development that involves relocation  of two portacoms to become offices  • development of communications plan  • evaluation of community processes, events  and community impact  • building skills and knowledge of the  community  • growing neighbourhood leadership  • maintaining and expanding piripoho  services  • developing mental health initiatives |
| Karamea Community  -West Coast  Agreement Signed:  11/09/2017 | Karamea is a hospitable, safe, and productive community where members of the community can live, share, play, celebrate, prosper and welcome others. | The community partner has a fundholder organization. The fundholder agreement is from 11 September 2017 to 10 September 2022.  The agreement is between Karamea CLDP Partnership Group and with the fundholder, Karamea Community Incorporated (KCI).  The agreement documents the commitment of the Department of Internal Affairs and Karamea Community to work together to support the realisation of locally-led aspirations, progress the community plan, and achieve the community’s overarching vision: *“*Karamea is a hospitable, safe and productive community where members of the community can live, share, play, celebrate, prosper and welcome others.”  The general aim of Karamea’s participation in the programme is “to achieve an inclusive self-supporting community culture in Karamea, ensuring that no one is left out unless by personal choice. We want to be a community where all our members flourish.”  The document hints at there being a Partnership Manager to be involved in the community partnership and that the fundholder will manage their payment. | • operational costs that include FTE salaries  (two years), travel and support costs  • upgrading the Oparara Arch Track and  carpark  • capability building of leadership group  • cultural art project  • development of a social enterprise to set up  a plant nursery for riparian planting  • work with Ministry of Education to extend  the new school hall so that it can be a  communal activity centre |
| Blackball  -West Coast  Agreement Signed:  14/12/2017 | Blackball – our future is in our past. | The initial information provided stated that this partnership was formed in 2017, with a second agreement signed in 2019. They state that due to a change in fundholder there was a need to update the partnering agreement.  This partner has a fund holder – the fund holder works on behalf of the community partner in relation to all things financial. The Fundholder is: ‘Development West Coast’  The agreement is very standard for this programme and includes the CLDP principles, roles and responsibilities for both partners. There is little to no detail provided on the make-up of this community.  The Fundholder Agreement provides detail on the roles and responsibility of the fundholder and the community leadership group. The responsibility of the fundholder includes: taking responsibility for the finances received from DIA in accordance with the Community’s objectives and planned activities. They are also to manage the documentation surrounding finances and report to the community leadership group where necessary. | • restoration work on the Blackball mine site  chimney  • small community projects that include  development of website, signage and  interpretation panels, marketing costs, bike  maintenance stand, pool upgrades, summer  festival  • operation of the community van  • opening of the Paparoa Track (10th Great  Wall) |
| Fab Feathy-Featherston  -Wairarapa  Agreement Signed:  02/02/2018 | To fully realise the potential of Featherston while retaining and enhancing what makes our town and community distinctive and great. | Fab Feathy Community-led Development Group standard CLDP agreement but with the addition of a community statement and the community vision which is included below.  Graphical user interface  Description automatically generated with medium confidence  Fab Feathy have a community steering group.  The Wairarapa REAP are the fundholder for the Fab Feathy community.  From the partner’s protocol document:  “The Fab Feathy Community-Led Development Group initiative has delegated the oversight of financial, physical and human resources, which support delivery of the goals and activities set out in ‘Our Future Featherston 1.0’ document, to the Fab Feathy Steering Group.”  The Steering Group is responsible for ensuring that:   * Appropriate plans and actions are in place to achieve goals and activities set out in an annual plan. * Appropriate mechanisms and resources are in place to support the Fab Feathy Steering Group paid employees. * Appropriate financial management is in place which ensure:   + that the allocation of resources is aligned to Fab Feathy Steering Group’s strategic priorities, **and**   + all financial decisions and transactions are transparent and consistent with the agreed annual budget.   Fab Feathy also had an operational framework to support the community in their operations as a collective. The document details that the steering group with provide direction to the community  The document detailing the position of a Fab Feathy Facilitator details the position for a 30 hr per week employee that is responsible to the community. Their role is to facilitate CLD in the community, manage activities and engage with community stakeholders.  Their experience does not include a need for cultural competency or an understanding of Te Tiriti or working with local Māori groups. | operational costs that include two FTE  salaries and fundholder fees  • funding for start-up community projects  • book festival  • support to develop a series of bike tracks for  the bikes in schools project |
| Resilient Carterton  Wairarapa  Agreement Signed:  12/04/2018 | A strong, well-connected and resilient Carterton | The Ka Pai Carterton document detail the six aspirations that the community is working towards. A standard CLDP agreement but includes additional information on the community partner.  Aspirations include: establishing a community-based identity, growing a vibrant central business district, forming spaces for collaboration (that include cultural spaces), having a community with reliable infrastructure, stuff to do- a place with a variety of activities to support a variety of needs and interests, sustainability/values, Youth- a place that supports the local youth.  Ka Pai Carterton has Connecting Communities Wairarapa Incorporated as their fundholder. The agreement is for 3 years and signed in 2020. Ka Pai Carterton is to pay Connecting Communities Wairarapa Incorporates $10,000 annually as a management fee.  The Fundholder Agreement provides detail on the roles and responsibility of the fundholder and the community leadership group. The responsibility of the fundholder includes: taking responsibility for the finances received from DIA in accordance with the Community’s objectives and planned activities. They are also to manage the documentation surrounding finances and report to the community leadership group where necessary.  They organised to have a community facilitator, whose role is to facilitate activities in line with the communities objectives under the CLDP. | • operational costs that include leadership  committee support, evaluation and FTE  salary  • community facilitation  • restoration of the community hall for youth |
| Sandringham  -Auckland  Agreement Signed:  24/04/2018 | Cultural diversity, vibrant, heritage character. | The agreement is very standard for this programme and includes the CLDP principles, roles and responsibilities for both partners. There is little to no detail provided on the make-up of this community. | operational costs that include FTE salary,  resourcing, and community engagement  costs  • food history project  • community events and projects including  online communications project, floral  carpet, youth native planting |
| Te Ara Whakamua o Whaitara  -Taranaki  Agreement Signed:  29/04/2018 | A connected, cohesive community. | “The engagement of the BMK Group is to provide a mechanism by which the TAWoW Leadership group can access financial support from DIA (and other funding organisatios, yet to be identified) to further the aspirations of the Waitara community as set out in the plan.”  The fund holder gets paid an annual admin fee of 10k. They manage funding, invoices and will provide regular reports to the community leadership group to support their monthly meetings.  Te Ara Whakamua o Whaitara changed fund holders after a year according to the included documentation.  The agreement was not provided as part of the documentation. | • operational costs that include two FTE  salaries  • community fun day  • website design and community signage  costs  • community consultation  • projects regarding Hauora, talent and  enterprise development and tourism |
| Whanganui Stone Soup  -Whanganui  Agreement Signed:  31/05/2018 | Connected, safe, locally-led community | No additional documentation provided. | • operational costs that include community  engagement, FTE salaries and fundholder  fees  • project costs including community  gathering, community vision plan, weekly  interest groups, Man Cave, champions  development, knitters group, art group,  board games group |
| Katikati Taiao  -Bay of Plenty  Agreement Signed:  01/09/2018 | Katikati is a community of place – of a common location, where we live, work and play, and where people enjoy the environment for recreation. | No additional documentation provided. | • community consultation hui  • community projects including connecting  with mana whenua, youth wellbeing,  intercultural connections, connection to the  natural environment and further service to  the community |
| South Invercargill Urban Rejuvenation project  -Invercargill  Agreement Signed:  02/09/2019 | A vibrant and diverse community that takes the lead in its own future. | The May 2019 job description provides detail on the community and the activities they have accomplished to date, highlighting that the community is well-established and developed as a collective. This is stated: “during the past 7 years there have been priority areas developed from community consultation, the building of a solid infrastructure, and significant stakeholder engagement and participation through projects, events, volunteerism, representation and advocacy.” They state that that is where the CLDP comes in and the partnership with DIA.  Their partnering agreement is standard for CLDP. However, the document includes the community’s strategic plan 2018-2019 as Appendix I. They include their 5 strategic goals:   1. Upgrade 2. Community 3. Capacity 4. Governance 5. Sustainability   They also provide what activities they plan to complete that align with these goals and the timeframe for completion. This plan is further updated in the 2020-2021 Strategic Plan document. | • operational costs that include FTE salary,  administration and volunteer training costs  • community projects including history trail,  annual street party, children’s day fair, night  food markets and beautification |
| Waimate2gether  -South Canterbury  Agreement Signed:  03/10/2018 | Proudly Waimate – Taking the good of the past into the best of the future. | The agreement is very standard for this programme and includes the CLDP principles, roles and responsibilities for both partners. There is little to no detail provided on the make-up of this community.  The Waimate Community Leadership Group was appointed by the Waimate Community through an external selection process to work toward fulfilling the vision of the Waimate community as set out in the Community Plan. Waimate Community has entered into a five year partnership with DIA under the CLDP.  Community Link is the fund holder for the Waimate Community and its Leadership Group. The Fundholder Agreement provides detail on the roles and responsibility of the fundholder and the community leadership group. The responsibility of the fundholder includes: taking responsibility for the finances received from DIA in accordance with the Community’s objectives and planned activities. They are also to manage the documentation surrounding finances and report to the community leadership group where necessary. | • operational costs that include FTE salary  and fundholder fees  • evaluation of community-led developments  impact on community  • community consultations  • disc golf project  • upgrade of the white horse monument and  its surrounds  • planning of walking and cycling trails |
| Ūawa/Tologa Bay  -East Cape  Agreement Signed:  19/11/2018 | Ka Tipu Te Whaihanga e Hika ki Ūawa! Creativity and innovation flourished my friend in Ūawa | No additional documentation provided. | • operational costs that include FTE salary, administration costs, community engagement and capacity building costs |
| Connect Cromwell  -Centra Otago  Agreement Signed:  11/12/2018 | To enable the community to express its vision for the development of Cromwell and Districts | The agreement is very standard for this programme and includes the CLDP principles, roles and responsibilities for both partners. There is little to no detail provided on the make-up of this community.  The Facilitator job description spoke to the importance of CLDP and CLD principles. That the facilitator needed to be connected in well with communities and have the ability to also work across communities. The document mentioned working in line with Te Tiriti o Waitangi; however, did not detail what that meant within the context of CLDP and the community itself.  They also have a fundholder, Cromwell Community Development Trust (CDCT). The Fundholder Agreement provides detail on the roles and responsibility of the fundholder and the community leadership group. The responsibility of the fundholder includes: taking responsibility for the finances received from DIA in accordance with the Community’s objectives and planned activities. They are also to manage the documentation surrounding finances and report to the community leadership group where necessary.  The community has formed a leadership group to drive change within the community, which appears to be standard for CLDP.  The funding partner also supports the identification and applications for funding beyond the CLDP. The leadership is to control how funds will be spent and the roles and responsibilities for achieving goals related to the community and programme. A member from the fundholder will attend monthly community leadership meetings as necessary.  In the CLD Facilitator job description, the document details that the community is looking for a facilitator, appears to be separate to DIA. A 20 hr per week role. Their role is to facilitate CLD in the community, strengthen community initiatives, ability to articulate the CLD principles and understand what they look like in practice, collaborate with stakeholders, build capacity and recognize gaps. | • operational costs that include FTE salary  • community festival  • community plan development and  community consultation |
| Otematata  -Waitaki  Agreement Signed:  16/11/2019 | To develop collaborative partnerships that will enable the creation and implementation of a strategic plan that is representative of the wider community, reflects our cultural heritage, respects our environment, allows for positive and structured growth and allows those who pass through or stay the opportunity to be part of this unique place. | Similar agreement to all CLDP programmes. The agreement highlights what is required in the partnership. The inclusion of community members, funding requirements, length of partnership, commitment ot the CLD principles and to acknowledging Te Tiriti.  The document also provides a brief description of the community: “Otematata is a small village in the Waitaki Valley…..with a well-established infrastructure, it is acknowledged as a tourist town.” | • AV equipment to enhance presentation  capabilities  • landscaping for community park  development options  • community planning |
| Raglan Naturally  -Waikato  Agreement Signed:  17/08/2020 | Building on our values and the unique character of our community, five key opportunities have emerged; protecting our natural environment, employment for locals and having a balanced approach to tourism, leading and setting an example as a community – nationally and internationally, equity, safety and looking after those in need, and to be led by our values and create solid foundations as we plan and grow as a community. | Their agreement is a standard CLDP agreement but includes more description about the community partner; specifically, their motivation to enter into the partnership and their community aspirations. Both focus on building a thriving community, a strong environmental focus and sustainability.  There is mention of application of Te Tiriti o Waitangi and partnering with iwi and pan-tribal organisations. They also mention Hapai Hapori’s Te Whakamotuhaketanga Hapū Strategy and the specific values that underpin this strategy. This is the only mention of this strategy across agreements. This may be due to the fact that it is the most recent partnership established. This may need to be explored further. | • legal fees  • support Raglan Naturally to set up a new  Trust |

# Appendix 2: Project documentation reviewed for this report

| **Site** | **Document Type** | **Document Name** | **Month and Day signed** | **Year Signed** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Blackball- westcoast | Fundholder Agreement | Blackball Fundholder Agreement | 30-Sep | 2019 |
| Blackball- westcoast | Partnering Agreement | Blackball Partnering Agreement | 9-Sep | 2019 |
| Connect Cromwell | Partnering Agreement | Connect Cromwell signed agreement | 29-Nov | 2018 |
| Connect Cromwell | Fundholder Agreement | CDCT Connect Cromwell Fundholder MOU | Absent | 0 |
| Connect Cromwell | CLDP Facilitator- Job Description | CLD Facilitator- Connect Cromwell | n/a | n/a |
| Fab Feathy- Featherston | Partnering Agreement | Fab Feathy DIA CLDP Partnership Agreement REAP MOU | Absent | 0 |
| Fab Feathy- Featherston | MOU | Fab Feathy REAP MOU | n/a | n/a |
| Fab Feathy- Featherston | Partnering Agreement | Fab Feathy Signed Agreement | 2-Feb | 2018 |
| Fab Feathy- Featherston | Protocols for Delivery | Final Fab Feathy REAP Protocols | n/a | n/a |
| Fab Feathy- Featherston | CLDP Facilitator- Job Description | Position Description Fab Feathy Facilitator | n/a | n/a |
| Karamea Community | MOU | CLDP Karamea- MOU Fundholder Partnership Group Draft | n/a | n/a |
| Karamea Community | Partnering Agreement | Absent | Absent | n/a |
| Katikati Taiao | Partnering Agreement | Absent | Absent | 0 |
| Otematata- Waitaki | Partnering Agreement | Otematata CLDP Partnership Agreement 16 Nov 2019 | 16-Nov | 2019 |
| Raglan Naturally | Partnering Agreement | Raglan Naturally | Absent | 0 |
| Randwick Park | Partnering Agreement |  | Absent | 0 |
| Resilient Carterton-Wairarapa | CLDP Facilitator- Job Description | Carterton Job Description | n/a | n/a |
| Resilient Carterton-Wairarapa | Partnering Agreement | Ka Pai Carterton | 8-Apr | 2020 |
| Resilient Carterton-Wairarapa | Fundholder Agreement | MOU Ka Pai Carterton- CCCW Fundholder | April | 2020 |
| Sandringham | Partnering Agreement | SPICE partnership agreement | 24-Apr | 2018 |
| South Invercargil | Admin & Finance Manager- Job Description | Job Description- Admin & Finance Manager | May | 2019 |
| South Invercargil | CLDP Project Manager job description | Job Description- Community Development & Operations Manager | Absent | 0 |
| South Invercargil | CLDP Project Manager job description | Job Description - Special Projects | Absent | 0 |
| South Invercargil | Partnering Agreement | Partnering Agreement | 1-Aug | 2018 |
| South Invercargil | Strategic Plan | Strategic Plan 2020 2021 | June | 2020 |
| Tamaūpoko | Partnering Agreement | Tamaupoko- Whanganui River | 29-May | 2017 |
| Tatau Pounamu | Fundholder Agreement | MOU MCA and TPC signed 15.02.21 | 15-Feb | 2021 |
| Tatau Pounamu | Partnering Agreement | Tatau Pounamu - Rotorua | 14-Jul | 2017 |
| Tatau Pounamu | Fundholder Agreement | Tatau Pounamu Agreement for Pou Awhi Service Work March 2020 | March | 2020 |
| Tatau Pounamu | External Agreement | Tatau Pounamu Pou Awhi Agreement Appendix 2 March 2020 | March | 2020 |
| Te Ara Whakamua o Whatara | Fundholder Agreement | BMK Letter of engagement | 8-Aug | 2019 |
| Te Ara Whakamua o Whatara | MOU | MOU BMK 8.7.19 | 8-Jul | 2019 |
| Te Ara Whakamua o Whatara | Partnering Agreement | Absent | n/a | n/a |
| Te Ara Whakamua o Whatara | Fundholder Agreement | MOU Knox Church - TAW | 15-Jun | 2018 |
| UawaTologa | Partnering Agreement |  | Absent | 0 |
| Waimate2gether | CLDP Project Manager job description | PM job description\_Waimate | Absent | 0 |
| Waimate2gether | Fundholder Agreement | signed MOU - Waimate | 6-Nov | 2018 |
| Waimate2gether | Partnering Agreement | Waimate | 3 Octorber | 2018 |
| Whananaki | Coordinator Job Description | MOU Whananaki CLD Part Time Coordinator Job Description | Absent | 0 |
| Whananaki | Fundholder Agreement | MOU Whananaki CLDP-NMP | 7-Jul | 2017 |
| Whananaki | Partnering Agreement | Whananaki CLDP | 30-Jun | 2017 |
| Whanganui Stone Soup | Partnering Agreement | absent | Absent | 0 |

1. The five principles of community-led development are: shared local visions or goals drive action and change; use existing strengths and assets; many people and groups working together; building diverse and collaborative local leadership; adaptable planning and action informed by outcomes. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. The Māori ACCESS programme, known as MACCESS, was a vocational training scheme for Māori job seekers. It was established in 1987, operated by the Ministry of Māori Affairs and delivered by tribal/regional authorities. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. We note that at the time of interviewing the community plan was earmarked for a rejuvenation based on community consultation. [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. https://www.newsroom.co.nz/news/cromwell-nzs-fastest-growing-small-town [↑](#footnote-ref-4)