



# PARLIAMENT OF THE COOK ISLANDS

---

## PARLIAMENT PAPER NO. 112

Rarotonga.

Madam Speaker,

I have the honour to present Te Mato Vai Project Special Select Committee Report, November 2016

I have the honour to be,

Ma'am

Hon. M. Brown  
Chairman

The **HON. M. BROWN**, Minister of Finance



## PARLIAMENT OF THE COOK ISLANDS

---

9 June 2017

Honourable Speaker  
Office of the Speaker of Parliament  
Parliament of the Cook Islands  
Nikao, Rarotonga  
COOK ISLANDS

**RE: TE MATO VAI PROJECT SPECIAL SELECT COMMITTEE REPORT, NOVEMBER 2016**

Honourable Speaker

As you recall, the Te Mato Vai Project Special Select Committee was established by a motion in Parliament on 13 June 2016 to:

- consider the grievances and concerns of the Petitioners of the Te Mato Vai Project in the light of the current status and progress thus far of this project, and
- to report the findings and conclusions of the Committee to Parliament by December 2016."

Pursuant to the Committee's Terms of Reference, it is my honour and privilege as Chair of the Committee to present to you this final report on the work of the Committee, for tabling in the House at the upcoming sitting of Parliament.

I have the honour, Madam Speaker, to be your obedient servant,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Mark Brown'.

Hon. Mark Brown  
Chairman  
Te Mato Vai Project Special Select Committee



## PARLIAMENT OF THE COOK ISLANDS

---

### REPORT OF THE TE MATO VAI PROJECT SPECIAL SELECT COMMITTEE JUNE 2017

#### **Table of Contents**

1. TERMS OF REFERENCE.....	3
2. MEMBERS.....	3
3. SECRETARIAT AND ADMINISTRATIVE SUPPORT .....	3
4. TECHNICAL SUPPORT .....	4
5. THE COMMITTEE PROCESS .....	4
5.1 COMMITTEE HEARINGS.....	4
5.2 REFERENCE LITERATURE .....	5
6. RESPONSES TO THE PETITION GRIEVANCES - THE FINDINGS .....	5
7. RESPONSES TO THE PETITIONERS PRAYER .....	13
Scope and Benefits .....	13
Review of Master Plan .....	13
Quality Assurance .....	14
Commissioning of Ring Main.....	14
Stage 2 of the Project.....	14
Potential Charges for Excessive Use of Water.....	15
Land Issues.....	15
Debt Servicing.....	15
The Way Forward - Exploring the Co-Management Principle .....	16
8. RECOMMENDATIONS.....	16
9. CONCLUSION .....	17

## **1. TERMS OF REFERENCE**

1.1 The Te Mato Vai Project Special Select Committee be established by a motion in Parliament on 13 June 2016 to:

- consider the grievances and concerns of the Petitioners of the Te Mato Vai Project in the light of the existing status and progress thus far of this project, and
- to report the findings and conclusions of the Committee to Parliament by December 2016.

## **2. MEMBERS**

- |                         |   |   |
|-------------------------|---|---|
| 1. Hon. Mark Brown      | - | Chairman                                |
| 2. Hon. Teariki Heather | - | Member                                  |
| 3. Hon. Albert Nicholas | - | Member                                  |
| 4. Hon. Kiriau Turepu   | - | Member                                  |
| 5. Mrs Ngamau Munokoa   | - | Member (withdrew due to medical travel) |
| 6. Mr Tamaiva Tuavera   | - | Member (replacement for Mrs Munokoa)    |
| 7. Mr George Angene     | - | Member                                  |
| 8. Mrs Selina Napa      | - | Member                                  |
| 9. Mr James Beer        | - | Member                                  |

## **3. SECRETARIAT AND ADMINISTRATIVE SUPPORT**

3.1 The Clerk of Parliament Mr John Tangi managed the public liason and administrative requirements of the Committee

3.2 The Office of the Editor of Debates of Parliament led by Mr Isaac Solomona and his staff team of sub-editors, stenographers and technician provided the communications and editorial support to the Committee.

3.3 The Corporate Services Division staff under the leadership of Deputy Clerk Mrs Helen Maunga and Director of Corporate Services Mrs Ina Pierre provided the administrative support and financial services to the Committee.



3.4 The Executive Director of the Pacific Legislatures for Population and Governance (PLPG) Mr Tangata Vainerere served as Committee Secretary responsible for the production of the Committee's final report to Parliament.

## **4. TECHNICAL SUPPORT**

4.1 A team of local and international experts provided technical support and guidance to the Committee throughout its deliberations. The team comprised of:

- Team Leader Mr Garth Henderson, Financial Secretary, MFEM
- Members
  1. Mr Tamarai Tutangata, CEO, CIIC
  2. Ms Lavinia Tama, Director, Development Coordination Unit, MFEM
  3. Mr Evan Mayson, Manager, TMV Project Management Unit
  4. Mr Daryl Rairi, Deputy Manager, TMV Project Management Unit
  5. Mr Adrian Teotahi, CWS Team Leader/Asset Management Coordinator
  6. Mr Andreas Demmke, Development Programme Manager, MFEM

## **5. THE COMMITTEE PROCESS**

### **5.1 COMMITTEE HEARINGS**

Committee meetings were held at Parliament Chamber on Monday 24<sup>th</sup> October, Thursday 27<sup>th</sup> October, Thursday 3<sup>rd</sup> November, and Thursday 10<sup>th</sup> November to deliberate on the Petition and to hear presentations by the Petitioners, Representatives of Landowners, and Staff of the Te Mato Vai Project Management Unit. Individuals who appeared before the Committee include:

1. Mr Garth Henderson, Financial Secretary, MFEM
2. Mr Tamarai Tutangata, CEO, CIIC
3. Ms Lavinia Tama, Director, Development Coordination Unit, MFEM
4. Mr Evan Mayson, Manager, TMV Project Management Unit
5. Mr Daryl Rairi, Deputy Manager, TMV Project Management Unit
6. Mr Adrian Teotahi, CWS Team Leader/Asset Management Coordinator
7. Mr Andreas Demmke, Development Programme Manager, MFEM
8. Mr Joseph Bridger, Director, National Environment Services
9. Mr Vavia Tangatataia Jnr, Environment Service Manager
10. Mr James Thompson, Chief Petitioner
11. Manavaroa Mataiapo - Mr Phillip Nicholas, Traditional Leader
12. Mr Tim Arnold, Legal Representative for Pa Ariki.

## 5.2 REFERENCE LITERATURE

Key reference documents sighted during the Committee Hearings include:

1. The Te Mato Vai Project Budget Outline (NZD65.9m)
2. The Te Mato Vai Tarrif Report 2014.
3. The Inspectors Report provided by PMU to KEW Consultancy in relation to concerns by John Batty on Te Mato Vai Project.
4. The cost breakdown from KEW Consultants of Stage One of the project.
5. The NZ Govt Report listed in the PERC Report to Parliament - Paper #45.
6. The REA/NES Environmental Impact Assessment Report, January 2014 that relate to Stage 1 of the Te Mato Vai Project.
7. The REA/NES Environmental Impact Assessment Report, March 2014 that relate to Stage 2 of the Te Mato Vai Project.
8. The TMV Tender Evaluation Report, August 2013.
9. MFAT(NZ)-CkIs Water Partnership Announcement.
10. Tim Arnold Submission to the Select Committee on Co-Management Principles for Te Mato Vai.
11. Record of Payments for Milestones and Drawdown of Concessional Loans (RMB) - MFEM
12. The OPUS Quality Assurance Report by Eric Thorn - Te Mato Vai Review of Electrofusion Coupling
13. Agreement for Supply of Road Sealing Materials Bitumen, Sealing Chip and Apply to Trenches Te Mato Vai Project Contract No. CK-RWR-001-S-ICI
14. AECOM New Zealand TE MATO VAI Water Supply Master Plan for Rarotonga, 4 April 2014
15. Cabinet Memorandum of 3 May 2016 on Cabinet and Executive Approval for Changes to the Capital Budget 2015/16 (*Tabled by Committee Member Mr James Beer obtained by OIA Request to Cabinet Services by the Leader of the Opposition*)

## 6 RESPONSES TO THE PETITION GRIEVANCES - THE FINDINGS

6.1 On the matter of the eleven grievances contained in the Petition, the Committee considered the following responses from the Project Management Unit:

**GRIEVANCE 1. THAT** *Cook Islanders are fundamentally opposed to paying for water so any water project premised on vague and uncertain 'user pays' principles is unacceptable.*

The Project Management Unit responds as follows:

1. Cook Islanders indirectly already pay for water.
2. Cost are a combination of their taxes and purchasing potable water from commercial vendors and recently very expensively even when subsidised by ICI – by having to buy truck-loads over the summer months. Families in some villages never received a drop of water down the water main for two months of the year (2014) over the Christmas/New Year period and were having to buy a tank full of water every week to satisfy their family needs. During this period eight trucks and their crews worked 24 hours a day to try and keep up with the need for water.
3. In addition to that it is likely that in the existing system the cost of paying for water falls very unevenly with families subsidizing major users like resorts, agricultural uses and other commercial and industrial users.
4. Once the new water system is up and running effectively, and only then will there be a new fairer system of payment not for the water, but for the cost of delivering it and maintaining the infrastructure that delivers the water so that there is a completely transparent and dedicated fund to ensure the system is properly maintained and replaced and we don't end up with the inefficient and run-down system we have now.
5. Prior to any system of payment being introduced there will be consultation with all stakeholders.
6. There are no vagaries around this, let's get the system up and running so that people know that when they turn on the tap they will have water that is reliable and safe for their family, visitors and workers.
7. A suitable payment system will be developed and options will be consulted on in due course; but any new system will have fairness and equity as its pillars.
8. The Government has stated that domestic households will not be charged for water however water may be charged on excessive use basis (refer to Section 7.1.12), for households there will be a free allocation. Commercial businesses will be charged as appropriate. Charging for water will drive behaviour changes, incentivising conservation and rain water harvesting, particularly in the commercial sector. This will reduce water demand. Alternative sources of water for agricultural purposes are being investigated by the government.

**GRIEVANCE 2. THAT** *Te Mato Vai Rarotonga upgrade currently costed between \$60m and \$73m is an unnecessarily extravagant burden to place on the consumers and taxpayers of this country and has all the hall-marks of repeating the Sheraton Hotel debacle of the late 1980s*

The Project Management Unit responds as follows:

1. Comparisons between Te Mato Vai and the Sheraton are deliberately mischievous. The investment proposed by the Government is nothing like the Sheraton. This is an investment in infrastructure which is for the overall public good; everyone in Rarotonga needs water and accesses water.
2. Unlike the Sheraton where nothing existed, there currently is a decrepit water system in Rarotonga which simply requires renewal after many years of neglect. The petitioners need to understand that a comparison of the TMV with the Sheraton Hotel is not valid as that was a different time when things were done differently. Unfortunately emotional statements such as the one above do not really contribute much to the very serious discussions that are taking place about this new water system.
3. Unlike the Sheraton, there has been considerable consultation, the government has shared all of the elements in the DRAFT master plan without holding anything back and that has been debated and consulted on and people's concerns have been noted and changes will now be made to the plan.
4. Those changes have been publicized, and certain costs have been taken out of the original draft in order to reduce the overall price of the project. The government is confident that funding arrangements are in place to cover what is now in the revised master plan.

**GRIEVANCE 3. THAT** *Te Mato Vai project is based on too many questionable assumptions and is being pursued with scant regard to cheaper options*

The Project Management Unit responds as follows:

1. It is unclear exactly what the "too many questionable assumptions" referred to in Grievance 3 are.
2. There are few technical assumptions in the draft Master Plan but all will be addressed when the detailed investigations of the detailed design starts. In saying that, the majority of the data that was used in the draft Master Plan were collected



from appropriate agencies that deal with these specific roles in the country, such as Statistics, meteorological services, rainwater data collection etc.

3. The assumptions are on the basis of a strong scientific methodology. The metering which is currently being conducted is expected to broadly confirm the assumptions on which Te Mato is based.
4. Cheaper options abound and like something you buy from a \$2 shop, if you get your \$2 worth you're lucky.
5. The government wanted a project that is designed to last Rarotonga and the country decades into the future with health benefits, commercial benefits, and that is cost effective and efficient. Our people shouldn't have to settle for anything less. The government did not look at the cheapest option, rather, the option that best suited the needs of our people.

**GRIEVANCE 4.** *That Te Mato Vai has over-estimated the volume of water required which means excessive infrastructure being built; it has failed to take account of privately owned water storage capacity as a result of the water tank subsidy; it provides inadequate storage to meet drought conditions; it has failed to translate loan repayment obligations into annual rates per household and fails to address responsibility should a budget blowout occur*

The Project Management Unit responds as follows:

1. The amount of water Te Mato Vai is looking to deliver is based on government statistics of the estimated population in the years of the projects life. It is difficult to comprehend what other alternate figures delivery should be based on.
2. For any engineering design around the world, engineers will always factor what it terms as "risk factor worst case scenario"; for example on water design, one will have to consider the volume of water estimated in the, usually, 30 years in the future and also taking into consideration the peak factors. If you under-estimate the volume, you will run into a risk of so many shortage issues straight after project commission. On the other-hand, we do currently have a very high demand which should be a first priority issue to re- solve and under-estimating design volume is definitely not an option that an experienced engineer will take in this case.
3. The amount of water required under Te Mato Vai is designed to deliver a daily amount of water per person based on comparable water systems and consumption in New Zealand and some of our Pacific neighbours like Fiji

and Samoa. Doing so will actually drastically reduce the huge wastage of water that disappears down the pipes from the intakes never to be seen again, never reaching the consumers it was intended for. Throughout the world water is regarded as a very precious commodity and we cannot continue to waste it in the way we are with our present inefficient system.

4. Rather than waste that water Te Mato Vai will look to increase storage at the intakes to increase resilience during drought periods.
5. Encouraging people to install tanks and harvest the rainfall off their roof can only enhance our water security. Introducing a transparent payment system like that mentioned in point 1 above would also act as an incentive to conserve water, and to collect rainwater.

**GRIEVANCE 5.** *That the savings on loan repayment by adopting cheaper options and reducing contributions from the local budget would mean more funds available for education, health and other struggling public services*

The Project Management Unit responds as follows:

1. Conversely the failure of 'cheaper' piece meal options will add further unbudgeted costs; require annoying and disruptive remedial work, depriving funds for the very services mentioned in the petition.
2. The present Te Mato Vai project is fully budgeted for as a separate capital project and doesn't affect those items mentioned in the grievance.

**GRIEVANCE 6.** *That Te Mato Vai project is over-ambitious and over-priced and is being driven by a minister who has a serious conflict of interest*

The Project Management Unit responds as follows:

1. The current water supply system is broken. There is no point in continuing to maintain a system which is beyond repair; unfortunately the water supply asset has been ignored and not maintained as it should have been for the past 20 to 30 years. Government can now choose not to invest and leave households and business to their own devices or step up and invest in a piece of public infrastructure that will benefit all.
2. Providing a clean, reliable and efficient water system for Rarotonga when funds are available is prudent. This is a government project not the work of one person,

and the talk of a conflict of interest is a cheap shot. Our society is a relatively small and close-knit one and just as in other similar sized countries or boardrooms around the world, 'potential' conflicts of interest occur every day, and are managed just as this one is.

3. The Te Mato Vai project followed the accepted procurement procedures of the Governments of the Peoples Republic of China, New Zealand and the Cook Islands. Issues relating to conflict of interest were managed according to the procurement procedures of each country.
4. Costs should not be separated from value, the World Health Organisation states that each \$1 invested in water, returns \$3-\$34 depending on the region and technology. This project is about job creation, increased economic investment and improved public health.

**GRIEVANCE 7.** *That the general public has been deceived into believing that the public meeting consultations process is meaningful and potentially influential when in fact most decisions have already been made*

The Project Management Unit responds as follows:

1. The decision has been made to invest in a piece of infrastructure which is of value to the Cook Islands. The public were presented and asked to comment on a proposed system.
2. Not only were concerns voiced at the consultation meetings listened to, but also changes have been made, where they have been deemed valid, to the master plan; which was re-published shortly after its adoption. In addition no land was taken by warrant, there was to be no water charges for the first 400 litres per person per day and charges are only for the excess usage over and above the allocation, there was a change in the composition of the PMU, the responsibility for the PMU was shifted from ICI to the Water Authority, and the idea of co-management of the water resources was introduced.

**GRIEVANCE 8.** *THAT laying new outer and inner ring mains at considerable cost ignores a proven much cheaper technology known as pipe relining and there is no indication that this option has been researched let alone considered*

The Project Management Unit responds as follows:

1. Relining is a known technology and can be an option to rehabilitate pipes. However it is not a lasting solution that can resolve future pipe bursting or leaking. Relining is a method that lacks durability and cannot be used when there is deterioration of the exterior pipe.
2. As we know the leakage proportion reaches around 40-70% leakage; we are also aware that the interior is also deteriorating, hence requiring complete replacement.
3. Relining would also require, completely draining the existing ring main pipeline for some time during relining. Meaning, no water during the relining period, for the island. This is why replacement through HDPE pipe is more reliable and also more economical with little risk, and the country will inherit a new robust pipeline for future generations.

**GRIEVANCE 9.** *THAT the ministry of infrastructure cook islands has persistently refused to publicly address the question of underground water resources which could possibly meet rarotonga's needs but at the very least satisfy demand during times of drought*

The Project Management Unit responds as follows:

1. Underground water resources have been the subject of some previous studies that have identified there is some potential to access and utilise groundwater to supplement surface water supplies, predominantly to avoid or provide relief from drought. The Government is currently coordinating work across several programmes (i.e. IWRM, WMI), including Te Mato Vai, to select contractors and consultants to investigate groundwater quantity, quality and viability for use as part of the drinking water supply. The results of those studies were made available in mid-2014 and fed directly into the detailed Te Mato Vai planning process revamp.
2. Effectively, we can get underground water from everywhere we drill around Rarotonga. What is important first is to assess the volume and quality of aquifer basin and analyse the volcanic formation of the island. Some volcanic formations are younger than others and usually the older the rock the more compacted it will be to obtain a good volume of underground water.
3. This information will be available first from the WATSAN study that started soon after the petition was lodged. On the other-hand underground water will be costly



compared to the current system (gravity system) because a borehole submersible pump is needed to pump water up and will cost for electricity etc. The lower cost approach is to reduce current demand then consider additional sources.

4. Underground water is also like savings in the bank for the future. This provides Rarotonga with a means to respond to severe droughts and climate change in the medium term.

**GRIEVANCE 10.** THAT *new pipeworks will not deliver water to homes if there is no water to fill them*

The Project Management Unit responds as follows:

1. Te Mato Vai involves more than just installing new pipes. It replaces an inefficient system, which will provide more water for storage for times of drought; it also offers more reliability and potable water, with all the attendant health and commercial benefits that will follow.

**GRIEVANCE 11.** THAT *expensive facilities to bring the water supply to potable standards are unwarranted when much of that effort would go to waste and to agriculture, especially when other options exist for delivering potable water to homes and kitchens (village filling station, commercial standalone plant, domestic u/v subsidized units)*

The Project Management Unit responds as follows:

1. This is a direct example of where the public was consulted on a range of methods to deliver potable water, and as the revised master plan shows, the option taken is to subsidise UV filters at the consumer's end of the system. So people were listened to, not deceived.
2. We believe it is archaic in a modern country that people have to drive or somehow travel to public filling stations or commercial vendors to get potable water, especially as that impacts on our most vulnerable people and in particular on dependents like children and the elderly.
3. Another example where we have taken concerns on board is the issue of adding fluoride and disinfection with chlorine. The issue of 'treatment' will be separated from 'disinfection' in the new master plan. This will allow time to continue a dialogue



about disinfection, together as a community, and agree in the future how to best to define “appropriate water quality”. Investigations are ongoing to address this.

4. Concerns with regards to the quality of water at Water Stations have been addressed through a regime of regular testing and assessment by the Ministry of Health.

## **7. RESPONSES TO THE PETITIONERS PRAYER**

### **7.1 On the matter of the prayer of the Petitioners,**

**THAT an immediate stop be put to Te Mato Vai until all misgivings and shortcomings of the project can be identified and investigated and other options explored and that independent expertise be solicited to conduct that exercise with a view to distilling all material into an upgrade which is manageable, practical and affordable;** the Project Management Unit responds as follows:

#### **Scope and Benefits**

7.1.1. The Te Mato Vai project was designed to provide a modern water service that our economy desperately needed and therefore simply couldn't be halted in the light of the petition. Therefore, with a high degree of confidence in its scope and eventual benefit to the Cook Islands, the government decided that the project needed to continue hence the ongoing implementation of Stage 1. In this regard, GHD Consultancy which is a New Zealand based Environmental and Engineering Consultancy won the competitive bid to manage the TMV Project in mid-2014 and Mr Evan Mayson was appointed as the Project Manager of the Project Management Unit for TMV. Mr Mayson was also the team leader and project manager in the design of the TMV Project as well.

#### **Review of Master Plan**

7.1.2. The Project Management Unit following the lodging of the petition in 2014 did undertake a thorough revision of the master plan originally developed by the Global Engineering Company AECOM in order to address the key concerns raised by the petitioners which were deemed valid in order to progress the project. The original master plan was just a starting point. Where the project is now is quite different from where it was in the original master plan.

## **Quality Assurance**

7.1.3. As part of the Quality Assurance process for Stage 1, a number of work and payment stoppages were enforced by the PMU in order to rectify some deficient workmanship. The implementation resumed after these deficiencies were rectified.

7.1.4. As a result of the revision of the master plan, Stage 1 of the project, i.e. the construction of the ring main around the island funded by the Chinese Government, was completed to the required standards and specifications apart from a tag list which consists of a list of things that still have yet to be done by the contractor and it's the engineer who will go down that tag list and get them to complete.

7.1.5. Once that tag list is completed a Certificate of Acceptance will be signed and then a period of twelve months of maintenance will come into effect where the contractor of the ring main will be required to remain on the ground and address any issues arising during that period of time. The projected completion date for this process is end of November 2016.

## **Commissioning of Ring Main**

7.1.6. It is anticipated that the new ring main will be commissioned in early 2017 by which time each section of the ring main will be connected to the existing distribution system.

## **Stage 2 of the Project**

7.1.7. Stage 2 of the project will involve the upgrade of the existing distribution system that doesn't include the ring main. That includes all the 12 intakes that the PMU have looked at and what is called the trunk mains which is the pipes from the intakes down to connect into the ring main.

7.1.8. The detailed designs for Stage 2 include details about new intakes; about trunk mains replacement where needed; treatment facilities and potentially control systems which will enable the ICI to control the flow of water and storage facilities.

7.1.9. In capitalising on local knowledge, local consultants and companies were engaged by GHD Consultancy in the design phase of the TMV project including Sam Napa Tauei, Ngamau Wichman-Tou, Teariki Rongo, Daryl Rairi and Eagle Surveys. These local consultants played key roles in guiding the design phase of the project.

7.1.10. The design requirements for Stage 2 called for extensive research, computer modelling, geological tests, mineral content testing, contamination



checks, environmental impacts assessments, and meticulous data analysis in order to complete the hydraulic design report which informed the decision-making regarding the selection of catchment, treatment, delivery, storage, management/monitoring and maintenance systems most appropriate for the TMV Project which will in turn provide the desired results for the delivery of safe potable water to the Rarotonga residents.

7.1.11. In addition, the PMU also engaged a consultant to produce a Tariff Report which included a tariff analysis to outline what potentially the projected cost of operating and maintaining the new water supply might be - i.e. *around \$1.4 million per year*.

### **Potential Charges for Excessive Use of Water**

7.1.12. In terms of the government's direction regarding domestic households there will be no charge for water for the first 400 litres per person per day but given that it will cost between \$1.2 and \$1.4 million per year to operate and maintain the water system if there is a level of water use that exceeds what is considered fair use for households then penalties will need to be considered for households wasting water by exceeding the free allocations of water per household. This may translate to about \$30 per month for average size households (less than 4 people) and about \$70 per month for large households (more than 5 people).

7.1.13. With regards to concerns on charges at water stations, there will not be any charges for water obtained at these established water stations around the island.

### **Land Issues**

7.1.14. Progress on Stage 2 Construction Design was delayed due to land access and compensation issues and the Government reassures landowners affected by the TMV project that their land will not be taken by warrant and good faith negotiations would need to continue in order to address these issues amicably.

### **Debt Servicing**

7.1.15. With regards to public concerns on debt servicing in relation to the loan of NZ\$23 million from the People's Republic of China signed in 2012, MFEM manages national debt based on a debt to GDP ratio so the TMV loan is not treated in isolation but as part the consolidated overall national debt which currently falls

within the approved borrowing limit of 35 percent of GDP. This effectively indicates that the TMV loan is truly manageable and fits within the debt carrying capacity of the Cook Islands.

7.1.16. Regarding concerns on the portion of the TMV loan going to foreign companies, almost two thirds of the total loan was invested in goods and services procured in-country, which is a huge benefit for the Cook Islands.

### **The Way Forward - Exploring the Co-Management Principle**

7.1.17. As a way forward in advancing the Te Mato Vai project, the concept of co-management of water resources which was instigated by the late Mr Ted Nia has been accepted by government. The co-management principle is a method employed by the New Zealand Government in managing water resources under a regime of co-management with traditional owners and leaders that has seen some positive outcomes in New Zealand.

7.1.18. With the support of local lawyer Mr Tim Arnold acting for Pa Ariki and traditional leader Manavaroa Mataiapo - Mr Philip Nicholas acting for himself and Kainuku Ariki, the co-management model being proposed for Te Mato Vai is to have issues raised by landowners addressed in part by a written agreement with landowners, and in part, by drafting protections into the proposed Rarotonga Water Authority Bill currently being drafted by Mr Arnold.

7.1.19. Based on recent consultations with landowners around Rarotonga, there is overwhelming support for this co-management principle and also the completion of the project.

## **8. RECOMMENDATIONS**

8.1. Based on the submissions made to the Committee by representatives of the petitioners, representatives of landowners and the Te Mato Vai Project Management Unit staff, the Committee recommends:

1. **That** Parliament note and accept the Report of the Te Mato Vai Special Select Committee; and
2. **That** the Government through the Te Mato Vai Project Management Unit and relevant stakeholders proceed with the implementation of Stage 2 of the Project.

8.2 Owing to evident confusion on the status of the Project, the Committee further recommends:

1. **That** the Te Mato Vai Project Management Unit immediately conduct more public awareness initiatives to update the general public on the progress of the Project noting that the public can view project updates on the Te Mato Vai Project website at - <http://www.tematovai.com/>

## **9. CONCLUSION**

9.1 The Committee fully acknowledges that the priority of the government, based on the desires of the people is to get good, clean consistent water supply to all our households.

9.2 The Committee further acknowledges the sentiments expressed by the petitioners, landowners, and other stakeholders towards ensuring that the remaining phase of the Te Mato Vai Project is implemented in an efficient and cost-effective manner.

9.3 The Committee also notes the development of the new Rarotonga Water Authority Bill and keenly awaits its ensuing passage through Parliament in the not too distant future.



---

**Hon. Mark Brown**  
Chairman  
Te Mato Vai Special Select Committee