

LIST OF CONTENTS

Letter of transmittal.....	vii
----------------------------	-----

PART I: THE MAJORITY FINDING, BEING THE FINDING OF THE TRIBUNAL (J M ANDERSON, PROFESSOR M P K SORRENSON)

CHAPTER 1: THE CLAIM	3
1.1 Introduction.....	3
1.2 Findings and recommendations sought	6
1.3 The hearings	7
CHAPTER 2: BACKGROUND	9
2.1 <i>Report on the Te Reo Maori Claim</i> (1986)	9
2.2 <i>The Report on Claims Concerning the Allocation of Radio Frequencies</i> (1990)	10
2.3 The broadcasting assets litigation and 25–29 GHz auction	15
2.4 <i>Radio Spectrum Management and Development Interim Report</i> (1999).....	18
CHAPTER 3: THE FIRST LIMB OF THE CLAIM	23
3.1 Claimant submissions	23
3.2 The Crown’s submissions	31
3.3 The principles of the Treaty revisited	36
CHAPTER 4: THE SECOND LIMB OF THE CLAIM	43
4.1 Claimant submissions	43
4.2 Crown submissions	46
4.3 Treaty principles.....	47
CHAPTER 5: FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	51
5.1 Findings	51
5.2 Recommendations	52

PART II: THE MINORITY FINDING OF JUDGE P J SAVAGE, PRESIDING OFFICER

CHAPTER 1: THE MINORITY FINDING	57
1.1 Introduction.....	57
1.2 The claim to a resource	57
1.3 The merits of the claim	58
1.4 The second limb of the claim	65
1.5 Conclusion.....	70

CONTENTS

APPENDIX I: STATEMENT OF CLAIM 73

APPENDIX II: RECORD OF INQUIRY 91

 Record of hearings 91

 Record of proceedings 92

 Record of documents 94



The Waitangi Tribunal
Wellington

The Honourable Tau Henare
Minister of Maori Affairs

Parliament Buildings
Wellington

Tena koe te Rangatira

This is our final report in this matter. Our interim report was delivered on 26 March 1999, and we were asked to make a final report available within three months of 29 March 1999 – the date on which the auction of management rights to frequencies within the 2GHz range had been due to commence.

We held a further six days of hearings and had reference, by agreement, to the evidence given at the hearings prior to the delivery of the interim report.

You will see that we remain divided on our findings on both limbs of the claim.

We have, however, by different paths reached the conclusion that there is a breach of the principles of the Treaty.

We have not been able to agree on the nature of the breach or the appropriate recommendations.

The decision of the majority is, of course, the decision of the Tribunal.

Dated at Wellington this 28th day of *June* 1999

M.P.K. Sorrensen

Judge P J Savage (presiding officer), J M Anderson (member), Professor M P K Sorrensen (member)

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

AM	amplitude modulation
app	appendix
BAAP	Buenos Aires action plan
c	circa
CA	Court of Appeal
CD	compact disc
ch	chapter
DLR	<i>Dominion Law Reports</i>
doc	document
DTT	digital terrestrial television
F Supp	<i>Federal Supplement</i>
fig	figure
FM	frequency modulation
GHz	gigahertz
ITU	International Telecommunications Union
kHz	kilohertz
L Ed 2d	<i>Lawyers' Edition, United States Supreme Court Reports</i> (second series)
ltd	limited
MHz	megahertz
MSUAG	Major Spectrum Users Advisory Group
NZLR	<i>New Zealand Law Reports</i>
p, pp	page, pages
para	paragraph
PC	Privy Council
pt	part
s, ss	section, sections (of an Act)
scc	Supreme Court of Canada
sec	section (of a book, report, etc)
SHF	super-high frequency
TPK	Te Puni Kokiri
TV	television
UHF	ultra-high frequency
US	<i>Reports of Cases in the Supreme Court of the United States of America</i>
vol	volume
Wai	Waitangi Tribunal claim
WTDC	World Telecommunications Development Conference