

From: Matt McCarten <matt@iwa.org.nz>
Subject: Re: Response to Trespass Order
Date: 28 July 2025 at 12:06:27 PM NZST
To: "Willie@waatea.co.nz" <Willie@waatea.co.nz>
Cc: Mike Tukaki <MikeT@muma.co.nz>, Tania Rangiheuea <tania@muma.co.nz>

Kia ora Willie,

After reflecting on your letter and my response overnight I suggest a practical compromise.

I actually don't wish, or need, to access to the marae on a regular basis. So there might be some middle ground.

If you pursue your present course, the police will not enforce your trespass order. I have no doubt the ERA will issue the union an enforcement injunction. Professional security agents certainly will not defy an ERA ruling, and any physical altercations against union representatives will then be criminal assault. That would bring the marae, and you and me, into a media circus if you tried to obstruct the union's access. I wish to avoid that.

As we have started the bargaining process we are required to discuss it with employees who will be covered by a CEA. Rather than the union regularly making visits onto the workplaces I'd be happy to hold a single hui on an agreed designated space on the marae to explain the initiative and answer questions. Then I will leave it to the kaimahi themselves to take the next steps, and I will stay away from the Marae unless MUMA breaks the law over its obligations under the ERA.

We will always honour any marae legitimate requests on conduct and behaviour.

I await your response.

Nga mihi,

Matt McCarten

P.S. Whilst this section is not a matter for the marae, I write it as a background to give you you a better understanding of the initiative that may help you consider a constructive way forward.

The decision for a collective agreement is driven from kaimahi who have reached out to me many times when I was employed at MUMA and since, over major concerns about how pay scales and reviews are conducted at MUMA. There is no uniform process or transparency. I have had past discussions with Mike about the lack of a transparent (or fair) salary policy. Mike said he had been charged to carry out a review of this (and other matters). I was pleased that Mike and Deborah (and Izzy) commenced the review. However in a recent discussion with Mike he said this review had ended. It seems this matter was not addressed.

When [REDACTED] raised a claim about an unilateral decision not to address her salary review, this was followed up with a disciplinary process against her. I have no doubt they are connected.

I have had several calls over recent months about this mUMA pay reviews seeking advice. I have never offered to be directly involved but offered advice, as I do for any worker from anywhere who contacts me. It seems some of the MUMA kaimahi had their issues addressed and some not. But this is not a sustainable or healthy situation for them or for me. After observing MUMA's conduct over [REDACTED] performance review it is clear the only way to resolve this matter is to bargain for a collective agreement that sets out a fair pay scale and transparent process. I only accepted membership in the last week to fulfil the legal requirements.

If MUMA has a better solution than we are open to discuss that.

On 27 Jul 2025, at 5:07 PM, Matt McCarten <matt@iwa.org.nz> wrote:

Kia ora Willie,

Attached is our response to your trespass order.

We will write to Mike tomorrow on the key issues we need to resolve with possible options on a way forward.

Matt McCarten
0295 684 422

Workplace Advocates
Level 9, Cider House
[4 Williamson Avenue, Ponsonby](#), 2021
PO Box 78-060, Grey Lynn 1245
09-390-7100

Workplace Advocates
Level 9, Cider House
[4 Williamson Avenue, Ponsonby](#), 2021
PO Box 78-060, Grey Lynn 1245
09-390-7100



Trespass MUMA Response 27 July .docx
57K

