

Minutes:
CAP Meeting – Northern Adaptation Area: Developing Pathways

Date: Thursday 27 April 2023
Time: 1.30pm – 5.30 pm
Location: Nga Manu Nature Reserve
(MS teams- link in invite)

Attendees:

Jerry Mateparae (Acting Chair), Donald Day, Martin Manning, Susie Mills, John Barrett, Melanie McCormick, Te Rangimārie Williams, Mark Taratoa, Kris Pervan, Deanna Rudd, Elspeth McIntyre, Jason Holland, Ashlyn Gallagher, Yvonna Chrzanowska, Stephen Daysh, Derek Todd, Kate MacDonald, Iain Dawe, Dr Aroha Spinks, Moira Poutama, Olivia Bird, Alfred Lison and Abbey Morris

Observers: Cam Butler

Apologies: Sandhira Naidoo and Jim Bolger (Chair)

Agenda Item	Comments
<p>Opening & Introductions</p>	<p>Welcome by Jerry Mataparae as the Acting Chair; Opening Karakia by John Barrett; New Iwi Representative Were Welcomed to the CAP</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Moira Poutama and Mark Taratoa have been appointed by NHOŌ to join the CAP. <p>Roundtable introduction from attendees Kris noted to the CAP that there is a significant interest in Takutai Kāpiti from Elected Members</p>
<p>Confirmation of the Minutes</p>	<p>Confirmation of the Minutes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> John motioned to move the minutes with minor edits; Jerry seconded the minutes following the changes.
<p>Update on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ngā Hapū o Ōtaki's Values Northern Adaptation Area Cultural Risk Assessment Cultural Values Report 	<p>Dr Aroha Spinks provided an update on Ngā Hapū o Ōtaki's (NHOŌ) Values and Cultural Values Report:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> NHOŌ have hosted a series of internal wānanga for NHOŌ whanau for the Cultural Values Report and iwi values. During these wānanga, Aroha shared an update about the progress of Takutai Kāpiti; Aroha noted that Te Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai (ĀkW) have requested removal of some references made to sites of significance, within the Cultural Values Report that she is writing. Aroha also noted that ĀkW are writing an additional Cultural Values Report for Takutai Kāpiti; and Aroha shared that within the April mana whenua hui for the project, John and Melanie expressed that part of ĀkW's rohe is within the NAA, however ĀkW's main focus will be from the Central Adaptation Area and further south down the Coast. <p>Discussion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Jerry asked when CAP can expect the Cultural Values Report to be shared – Aroha indicated by the end of this month, but that timing could change; Abbey mentioned that Ngāti Toa Rangatira (Ngāti Toa) are unable to engage with Takutai Kāpiti due to lack of capacity. Abbey shared that Jim will be doing regular updates at Council meetings about the CAP's work. At these Council meetings, there is typically a Ngāti Toa governance representative present;

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • John noting that NHoŌ and ĀkW will also be exchanging korero with Ngāti Toa in relation to the CAP’s work; • Abbey mentioned within the Operative District Plan 2021, it has a list of the sites of significance to Ngāti Toa which are within the Paekākāriki Adaptation Area (PAA). As Ngāti Toa will not be engaging with the project, a Cultural Values Risk Assessment for the PAA is likely to just focus on the physical risk to these sites of significance, and not include social nor culture risks specific to Ngāti Toa, as it would be inappropriate to be making such statements on behalf of Ngāti Toa. Further details will need to be consider for that particular risk assessment.
<p>Tabling Northern Adaptation Area Risk Assessment Report</p>	<p>Abbey Morris, KCDC</p> <p>The draft Northern Adaptation Area Risk Assessment Report was tabled for the CAP’s review. It was noted that the Cultural Values Risk Assessment was not included within this draft report. The report will be recirculated once the Cultural Values Risk Assessment has been incorporated.</p>
<p>Developing Pathways For NAA <i>(Facilitated information session with discussion)</i></p>	<p>Stephen Daysh, Mitchell Daysh & Derek Todd, Jacobs</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Stephen shared that the CAP needs to shortlist three or four pathways for erosion and then again for inundation for each settlement within the NAA. There needs to be multiple pathways in order to score the pathways against the MCDA criteria. In the next workshop, the CAP will do this scoring and the process of doing such will assist the CAP with determining the best pathways for each settlement. • As a starter for discussion, Jacobs prepared slides with potential pathways for the NAA based on the draft objective for the adaptation area. Using these slides, along with the NAA High-level Menu of Pathway Options, Derek and Stephen walked the CAP through determining their draft pathways for the NAA. • The CAP landed their preferred draft pathways for the NAA. This is captured within Appendix 1 of these minutes. <p>Discussion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Derek shared that the NAA has been split into four sub-areas (settlements), and then further split depending on hazard source – erosion or inundation. This does not mean that there needs be differentiating pathways between the settlements, however it might require a different pathway depending on the hazard source. This is something for the CAP to determine; • Jerry reminded the CAP that the draft NAA objective was based on the NAA community’s feedback; • Derek noted that all pathways (at all timeframes) should include an ‘avoid’ option, and this will be done through land-use planning such as district planning; • It is predicted by Jacobs, that when the long-term timeframe (approximately 50-100 years), the numbers of properties that are going to be affected are around 14 for the SSP2-4.5 scenario and 40 for the SSP5-8.5 scenario in the Ōtaki Beach settlement. This amount will be dependent on how effective the land-use planning is that will be put in place; • Jerry questioned if hard engineering protection aligns with the NAA objective. Derek responded that this a viable option for the area, however the CAP could take this pathway option off the table if they believe it does not meet the objective; • Susie questioned what the options would be regarding hard engineering protection. This was responded with flood gates, seawalls, stop banks etc from the room; • Derek shared that the CAP would need to determine what their preference is for these hard engineering protection options. Stephen noted that there will not be time for this today for each area;

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Regarding seawalls, Martin noted that the problem with sea walls is the relocation and the timing – they do not last forever. Seawalls also defers relocation of sediment (can make the situation worse in other areas) and therefore it is not an easy decision to make; • Iain commented that putting in a seawall could buy time before retreat might have to occur. Martin commented that in the low land for Ōtaki, having a seawall could improve the stop banks down the river and also pump stations could be put in. In order to determine if it is feasible, the costs of doing such need to be considered; • Derek suggested that the CAP could focus on the SSP5-8.5 scenario when shortlisting pathways, as this could create a safer approach; • Martin suggested not to use years to indicate when the pathways could change. Jerry agreed and shared the rate of increased sea level rise could be sooner than predicted; • Stephen and Derek suggested to the CAP that once they completed shortlisting this pathways exercise, triggers will be incorporated to show when the next step in the pathway needs to kick in. • CAP discussed that timeframes are less important than triggers, as it will be the triggers that determine when and what action is required. Stephen shared that with the Hawkes Bay, they made it really clear that the trigger could be short or long-term depending on the actual rate of sea level rise and when it occurred in the future; • Stephen also shared the Hawkes Bay panel recommended that the determined pathways are reviewed every 10 years in order to keep the Hawkes Bay Council’s planning relevant; • Mark advised the CAP that people who are in control of the funding and managing the pathway, will need to be consistently aware of the rate that the sea level is rising; and • Aroha shared the feedback received from Ōtaki residents, kaumatua and mana whenua, is that in the last 10 years they are seeing the rate of coastal erosion increasing, especially around Waitohu Stream mouth and Ōtaki River mouth.
	<p>TEA BREAK</p>
<p>Developing Pathways For NAA continued...</p>	<p>Discussion continued:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Stephen suggested the CAP choose a range of pathways, so they then can see how they stack up when it comes to the MCDA scoring of the pathways; and • There was discussion regarding Status Quo as a pathway option. All of the CAP agreed that just continuing doing what currently is being done is not enough when it comes to sea level rise. <p>Discussion on Draft Pathway in Ōtaki Beach Settlement (Erosion):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hard engineering protection as a pathway option that is not a preference for NHoŌ; • Derek advised if the CAP feel that the hard and soft engineering pathway options do not align with the NAA objective then retreat might be worth considering; • Martin noted that the relocation element of retreat and the timing of putting in a sea wall would be a challenging decision to make; • Derek advised increasing dune resilience as an enhance pathway could be a good option for this area. Susie backed up this comment by sharing she has seen positive results from increased dune planting • Olivia asked whether there is the possibility of doing a combination pathway of retreat and hard engineering protection. Derek advised no, as both pathways are very different; and • 4 pathways for erosion were shortlisted and agreed by the whole CAP present.

Discussion on Draft Pathway in Ōtaki Beach Settlement (Inundation):

- Jerry noted the hard engineering protection might be more specific to the rivers.
- Derek shared for scenario SSP5-8.5 and for the predicted timeline of 2130, the risk of inundation is 'extreme' for properties within the NAA. It is projected at the medium term timeframe (30 – 50 years), that 130 to 140 properties within the NAA could be affected by inundation and in the long term timeframe (50 – 100 years) potentially 170 to 200 properties could be affected;
- There was an in-depth discussion from NHOŌ and the room to have a pathway that started with accommodate. Through this discussion the CAP landed their own draft pathway; and
- 4 pathways for inundation were shortlisted and agreed by the whole CAP present.

Discussion on Draft Pathway in Te Horo Beach (Erosion):

- Derek shared that there is a similar predicted risk for Ōtaki Beach in terms of erosion;
- Derek pointed out the number of properties potentially at risk for the SSP5-8.5 scenario is around 20 houses for 2130; and
- 4 pathways for erosion were shortlisted and agreed by the whole CAP present.

Discussion on Draft Pathway in Te Horo Beach (Inundation):

- Cam Butler shared with CAP if there is a significant storm event and inundation, it would likely cut off the community for at least 3 days because of the Waitohu Stream is already so full; and
- 4 pathways for inundation were shortlisted and agreed by the whole CAP present.

Discussion on Draft Pathway in Peka Peka Beach (Erosion):

- Derek predicted in the long term there could be 33 properties at risk for the SSP5-8.5 scenario, and it is ranked as 'medium' within the risk assessment for properties. The houses in this area are in a 'strip' and are on the front line towards the beach; and
- 4 pathways for erosion were shortlisted and agreed by the whole CAP present.

Discussion on Draft Pathway in Peka Peka Beach (Inundation):

- Olivia commented that properties and infrastructure should not be the main drive to shortlist pathways. The other domains (such as ecology) need to be considered, especially since the NAA objective is particularly nature based; and
- 4 pathways for inundation were shortlisted and agreed by the whole CAP present.

Discussion on Draft Pathway Rural NAA (Erosion):

- Derek shared that the Ecological and Natural Character domains are likely going to be affected more for this settlement regarding erosion;
- Derek commented it is projected that only 8 or 9 farmhouses for the SSP5-8.5 scenario and during the medium and long term timeframe will be affected in rural NAA. Given this information, Derek suggested that maybe Status Quo could be a viable pathway option for this area;
- Stephen shared that Status Quo could be a good financial pathway for this area due to the low level of people living in the area that could be affect; and
- 3 pathways for erosion were shortlisted and agreed by the whole CAP present.

	<p>Discussion on Draft Pathway Rural NAA (Inundation):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Derek shared that under the SSP5-8.5 scenario, 70 properties could be at risk of inundation during the short term, 90 to 100 properties for the medium timeframe and 135-176 for the long timeframe. It was noted that this number has been from where inundation could touch the property boundaries only and not the actual houses or buildings necessarily. Stephen shared that Status Quo could be a viable pathway given this; • It was questioned by Iain if the land in this area is used for production. Derek commented that there is some degree of production, and it is residential farming; • Derek suggested for the CAP to keep in mind that the inundation in the area is based on a 1% AEP (1% chance in any given year of a storm event occurring) and so it would be temporary salt water flooding – it could impact grazing grass; and • 2 pathways for inundation were shortlisted and agreed by the whole CAP present.
<p>Defining Multiple Criteria Decision Analysis (MCDA) Weightings for NAA</p>	<p>Stephen started this discussion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Stephen noted that in July last year, the CAP defined the MCDA criteria and the associated scoring guide; and • Today the CAP were asked to assign the weighting of the MCDA criteria for the NAA and to provide some key reasons for their decision. • Result of the CAP's decision for the MCDA criteria for the NAA is captured in within Appendix 2 of these minutes. • This was agreed by the whole CAP who were present; and • During the process, it was decided to add a pre-statement for the Community Social and Economic Wellbeing criteria – <i>'The community has choice around:'</i>.
<p>Next Steps</p>	<p>Next Step:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Stephen noted that the next CAP workshop will be looking at scoring the shortlisted pathways against the MCDA; • Stephen and Yvonna reminded the CAP about the upcoming community values workshop for the Central Adaption Area that will be occurring on Saturday 6th May. It was expressed that the purpose of this community workshop is for the CAP to hear from the community. The information shared at the workshop, along with the results of the Have Your Say survey, will capture the 'values' of the community within the CAA. These values will help to inform the 'objective' for the CAA. <p>Meeting closed at 5:45pm.</p>
<p>Closing Karakia</p>	<p>By John Barrett</p>

ATTACHMENTS

NAA Adaptation Pathways PowerPoint Presentation – CAP Workshop 27 April 2023

NAA High – level Menu of Pathway Options – CAP Workshop 27 April 2023

NAA Takutai Kapiti MCDA Weightings – CAP Workshop 27 April 2023

Appendix 1: Shortlisted Pathways for Northern Adaptation Area

DRAFT

Draft Pathways: Otaki Beach Settlement

All pathways at all timeframes to include “Avoid” option through land-use planning



Management Unit	Draft Pathway	Short term	Signals and Triggers ¹	Medium term	Signals and Triggers ²	Long term
Management Unit 1A: Open Coast Erosion/Inundation	1 (best under SSP2-4.5)	Enhance (Increase Dune Resilience)	→	Enhance (Increase Dune Resilience)	→	Soft Engineering Protection (dune reconstruction, renourishment, scraping)
	2 (best under SSP2-4.5)	Enhance (Increase Dune Resilience)	→	Soft Engineering Protection (dune reconstruction, renourishment, scraping)	→	Soft Engineering Protection (dune reconstruction, renourishment, scraping)
	3 (SSP5-8.5 only)	Enhance (Increase Dune Resilience)	→	Soft Engineering Protection (dune reconstruction, renourishment, scraping)	→	Hard Engineering Protection (Infrastructure & Properties)
	4 (SSP5-8.5 only)	Enhance (Increase Dune Resilience)	→	Soft Engineering Protection (dune reconstruction, renourishment, scraping)	→	Retreat (Infrastructure & Properties)
Management Unit 1B: Inlets/Rivers inundation	5 (Either scenario)	Enhance (strengthen existing structures)	→	Accommodate (proactively raise floors/flood proof houses)	→	Additional Hard Protection (stopbanks, floodgates, pump stations)
	6 (SSP5-8.5 only)	Enhance (strengthen existing structures)	→	Additional Hard Protection (stopbanks, floodgates, pump stations)	→	Retreat (Infrastructure & Properties)
	7 (SSP5-8.5 only)	Enhance (strengthen existing structures)	→	Accommodate (proactively raise floors/flood proof houses)	→	Retreat (Infrastructure & Properties)
	8 (SSP5-8.5 only)	Accommodate (proactively raise floors/flood proof houses)	→	Additional Hard Protection (stopbanks, floodgates, pump stations)	→	Retreat (Infrastructure & Properties)

¹ The timeframe will be dependent on the rate of sea level rise.

² The timeframe will be dependent on the rate of sea level rise.

Draft Pathways: Te Horo Beach Settlement

All pathways at all timeframes to include “Avoid” option through land-use planning



Management Unit	Draft Pathway	Short term	Signals and Triggers ³	Medium term	Signals and Triggers ⁴	Long term
Management Unit 2A: Open Coast Erosion/Inundation	1 (best under SSP2-4.5)	Enhance (Increase Dune Resilience)	→	Enhance (Increase Dune Resilience)	→	Soft Engineering Protection (dune reconstruction, renourishment, scraping)
	2 (best under SSP2-4.5)	Enhance (Increase Dune Resilience)	→	Soft Engineering Protection (dune reconstruction, renourishment, scraping)	→	Soft Engineering Protection (dune reconstruction, renourishment, scraping)
	3 (SSP5-8.5 only)	Enhance (Increase Dune Resilience)	→	Soft Engineering Protection (dune reconstruction, renourishment, scraping)	→	Hard Engineering Protection (Properties)
	4 (SSP5-8.5 only)	Enhance (Increase Dune Resilience)	→	Soft Engineering Protection (dune reconstruction, renourishment, scraping)	→	Retreat (Properties)
Management Unit 2B: Inlets/Rivers inundation	5 (Either scenario)	Enhance (strengthen existing structures)	→	Accommodate (proactively raise floors/flood proof houses)	→	Additional Hard Protection (stopbanks, floodgates, pump stations)
	6 (SSP5-8.5 only)	Enhance (strengthen existing structures)	→	Additional Hard Protection (stopbanks, floodgates, pump stations)	→	Retreat (Infrastructure & Properties)
	7 (SSP5-8.5 only)	Enhance (strengthen existing structures)	→	Accommodate (proactively raise floors/flood proof houses)	→	Retreat (Infrastructure & Properties)
	8 (SSP5-8.5 only)	Accommodate (proactively raise floors/flood proof houses)	→	Additional Hard Protection (stopbanks, floodgates, pump stations)	→	Retreat (Infrastructure & Properties)

³ The timeframe will be dependent on the rate of sea level rise.

⁴ The timeframe will be dependent on the rate of sea level rise.

Draft Pathways: Peka Peka Settlement

All pathways at all timeframes to include “Avoid” option through land-use planning



Management Unit	Draft Pathway	Short term	Signals and Triggers ⁵	Medium term	Signals and Triggers ⁶	Long term
Management Unit 3A: Open Coast Erosion/Inundation	1 (best under SSP2-4.5)	Enhance (Increase Dune Resilience)	→	Enhance (Increase Dune Resilience)	→	Soft Engineering Protection (dune reconstruction, renourishment, scraping)
	2 (best under SSP2-4.5)	Enhance (Increase Dune Resilience)	→	Soft Engineering Protection (dune reconstruction, renourishment, scraping)	→	Soft Engineering Protection (dune reconstruction, renourishment, scraping)
	3 (SSP5-8.5 only)	Enhance (Increase Dune Resilience)	→	Soft Engineering Protection (dune reconstruction, renourishment, scraping)	→	Hard Engineering Protection (Properties)
	4 (SSP5-8.5 only)	Enhance (Increase Dune Resilience)	→	Soft Engineering Protection (dune reconstruction, renourishment, scraping)	→	Retreat (Properties)
Management Unit 3B: Inlets/Rivers inundation	5 (Either scenario)	Enhance (strengthen existing structures)	→	Accommodate (proactively raise floors/flood proof houses)	→	Additional Hard Protection (stopbanks, floodgates, pump stations)
	6 (SSP5-8.5 only)	Enhance (strengthen existing structures)	→	Additional Hard Protection (stopbanks, floodgates, pump stations)	→	Retreat (Infrastructure & Properties)
	7 (SSP5-8.5 only)	Enhance (strengthen existing structures)	→	Accommodate (proactively raise floors/flood proof houses)	→	Retreat (Infrastructure & Properties)
	8 (SSP5-8.5 only)	Accommodate (proactively raise floors/flood proof houses)	→	Additional Hard Protection (stopbanks, floodgates, pump stations)	→	Retreat (Infrastructure & Properties)

⁵ The timeframe will be dependent on the rate of sea level rise.

⁶ The timeframe will be dependent on the rate of sea level rise.

Draft Pathways: Rural NAA

All pathways at all timeframes to include “Avoid” option through land-use planning



Management Unit	Draft Pathway	Short term	Signals and Triggers ⁷	Medium term	Signals and Triggers ⁸	Long term
Management Unit 4A: Open Coast Erosion/Inundation	1 (best under SSP2-4.5)	Status Quo (continue current dune maintenance)	→	Enhance (Increase Dune Resilience)	→	Enhance (Increase Dune Resilience)
	2 (best under SSP5-8.5)	Status Quo (continue current dune maintenance)	→	Enhance (Increase Dune Resilience)	→	Soft Engineering Protection (dune reconstruction, renourishment, scraping)
	3 (best under SSP5-8.5)	Enhance (Increase Dune Resilience)	→	Enhance (Increase Dune Resilience)	→	Soft Engineering Protection (dune reconstruction, renourishment, scraping)
Management Unit 4B: Inlets/Rivers inundation	4 (Either scenario)	Status Quo (maintenance of current structures)	→	Enhance (strengthen existing stopbanks)	→	Accommodate (proactively raise floors/flood proof houses)
	5 (SSP5-8.5 only)	Accommodate (proactively raise floors/flood proof houses)	→	Accommodate (proactively raise floors/flood proof houses)	→	Retreat (Infrastructure & Properties)

⁷ The timeframe will be dependent on the rate of sea level rise.

⁸ The timeframe will be dependent on the rate of sea level rise.

Appendix 2: Defined Multiple Criteria Decision Analysis Weightings: Northern Adaptation Area

#	Criteria	Description	Weighting	Key Reasons
IMPACT CRITERIA	1.	Ecology	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> It is important to conserve ecosystems and they protect other criteria such as natural landscape, economy and social values; Maintenance of ecology directly relates to Te ao Māori values; Ecology is another form of soft engineering; Weighting ecology highly aligns with the NAA objective; and Ecology was important to the NAA community, including hapu.
	2.	Landscape	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Structures are not always there forever – they come and go; Landscape has a temporary/transitional nature – it changes over time; and Function over form.
	3.	Te ao Māori values	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The NAA community has told CAP that this is important to them; Ranking it highly is a reflective of the NAA objective; Reestablishing mahinga kia is important – preserving for the future; and Speaks to kaitiakitanga.
	4.	Community Social and Economic Wellbeing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The community has choice around: <i>(new addition)</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Health and safety of the community Certainty around future of community Social cohesion within the community Maintain the insurability of personal assets. 	3

#	Criteria	Description	Weighting	Key Reasons
5.	Public Access and Recreation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Wider community/district use of the coastal environment Opportunities for recreation Public access to the coastal environment 	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Access to the beach was the most requested topic by the NAA community; It is a core part of the NAA objective;
6.	Regulatory consenting and policy risk	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Regulatory consenting and policy risks of implementing an option including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consenting requirements; District plan changes; and Consistency with statutory framework. Carbon footprint associated with the pathway. 	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Moirā back The goal is the solutions not the ease of getting the pathways in place Need to do the best options – so be it if extra work is needed to get these pathways into action
7.	Effectively manages the risks of coastal erosion	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Effectively manages the risks of Coastal Erosion. Proportionate to the nature and scale of the risk over time. Avoids the exacerbation of risk in other areas. Approaches are supported by best practice and a robust consideration of the science/Mātauranga 	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Heart of the exercise/project Key element of the NAA objective Access to the beach and te ao Māori values have high ranking for protection from coastal erosion. NAA is accrediting currently Lesser risk of erosion impacting houses, infrastructure, assets and people for NAA
8.	Effectively manages the risks of coastal inundation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Effectively manages the risks of Coastal Flooding. Proportionate to the nature and scale of the risk over time. Avoids the exacerbation of risk in other areas. Approaches are supported by best practice and a robust consideration of the science/Mātauranga 	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Heart of the exercise/project Key element of the NAA objective There are lots of areas within the NAA that are exposed to inundation Inundation causes higher impacts across all domains within the NAA

<p>TECHNICAL CRITERIA</p>
<p>Guidance</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> All criteria must be 'weighted' on a scale of 1 to 3 (no half numbers); with 1 = lowest, and 3 = highest . Weightings are assigned to reflect relative importance between criteria All criteria are important – wouldn't be included if they weren't Weightings reflect that while all criteria are important, they are not all equally important to the task at hand The Panel must debate and ultimately agree which weighting to apply to each criteria