

# Children's Rights and Alternative Care

---

United Nations Committee on the Rights of the Child

---

2021 Day of General Discussion





## About VOYCE - Whakarongo Mai

We are VOYCE - Whakarongo Mai, which stands for the Voice Of the Young and Care Experienced - Listen to me, based in Aotearoa (New Zealand). We exist to amplify the voices of care experienced tamariki (children) and rangatahi (young people) and ensure they are at the centre of all matters that affect them. We are a totally independent non-governmental organisation that was codesigned by tamariki and rangatahi with care experience for tamariki and rangatahi with care experience.

We are guided by our five pou (pillars) in all that we do:

- WHAKAMANA (empowerment): We advocate alongside of and with care experienced tamariki and rangatahi, in relation to their goals and concerns
- TŪHONO (connection): We connect care experienced tamariki and rangatahi with each other through activities and local networks
- WHAKATAIRANGA (amplification): We promote the collective voice of care experienced tamariki and rangatahi so that they can influence the wider system
- WHAIPŪKENGĀ (skills development): We equip and enable care experienced tamariki and rangatahi for their future
- RANGATIRATANGA (leadership development): We build leadership among care experienced tamariki and rangatahi

For more information, please contact:

Kath Harrison  
Kaitohutohu matua (Senior Advisor) Evaluation and Research  
[kath.harrison@voyce.org.nz](mailto:kath.harrison@voyce.org.nz)

## Introduction to the Aotearoa context

Aotearoa is a colonised nation with indigenous peoples known collectively as Māori. Traditional Māori society was based on collectivist principles, with the identity and customs of each whānau (family) being strongly influenced by complex and sophisticated hapū (kinship groups or clans) and iwi (tribal) systems (Consedine & Consedine, 2012). In 1840, in response to increasing European migration and civil unrest, Te Tiriti o Waitangi (the Treaty of Waitangi) was signed between many Māori leaders and representatives of the British Crown under the guise of promoting harmony between Māori and the ‘lawless settlers’ (Consedine & Consedine, 2012). The colonising machine of the British Crown was subsequently set to work:

*“From the time of the signing of the Treaty until the mid-1970’s Māori went from being an industrious, vibrant, economically viable and entrepreneurial society successfully adapting to a rapidly changing world to a dispossessed, marginalised, threatened and involuntarily minority population in their own country.”*

(Consedine & Consedine, 2012, p.96-7)

Despite a catalogue of breaches in the 180 years since the signing of Te Tiriti, the enactment of the Treaty of Waitangi Act 1975 and the Waitangi Tribunal has highlighted the principles of Te Tiriti as “underlying mutual obligations and responsibilities placed on the parties... [which enable it] to be applied as a living document, including to circumstances not foreseen in 1840” (Waitangi Tribunal, 2021, p.9-10). These principles include ‘tino rangatiratanga’ (full authority or self-determination), via partnership, active protection, equity and options (Waitangi Tribunal, 2021).

## The climate of child protection in Aotearoa

‘Oranga Tamariki’, meaning ‘children’s wellbeing’, (OT) is the current name for the statutory care and protection agency in Aotearoa. OT was established in 2017 following a fifteenth organisational restructure in less than 20 years. This latest restructure was initiated in response to findings from a 2015 Expert Advisory Panel (EAP) report and on the back of longstanding recommendations from a 1988 Ministerial Advisory Committee (MAC) report, ‘Pūao-Te-Ata-Tū’ (Daybreak). The 1988 MAC report highlighted that:

*“The presence of racism in the Department is a reflection of racism which exists generally in the community. Institutional racism exists within the Department as it does generally through our national institutional structures. Its effects in this case are monocultural laws and administration in child and family welfare, social security, or other departmental responsibilities. Whether or not intended, it gives rise to practices which are discriminatory against Māori people.”*

(MAC, 1988, p.24)

The 2015 EAP report found that:

*“The current system is fragmented, lacks accountability, and is not well-established around a common purpose. Children in care not only experience unacceptable levels of re-abuse and re-victimisation, they also have poor long-term outcomes... the system as a whole is ineffective in preventing further harm... There is a need to address the over-representation of Māori children in the system... Potential causes of this over-*

*representation include higher levels of deprivation in Māori families, conscious and unconscious bias in the system, and a lack of strong, culturally appropriate models for strengthening families and child development.”*

(MSD, 2015, p.7)

In 2021, following several reviews and inquiries into the policy and practice of the department’s latest iteration, the Waitangi Tribunal released findings from an urgent inquiry. The Tribunal concluded that, both prior to 2017 and after, “the Crown – through Oranga Tamariki – breached its Treaty obligation to honour the right of Māori to exercise tino rangatiratanga” (Waitangi Tribunal, 2021, p.109/162). During the Tribunal proceedings, Gráine Moss (then-Chief Executive of Oranga Tamariki) had acknowledged in her 24 November 2020 statement:

*“The Crown has failed to fully implement the recommendations of Pūao-Te Ata-Tū in a comprehensive and sustained manner. This implementation failure has impacted outcomes for tamariki Māori, whānau, hapū and iwi. Further than this, it has undermined Māori trust and confidence in the Crown, as well as the belief in the Crown’s willingness and ability to address disparities.*

*Structural racism is a feature of the care and protection system which has adverse effects for tamariki Māori, whānau, hapū and iwi. This structural racism has resulted from a series of legislative, policy and systems setting over time and has degraded the relationship between Māori and the Crown. The structural racism present in the care and protection system reflects its presence in society more generally, which has meant that more tamariki Māori are reported, thus coming to the attention of the care and protection system. The impact of structural racism on outcomes for and experiences of tamariki Māori and their whānau, and on culture and trust, means that the Crown should have identified the need to tackle structural racism when establishing Oranga Tamariki.*

*Historically Māori perspectives and solutions have been ignored by the care and protection system. In order to address this historic aversion, Oranga Tamariki needs to partner and engage with Māori so together they can deliver better outcomes for tamariki Māori.”*

(Waitangi Tribunal, 2021, p.5)

The Tribunal’s inquiry concluded with the recommendation that:

*“The principles of active protection and equity require the Crown to recognise and accept that the systemic features that cause and sustain the disparities in the number of tamariki Māori being taken into State care require a major system change, together with a significant reallocation of resources towards strengthening whānau, in particular, through the use of ‘by Māori for Māori service provision’ .”*

(Waitangi Tribunal, 2021, p.22)

## Protective legislative provisions

### *Outcomes for Māori*

The establishment of OT in 2017 saw a suite of legislative reforms, one of which was the insertion of a new 'section 7AA' to the Oranga Tamariki Act 1989 which came into force on 1 July 2019. This section defines the duties of the department's Chief Executive in relation to Te Tiriti, to ensure that "the policies and practices of the department that impact on the well-being of children and young persons have the objective of reducing disparities by setting measurable outcomes for Māori children and young persons" (Oranga Tamariki Act 1989, section 7AA(2)(a)).

In order to meet its statutory obligation under section 7AA(2)(b), the policies practices and services of OT must "have regard to mana tamaiti (tamariki) and the whakapapa (genealogy) of Māori children and young persons and the whanaungatanga (familial) responsibilities of their whānau, hapū, and iwi" (Oranga Tamariki, 1989). The Act defines mana tamaiti as the "intrinsic value and inherent dignity derived from a child's or young person's whakapapa and their belonging to a whānau, hapū, iwi, or family group, in accordance with tikanga Māori or its equivalent in the culture of the child or young person" (Oranga Tamariki, 1989, Interpretation).

In order to fulfil its duties in relation to Te Tiriti, OT developed the following Mana Tamaiti objectives:

- *“ensuring the participation of tamariki Māori, rangatahi, whānau, hapū, and iwi in decisions affecting them at the earliest opportunity;*
- *supporting, strengthening and assisting whānau Māori to care for their tamariki and rangatahi to prevent the need for them to enter care or youth justice;*
- *supporting tamariki Māori to establish, maintain, and strengthen their sense of belonging through cultural identity and connections to whānau, hapū, and iwi ;*
- *prioritising the placement of tamariki Māori within their broader whānau, hapū and iwi wherever possible; and*
- *supporting, strengthening and assisting tamariki and rangatahi Māori and their whānau to prepare for their return home or transition into the community.”*

(Oranga Tamariki, 2019, p.9)

### *Best interests of the child*

The introduction of section 4A in 2019, stipulated that "the wellbeing and best interests of the child or young person are the first and paramount consideration" (Oranga Tamariki Act, 1989). As highlighted by the Waitangi Tribunal (2021), a key issue with this "is the tension that child-centric provisions such as section 4A set up with the more collective Māori worldview" (p. 151). Indeed, over thirty years prior, the MAC report (1988) stated:

*“The Maori child is not to be viewed in isolation, or even as part of nuclear family, but as a member of a wider kin group or hapu community that has traditionally exercised responsibility for the child’s care and placement... The current principle is seen in practice as negating the right of the group to care for its own or to be heard in the proceedings... The physical, social and spiritual wellbeing of a Maori child is inextricably related to the sense of belonging to a wider whanau group.”*

(p.29-30)

The Waitangi Tribunal (2021) further states that:

*“The issue as we see it, lies not so much in the articulation of the principle of the well-being and best interests of the child, but the way in which the care and protection system allocates responsibility for that assessment. Simply put, the gatekeepers are no longer Māori, whānau, and hapū as envisaged under the Treaty, but statutory social workers, court-appointed lawyers, psychologists, and judges.”*

(p.153)

### *Child participation*

Section 5(1)(a) of the Oranga Tamariki Act 1989 stipulates that: “a child or young person must be encouraged and assisted, wherever practicable, to participate in and express their views about any proceeding, process, or decision affecting them, and their views should be taken into account”. The Act goes further in requiring “that services are available... that provide them with an opportunity and support to express their views about matters that are important to them” (section 7(2)(bb)(i)) and that these services “must operate independently from other services provided under this Act” (section 7(3)).

This legislation provides the legal basis for the provision of advocacy services to tamariki and rangatahi in care by VOYCE - Whakarongo Mai. The Act extends this advocacy to the amplification of tamariki and rangatahi views regarding “the operation and effectiveness of processes and services under this Act, for the purpose of contributing to the improvement of these” (section 7(bb)(ii)), and states “wherever possible, that all policies adopted by the department, and all services provided by the department... have regard to the views of children and young persons” (section 7(c)(iia)).

While these provisions are encouraging, their conservative application in other sections of the Act serves to potentially undermine the original intent. For example, elsewhere the participation of tamariki or rangatahi is only to be encouraged “to the degree appropriate for their age and level of maturity, unless... that participation is not appropriate” (section 11(2)(a)), and, regarding the presence of an advocate, “if the person responsible for a proceeding... considers it is impracticable or inappropriate for the person providing support to be present at the proceeding or meeting, that person may not be present” (section 11(5)).

Specifically regarding care and protection family group conferences, the Act places power with the coordinator convening the conference to prevent tamariki or rangatahi from attending if they have formed an opinion that “the attendance of that child or young person would not be in the best interests of that child or young person, or would, for any other reason, be undesirable; or the child or young person would be unable, by reason of [their] age or level of maturity, to understand the proceedings” (section 22(1)(a)).

It is the position of VOYCE - Whakarongo Mai that refusal to allow tamariki, rangatahi, or their advocates to participate in proceedings regarding matters that affect them can only be justified on the grounds of safety or the infringement of another party’s rights. In such circumstances we believe alternative means of participation should always be made available in order to uphold the rights of tamariki and rangatahi. We believe it is the responsibility of convenors and decision makers to ensure proceedings are safe for and accessible to all tamariki and rangatahi, wherever possible, regardless of their age or level of maturity.

## Monitoring, oversight and redress

### *Independent Children's Monitor*

The Office of the Children's Commissioner, which we understand has also submitted, has for some time held a core function in the monitoring of OT. More recently, in 2019 the Independent Children's Monitor (ICM) was established, with an initial focus on allegations of abuse or neglect of tamariki and rangatahi in care, then the monitoring of standards of care in statutory residential facilities, with the intention for this entity to expand over time to monitor the entire Oranga Tamariki system (ICM, n/d).

The ICM had been initially set up under the Ministry of Social Development, with a view to the Monitor being hosted by the Office of the Children's Commissioner once established. The Government has more recently announced that the ICM will no longer adopt an independent position, instead being established within a new government department alongside the Education Review Office (ERO). This move has been criticised by many, including our own Chief Executive (CE), Tracie Shipton who states the alignment of ICM with ERO banishes the 'independent' body to a closed system, with a compliance-driven rather than rights-based kaupapa (purpose):

*"Establishing the ICM was an opportunity to have something profoundly different, to do right by young people, and we are disappointed by this decision. An opportunity to lead the way has been lost and we owe it to our young people to do better".*

(Tracie Shipton, CE of VOYCE - Whakarongo Mai)

Indeed, the potential watering down of the Monitor's role is already beginning to emerge through the passive approach it has adopted to assessing compliance with care standards, by being "reliant on agencies having the necessary assurance systems and processes in place, as well as the ability to supply the Monitor with information that is necessary for it to carry out its functions." (ICM, 2020, p.7). For example, two agencies "reported that they did not receive any allegations of risk of harm caused by abuse or neglect for the 12-month period. Therefore, [the Monitor deemed that] testing compliance or making a visit to one of their sites was not required" (ICM, 2020, p.8).

### *Royal Commission of Inquiry into Abuse in State Care*

The Royal Commission of Inquiry into Abuse in State Care was set up "to examine, effectively and impartially, the abuse and neglect of the country's youngest and most vulnerable individuals while in State and faith-based care primarily between 1950 and 1999" (Royal Commission, 2020, p.12). To date, the Inquiry has gathered evidence via survivor accounts, investigations and public hearings, and research and policy work, and has released an interim report on their approach, and the key themes and common issues emerging from their findings (Royal Commission, 2020).

Cabinet recently announced it has narrowed the Royal Commission's scope by "removing the requirement for it to look at modern-day care policy settings to avoid duplication with other reviews already underway" (Beehive, 2021). We are concerned this will contribute to a perception of abuse as simply occurring in historic settings, when in fact we continue to hear from rangatahi experiencing ongoing trauma at the hands of the current system. This recent decision leaves a more-than 20-year gap in the care experience narrative, risking the credibility of the Inquiry's findings and recommendations to make lasting changes to the system.

Despite already being granted an opportunity to contribute more recent experiences of abuse in State care, if those affected have not yet approached the Royal Commission of Inquiry, their opportunity has now been withdrawn. This change excludes, silences and further disempowers young people who have already been failed by a broken system. We disagree with the Government's justification for the reduction in scope, that current investigations into Oranga Tamariki cause an 'overlap' with the Inquiry, as the existing Oranga Tamariki reviews are not wide-reaching and cover the specific concerns of systemic racism and uplifts.

### *Redress schemes*

As part of its Inquiry into Abuse in State Care, the Royal Commission has heard from many survivors that "making a [redress] claim was traumatising because the response was so protracted, they were frequently disbelieved and had to relive their abuse, sometimes numerous times. Nor had they yet received the justice they sought" (Royal Commission, 2020, p.106). In response, the Royal Commission has drafted some proposed principles for effective redress and sought submissions for feedback regarding these.

VOYCE – Whakarongo Mai sought the views of care experienced rangatahi and the kaimahi (workers) who support them, to inform our submission to the Royal Commission on redress schemes. Their voices are provided in Appendix A, however can be summarised by the following recommendations:

- Provide survivors with holistic and tailored rehabilitation to meet individual needs, in order to restore health and wellbeing;
- Work with survivors to understand their needs and to provide choice in the process and in the redress received;
- The responsibility for decisions on claims by survivors for out-of-court redress should sit with an independent body, and community organisations have an important support role to play;
- Redress schemes should be designed and operated by Māori, for Māori. Any new redress agency must involve Māori survivors, non-government organisations, whānau and hapū in developing any new claims process.

The significance of appropriate redress has also been highlighted by the Waitangi Tribunal's findings:

*"It is difficult to overstate the severity of the breaches we have found of the guarantee of tino rangatiratanga... and of the principles of partnership, active protection, and options. The prejudice arising is profound... The case for substantial redress is obvious, but its form less so. While there are differences of emphasis in the redress the claimants seek, the fundamental plea is that the Crown acknowledge its failures of policy and process, accept that the 2017 reforms are not a sufficient answer, and commit to working in true partnership with Māori to transform the care and protection system."*

(Waitangi Tribunal, 2021, p.25)



## Conclusion and recommendations

In conclusion, there is a significant amount of work to be done in the care and protection space of Aotearoa. The system appears to be ripe for major reform, and there is significant appetite for solutions which progress towards fulfilling the principles of Te Tiriti. For reasons outlined throughout the body of this submission, VOYCE - Whakarongo Mai makes the following recommendations:

- THAT the Waitangi Tribunal's recommendation for 'by Māori for Māori service provision' be realised through the urgent implementation of a Māori Transitional Authority;
- THAT section 7AA of the Oranga Tamariki Act 1989 be fully and authentically implemented, including the fulfilment of the department's own objectives in relation to Mana Tamaiti;
- THAT the concept of 'best interests of the child' be more effectively understood as it applies within a Māori worldview, by those with duties and responsibilities to assess and apply it;
- THAT the legislation, policy and practice underpinning child participation in care proceedings be enhanced in order to fulfil our obligations under UNCROC;
- THAT the independent status of the 'Independent Children's Monitor' be assured through its appropriate placement outside of government departments;
- THAT the Royal Commission of Inquiry into Abuse in State Care be adequately resourced to ensure historic findings can be considered in relation to current policy and practice; and
- THAT redress schemes be revised to ensure they are fit for purpose in minimising re-traumatisation and effectively making amends to those affected by statutory harm.

## Appendix A: Summary of rangatahi and kaimahi views gathered for submission to the Royal Commission on Redress Schemes

VOYCE - Whakarongo Mai recommendations on redress schemes:

- Provide survivors with holistic and tailored rehabilitation to meet individual needs, in order to restore health and wellbeing
  - *“To as closely as possible give back what was taken” - Rangatahi*
  - *“Whatever you’ve identified as what was taken away from you, is what needs to be rebuilt and is open to interpretation from each individual” - Rangatahi*
  - *“To enable the healing journey. To provide the support to enable that healing” - Rangatahi*
  - *“There should be no limitations as to what redress might look like for each individual, whether it’s re-building confidence; reconnection with their culture or heritage; being connected to their marae; learning coping mechanisms etc. But support will need to be provided to help young people to define their process of healing” - Rangatahi*
  - *“Redress is both a process and an outcome. The process needs to be restorative in and of itself” - Kaimahi*
  - *“The type of redress must be holistic. Mind, body and soul must be healed. Along the way, different systems would be available” - Rangatahi*
  - *“An investigation into the issue, acknowledging and an apology and the support and funding to seek counselling, psychology or rehabilitation services” - Rangatahi*
  - *“When you’ve gone through trauma, you don’t necessarily know what you need to heal” - Kaimahi*
  - *“Reviewing claimants records. People who have had criminal records in their young years soon after an abuse has taken place, particularly those transitioning out of care, 16-23... The impact of their trauma is so big and now they have criminal records indicative of their experience that might ruin their lives” - Kaimahi*
- Work with survivors to understand their needs and to provide choice in the process and in the redress received.
  - *“A Kaiwhakamana (advocate) role is needed, someone to advocate for you in your process with redress” - Rangatahi*
  - *“You might not know what you need to heal but you might just know that you need to start on that process” - Kaimahi*
  - *“There should be independent advocacy for young people who have a claim” - Kaimahi*
  - *“For a young person, the [redress] process must be centred around what ‘Ora’(wellbeing) might look like for them. From the youth perspective, that would take a bit of skilful navigating” - Kaimahi*
  - *“We want to see an apology from the specific person responsible for the abuse” - Rangatahi*
  - *“An apology needs to be given by whoever is head of the institution and those in leadership roles of that faith/religion” - Rangatahi*

- *“Individuals and organisations need to be held accountable, although survivors should have the option of remaining anonymous” - Rangatahi*
- *“Responsibility needs to go beyond apology and towards an approach of restorative justice in order to attempt to put right the harm caused” - Kaimahi*
- *“If they [rangatahi] experienced harm while in faith-based care, what does that do to that core relationship with faith?” - Kaimahi*
- The responsibility for decisions on claims by survivors for out-of-court redress should sit with an independent body, and community organisations have an important support role to play
  - *“A restorative process is so individual to each person. Social workers are not always doing their jobs while a young person is in care. Rangatahi and care leavers need people to support them with accessing the support available” - Rangatahi*
  - *“Community should be taking the lead on this, rather than government” - Kaimahi*
  - *“Put money into existing community organisations, including VOYCE - Whakarongo Mai and Whānau Ora [family wellbeing initiative], to provide dedicated Kaimahi for this work and a team to be able to provide ongoing support and suggestions with redress” - Kaimahi*
  - *“There is a role for VOYCE, our Kaiwhakamana, in working alongside young people, and a role for Whānau Ora... We have to be clear about our processes and our part of the solution” - Kaimahi*
  - *“Those leading any new redress agency should themselves have lived experience” - Rangatahi*
  - *“Those in the position to make decisions on redress should themselves have lived-experience” - Rangatahi*
  - *“Any decisions made on changes to redress schemes must be made in consultation with survivors of abuse in care and those with care experience” - Rangatahi*
- Redress schemes should be designed and operated by Māori, for Māori. Any new redress agency must involve Māori survivors, non-government organisations, whānau and hapū in developing any new claims process
  - *“Māori kids are disproportionately represented in our care statistics. We must have a process that works for Māori” - Rangatahi*
  - *“How is this new redress scheme going to look different? You can say you’re going to be consistent with the principles of the Treaty but we haven’t seen this yet. If there’s going to be healing with whakapapa then we need to get on board and welcome them home. That’s not something that the Royal Commission and these other organisations can do.” - Kaimahi*
  - *“In an ideal world, we wouldn’t have to have separate schemes for Māori and Pacific Island. We just need the right people in there doing this part of the mahi” - Kaimahi*
  - *“We need to address the intergenerational effects of abuse in care. How does iwi come on board to facilitate multigenerational healing from abuse? Whānau Ora would be an amazing community provider, as would VOYCE. Government would need to provide the funds and resources if community expected to provide the extra support.” - Kaimahi*

## Glossary of Māori words

The Māori terms listed below represent complex and multifaceted concepts that are not fully captured by their English equivalents. In the interests of brevity and achieving the purpose of this submission, however, the following definitions are respectfully provided to support the predominantly international audience's understanding of the unique context of Aotearoa.

Aotearoa	New Zealand
Hapū	Kinship group or clan
Iwi	Extended kinship group or tribe
Kaimahi	Worker
Kaiwhakamana	Advocate
Kaupapa	Purpose
Mana	Intrinsic value and inherent dignity derived from identity and belonging
Māori	Indigenous New Zealander
Ora	Wellbeing
Oranga Tamariki	Children's wellbeing (New Zealand's statutory care and protection agency)
Pou	Pillar, symbolic of a traditional indigenous meeting house
Pūao-Te-Ata-Tū	Daybreak (1988 Ministerial Advisory Committee report)
Tamaiti	Child
Tamariki	Children
Tino rangatiratanga	Full authority or self determination
Tūhono	Connection
Rangatahi	Young people
Rangatiratanga	Leadership development
Whaipūkenga	Skills development
Whakapapa	Genealogy or multi-generational ancestral relationships
Whānau	Extended family group
Whānau Ora	Family wellbeing (social service initiative)
Whanaungatanga	Familial or kinship ties and responsibilities
Whakamana	Empowerment
Whakatairanga	Amplification

## References

- Beehive. (2021, April 23). *Royal Commission into Historic Abuse scope adjusted to avoid timeline delay* [Press release]. <https://www.beehive.govt.nz/release/royal-commission-historical-abuse-scope-adjusted-avoid-timeline-delay>
- Consedine, R. & Consedine, J. (2012). *Healing our History: The Challenge of the Treaty of Waitangi*. London, England: Penguin Books.
- Independent Children's Monitor. (n/d). *Ā mātou mahi – what we do*. <https://www.icm.org.nz/what-the-monitors-doing/>
- Independent Children's Monitor. (2020). *Te Manu Whakamaru Tamariki Motuhake (Independent Children's Monitor): Agency Compliance with Regulations 69 and 85 of the Oranga Tamariki (National Care Standards and Related Matters) Regulations*. Wellington, Aotearoa: Author. Retrieved from <https://www.icm.org.nz/assets/Uploads/Documents/Reports/Report-3/Third-Monitoring-Report-November-2020.pdf>
- Māori Perspective Advisory Committee. (1988). *Puao-Te-Ata-Tu (Daybreak): The Report of the Ministerial Advisory Committee on a Māori Perspective for the Department of Social Welfare*. Wellington, Aotearoa: Author. Retrieved from <https://www.msd.govt.nz/documents/about-msd-and-our-work/publications-resources/archive/1988-puaoteatatu.pdf>
- Ministry of Social Development. (2016). *Expert Panel Final Report: Investing in New Zealand's Children and their Families*. Wellington, Aotearoa: Author. Retrieved from <https://www.msd.govt.nz/documents/about-msd-and-our-work/publications-resources/corporate/expert-panel-cyf/investing-in-children-report.pdf>
- Oranga Tamariki. (2019). *Oranga Tamariki – Ministry for Children: Annual Report 2018/19*. Wellington, Aotearoa: Author. Retrieved from <https://orangatamariki.govt.nz/assets/Uploads/About-us/Report-and-releases/Annual-Report/OT1170-Annual-Report-2018-2019.pdf>
- Oranga Tamariki Act. (1989). <https://www.legislation.govt.nz/act/public/1989/0024/latest/DLM147088.html>
- Royal Commission. (2020). *Tāwharautia: Pūrongo o te Wā (Interim Report – Volume One)*. Wellington, Aotearoa: Author. Retrieved from <https://www.abuseincare.org.nz/assets/Uploads/Abuse-in-Care-Volume-One.pdf>
- Royal Commission. (2021, May 20). *Commission welcomes Government funding commitment* [Press release]. <https://www.abuseincare.org.nz/news/commission-welcomes-government-funding-commitment/>
- Waitangi Tribunal. (2021). *He Pāharakeke, He Rito Whakakīkinga Whāruarua: Oranga Tamariki Urgent Inquiry (Wai 2915)*. Wellington, Aotearoa: Author. Retrieved from [https://forms.justice.govt.nz/search/Documents/WT/wt\\_DOC\\_171027305/He%20Paharakeke%20W.pdf](https://forms.justice.govt.nz/search/Documents/WT/wt_DOC_171027305/He%20Paharakeke%20W.pdf)