**FINAL**
Te Kāhui Tātai Tupuna

# He Tātai Tupuna

Iwi Affiliation and the New Zealand Births, Deaths and Marriages
Record System 2022

"Whakahokia mai te mana o te iwi ki te iwi, o te hapū ki te hapū, o te whānau ki te whānau, o te tangata ki tōna rau kotahi."[1]

---

[1] "Return the authority of the tribes to the tribes, of the sub tribes to the sub tribes, of the families to the families, of the individuals to the individuals, representing, as they do, the generations of the past and present." W. Tibble, submission 58, Hui Taumata 1984.

**Glossary**

Iwi – Tribe

Mana – authority, power, prestige

Mana motuhake – independence, cultural and tribal freedom to act

Tātai Tupuna/Tīpuna – All Māori individually carry the mana of their direct line of ancestry, whether by descent or through whāngai (mana tuku). Tātai tupuna/tīpuna acknowledges the importance of this line of descent to Māori identity, and an individual's right to self-identify their iwi and hapū connections stems from this authority

Wānanga – Meetings where ideas and matters are discussed in detail, usually involving a Māori process

Whānau – Extended family

Whāngai – Tradition of children being raised by someone other than their birth parents – usually a relative. May be temporary or permanent.

Whakapapa – Genealogy

**Introduction**

This paper summarises the discussions and decisions of Te Kāhui Tātai Tupuna to the Registrar-General of Births, Deaths and Marriages on whether the government should collect iwi affiliation of Māori as part of the national and official records system.

Te Kāhui Tātai Tupuna is made up of members of iwi and Māori entities. This explains why the kōrero in this report is about more than information collection. When considering the government collection of iwi data, Te Kāhui Tātai Tupuna has also explored the importance of iwi access to iwi information, the need for iwi to verify their members, as well as how iwi data in government possession should be governed. The important voice of the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous people is also recognised in this context.

This paper has been produced as both a record of the discussions and decisions of the group, as well as a discussion document for feedback from iwi, Māori and other relevant stakeholders.

**Background**

New Zealand's national births, marriages and deaths record system is currently being modernised. The existing system is old and not fit for purpose. In 2019 a Cabinet paper and budget were approved to update the system, including adding new and useful features. The capture of iwi affiliation records is one potential new feature.

Not many know that New Zealand used to collect iwi affiliation and record it on birth certificates. Before 1960, iwi affiliation was part of the official records system. But should the state collect this now?

In 2021, the Registrar-General, Jeff Montgomery decided it was important to engage with iwi and Māori on this matter. Initial engagement included visits to key iwi and Māori organisations. Unfortunately, the COVID pandemic stopped further engagement.

Then in October 2021, the Registrar-General decided to bring a group together to explore this topic with him and his staff. Due to COVID, the meetings would be held online. Every iwi and major Māori organisation was invited to be a member of this group and to help advise the Registrar-General.

For a variety of reasons only some agreed to participate. Those who agreed to participate provided a representative to join in online. They are:

- Kirikowhai Mikaere – Chair of Tūhourangi Iwi, and lead of the Iwi Chairs Data Technical Group, and Te Kāhui Raraunga
- Mark Moses – Representative of Ngāti Apa ki te Rā Tō
- Callie Corrigan – Representative of Te Hiku Iwi Development Trust
- Taku Parai – Representative of Ngāti Toa Rangatira
- Rachael Tuwhangai – Representative of Ngāti Maniapoto
- Whetumarama Porter – Manager of Ngāti Whātua ki Orakei Iwi Records Management System, Representative of Ngāti Whātua ki Orakei

- Arapata Reuben – Manager of Ngāi Tahu Iwi Records Management System, and Representative of Te Rūnanga o Ngāi Tahu
- Lewis Ratapu – CEO, Tātou Tātou PSGE, Representative of Kahungunu ki Te Wairoa
- Willie Makea – Representative of Taranaki Whānui
- Dan Te Kanawa - Tūhono Trust
- Te Pūoho Katene – Te Pūtea Whakatupu Trust
- Dr Karaitiana Taiuru – Independent Māori Data Sovereignty Expert
- Colleen Tuuta – Member of Te Atamira Taiwhenua advisory group

The group, known as Te Kāhui Tātai Tupuna, agreed that Kirikowhai Mikaere would act as co-chair alongside Jeff Montgomery. Since November 2021, Te Kāhui Tātai Tupuna has met at least monthly – mostly online, and more recently in person. Facilitation support was provided by Atawhai Tibble.

This report *He Tātai Tupuna* summarises the outcomes of these meetings.

The engagement process has been a sustained series of wānanga over a long period of time. The discussions have been detailed and deep. Members have shared their experiences gathering iwi membership information, connecting whakapapa, working with the Crown, the challenges with whāngai, and stories about whānau searching for their identity.

Moreover, given the participants and their interests, the kōrero has been about more than the collection of information. Te Kāhui Tātai Tupuna also explored the importance of iwi access to iwi information, the need for iwi to verify their members, as well as how iwi data in government possession should be governed. There have been in depth discussions about the future of iwi data, the different experiences across the board with developing iwi register systems, the challenges of trying to get information out of the government, and clashes between privacy and the desire for iwi to see information of their members.

Many issues have been raised. Some have been addressed. Many are not. There is still plenty of work to do, and much to address through the co-design stage.

He Tātai Tupuna summarises the discussions, identifies key issues raised, and provides clear statements about what the group considers the Registrar-General should do. The key elements of the kawa that will guide all further work are expressed as pou. The directives identified so far to give expression to these pou are expressed as tikanga. This paper has been produced as both a record of the discussions and decisions of the group, as well as a discussion document for feedback from iwi, Māori, and other relevant stakeholders.

**Pou supporting the collection of iwi affiliation by the Registrar-General**

Te Kāhui Tātai Tupuna regards the following pou as the kawa providing the foundation for all further work and thinking on the collection of iwi affiliation data by the Registrar-General.

**Pou 1**

Iwi affiliation data is mātauranga Māori and is a taonga. As such, it is subject to Māori data governance.

It should be part of a Te Tiriti-based data eco system that is:

- focused on the development and support of the wellbeing of whānau and iwi members;
- founded on iwi mana motuhake, iwi control and management of iwi data; and
- supported and enabled by the Crown.

**Pou 2**

Any collection of iwi affiliation by the Registrar-General CAN NOT occur without an in-principle agreement by the Crown to share this information back to iwi.

**Pou 3**

Verification of iwi affiliation can only be undertaken by iwi or their chosen representatives, and not the Crown or its agents.

**Pou 4**

Iwi mana motuhake or independence is important and fundamental to this overall process. Iwi must be free to participate in this process or not. It is their choice.

**Directives**.

1. The Registrar-General, Births, Deaths and Marriages should collect iwi affiliation records or data because:
    a. this information is of personal and collective importance to the individual and their whānau. This information is the basis of their belonging to others, to the land, to waters, and places. These records are critical to one's whānau identity;
    b. this information is of collective importance to the iwi. It can facilitate linking with iwi and updating iwi registers; and
    c. the information is of importance to the Crown and to the nation. These records of iwi affiliation are a key part of this country's partnership, national story.

2. Iwi affiliation can have different meanings depending on the point of view, from an individual expressing their identity to an iwi recognising an affiliation claim and

confirming membership. Formal iwi affiliation records need to be verified wherever possible. The Crown must support the verification process. Until verification by the iwi concerned has been undertaken, a claim to iwi affiliation does not constitute membership of an iwi.

    a. For iwi, affiliation has important implications to their business, including social, cultural, and economic support for members and their whānau, so it is important the data is accurate.

    b. For whānau, they want to ensure their information is correct, so they are connected to their kin and ancestral spaces. However, due to colonisation and other issues, whānau information about their ties and affiliation to iwi may be incorrect or have missing pieces.

3. There are no expectations that iwi will share their own registration data with the Crown. Any choice to do so would be on an iwi-by-iwi basis.

4. Co-design in partnership with iwi is essential. An efficient, effective, and flexible approach that captures, verifies, and stores iwi affiliation records should be co-designed and built with iwi. It requires Crown support and investment. Co-design must lead to joint decisions.

    a. The system must be able to store and protect iwi affiliation data separately, as mātauranga Māori subject to Māori data governance.

    b. The system must be sufficiently flexible to provide for important changes such as the addition of new iwi.

    c. The system must be able to record and manage consents and provide opt in and opt out points, reflecting the mana of the individual and iwi Māori.

    d. The system must be able to record changes in iwi affiliation of an individual.

5. The Registrar-General should continue working with Te Kāhui Tātai Tupuna and other interested iwi and Māori to help co-design and build this approach of collecting, sharing, and managing iwi affiliation data. This should include an initial investment in an independent technical advisor to assist Te Kāhui. This will ensure the general database can be modernised, and that iwi affiliation records are collected and verified but in a way that supports mana motuhake of iwi and individuals.

6. Individuals must be given choices and supported through their life journey in identifying their iwi and sharing their affiliation information with iwi and iwi organisations.

**Discussion**

Te Kāhui Tātai Tupuna agrees in principle that the Registrar General should collect iwi affiliation records. This collection of iwi information is important for a number of purposes.

- **Primary Purpose – Whānau:** The collection of iwi affiliation data by the Registrar-General creates an opportunity for whānau to express the iwi affiliation of a baby (mokopuna) when registering their birth. This important element of expressing the whakapapa of the child is the first step of creating an identity record for them to use later in life.
- **Primary Purpose – Iwi:** The collection of iwi affiliation data by the Registrar-General contributes to improving the overall quality of Māori data managed by iwi for the benefit of their members. This purpose recognises the mana of the collective view in Te Ao Māori.
- **Secondary Purpose – Crown:** The collection of iwi affiliation data by the Registrar-General enhances the ability of the Crown to be a better Tiriti partner and service provider. It helps the Crown understand and recognise iwi Māori and to use reliable data in the co-design of better targeted services and system change.

However, Te Kāhui noted a number of important caveats to this support.

*Data needs to be shared*

While Te Kāhui Tātai Tupuna agree with the Crown collection of iwi affiliation, this cannot and must not occur without an in-principle agreement by the Crown to share this information back to iwi.

There can be no iwi data collection without sharing by the Crown back to the iwi.

*Data needs to be verified*

Te Kāhui Tātai Tupuna are clear that while collecting iwi affiliation is important, just as important is the need to verify and confirm iwi affiliation.

High quality verified iwi affiliation data is very important for iwi (second primary purpose above). It helps ensure iwi registers are accurate and enables iwi to provide services to members with confidence. For iwi, this includes a constitutional requirement to verify the affiliation of members. At times, this can come into conflict with the individual's right to express their iwi.

The verification process should be undertaken by iwi and/or any organisation they nominate to represent them, rather than the Crown. More discussion is needed around the specifics of organisations that may be involved as part of a holistic solution. It is recognised that iwi have differing capabilities and resources for this mahi.

Each iwi has its own tikanga about how it verifies the ties of any person to the iwi, and these tikanga must be respected. There may be also different levels of verification, particularly if a

whānau or individual is applying for benefits offered by the iwi to its members. Different Iwi will also have different tikanga around how they treat verification of data for whāngai.

*The Approach should be co-designed*

Te Kāhui Tātai Tupuna realise this approach requires system co-design. This is why they recommend the Registrar-General should continue to work with Te Kāhui Tātai Tupuna, and other iwi and Māori who are interested in being involved, in order to co-design the iwi affiliation approach.

*Joint governance is needed*

Te Kāhui Tātai Tupuna consider this approach requires joint governance to reflect the Te Tiriti partnership and affirm the Kaitiakitanga of iwi affiliation data that resides in Te Tari Taiwhenua (DIA). Discussions have included proposing a position with mana at the same level as the Registrar-General.

*The Crown will need to invest in this to make it work*

Te Kāhui Tātai Tupuna are aware that the modernisation of the national births marriages and deaths records system is a significant project and a major priority for the Registrar-General. At the same time, they would like to see progress made on co-designing the iwi affiliation approach.

The group agrees that all iwi should be able to participate in developing this process. But also, they have the choice to opt out entirely.

They also recommend some investment be made in an independent advisor to work for and with Te Kāhui to help support the development of the iwi affiliation approach within the wider modernisation project.

*Principles and values*

Te Kāhui Tātai Tupuna has developed some principles and values to guide co-design.

Furthermore, to guide the co-design of the iwi affiliation approach, the group have developed a set of principles and values. The principles are:

- Mana Motuhake – Recognition of the mana motuhake of iwi:
    - The approach is based on the consent of participating iwi;
    - Iwi have the right to opt in and/or out of this approach;
    - The design of the new system must enable participating iwi to have control over their own data.
- Kotahitanga – iwi also have the right to work together for the best interests of everyone.
- Partnership, between the Crown and Māori is critical, as envisaged by Te Tiriti o Waitangi.
- Investment by the Crown in this process is part of the partnership described above and is necessary to ensure the solution meets iwi needs.

The values are:
- Atawhaitia te whānau – be kind and gracious to whānau with regards to their data
- Be Good Ancestors – act in ways that honour our tupuna
- Whakapapa – this is about nurturing and strengthening connection and identity via whakapapa
- Ngākau pono – to act in good faith, with truth and honesty
- Kaitiakitanga – be good stewards and guardians of whānau and their iwi data
- Manaakitanga – care for and use iwi data in a mana enhancing way
- Do no harm can be seen as part of all the above.

*Other discussions regarding the collection of iwi affiliation*

Te Kāhui agree that birth registration is a prime opportunity for parents to express what they understand about the identity of the mokopuna. In fact, it may be an option that should be available to a person at a number of points of their life.

At the same time, verification should not occur instantaneously. Using a birth registration as an example, in the interests of manaakitanga, the parents should be allowed to simply provide the information they know. Having a third party (e.g. an iwi organisation) intervene at this point and question the information they provide could be unhelpful and could cause whakamā. Registering the birth of a baby (mokopuna) provides a valuable touch point with whānau. They could be offered the option of providing iwi affiliation information at this point, on the understanding it will be passed on to the iwi they reference (provided those iwi have agreed to participate). The iwi could then take whatever steps they need to confirm the affiliation of the mokopuna to the iwi.

*The use of Tātai Tūpuna*

Te Kāhui Tātai Tupuna discussed the use of the term 'tātai tūpuna', rather than whakapapa, when considering the role of the Registrar-General in collecting iwi affiliation data.

The information collected by the Registrar-General has the potential to be used to help identify parents and grandparents, as the immediate tātai tūpuna of a person.

The question of the status of whāngai and adopted Māori is a question that is expected to need further exploration over time. The view of Te Kāhui at this point is that the validation of any iwi affiliation claim of someone who is whāngai or adopted is a matter for the mana motuhake of each iwi involved in validating a claim.

*How is an iwi defined for the purpose of iwi affiliation data?*

Te Kāhui agreed that the Tatauranga Aotearoa / Stats NZ standard definition of iwi should be used by the Registrar-General when collecting iwi affiliation data, e.g. at birth. It is acknowledged that this standard is currently under review, and an updated version is expected in 2023. At least one member of Te Kāhui is working with Tatauranga Aotearoa on this review.

The Registrar-General should use the standard set of iwi affiliation codes provided by Tatauranga Aotearoa. As this list of codes changes over time, the Registrar-General will need to be able to update the codes and fields used to collect information provided about iwi affiliation.

If this standard changes to include hapū in the future, a full engagement process will be conducted to discuss this. In the meantime, any information that is provided that falls outside of the standard will be collected as free text and shared with Tatauranga Aotearoa for their consideration in their ongoing reviews of the standard.

*Mana of the person – consent processes*

The mana of a person around access to their iwi affiliation data can best be protected by giving them choice. A good way of honouring their mana would be asking for the consent of the individual (or parents, in the case of a birth) for the iwi affiliation to be shared with the named iwi. A person should be able to share validated data about themself to help verify *their identity.*

*Consent or opt out?*

Another option would be for a person or their parents to consciously opt out of having the information provided shared with the named iwi. This could make the process simpler for whānau who have not been active in seeking connection with their iwi. Te Kāhui is keen to avoid unnecessary barriers.

*Mana of the iwi*

If an iwi is named in iwi affiliation data, it should always have access to that information if it is presented in a way where a person cannot be identified (for example, aggregated data).

Consent of the person or parents could provide permission to share information with iwi and nominated organisations. If this information is not passed to iwi, they will not be aware that there is an affiliation claim.

*Trust as a key consideration*

Te Kāhui identified trust as a critical factor to be considered when designing processes to provide access to iwi affiliation data. If members of iwi do not trust the process or the organisation(s) involved, they will be reluctant to provide information about iwi affiliations. Trust in the Crown is generally low in this context, but it is already necessary to provide information about the birth of a baby, in order to access government services. Respected elders such as aunties also play a significant role in encouraging whānau to register with their iwi.

Transparent consent processes that clearly show which organisation's information will be shared with, and that give people choices, can help to build trust. Transparent information about ownership of the information will also be important for getting people's participation.

*What kinds of organisation could be involved in holding and sharing data?*

It is expected that mandated iwi groups who have gone through the process to be defined as an iwi or iwi organisations would be involved in the collection and holding of iwi affiliation data. Te Kāhui discussed the fact that structures such as rūnanga and Post Settlement Governance Entities (PGSEs) are not indigenous constructs, although some iwi have had significant input into the design of their own organisations. There is a degree of conflict between the concept of a PSGE and that of being descended from a tūpuna or a waka. While the ideal will be to reach a point over time where iwi affiliation data is managed through structures that better reflect iwi Māori, initial steps will likely need to include current forms of organisation. The nature of organisations involved will need to be considered carefully so trust is not eroded, and all Māori can participate if they wish.

There has been some discussion around which organisations could perform these processes. Some iwi or iwi-linked entities have the capability and resources to do this mahi; others may not.

One option discussed is having an organisation (an 'infomediary') undertake this mahi on behalf of iwi. Another possibility is for some iwi, or one or more iwi intermediaries, to do this mahi on behalf of others, by arrangement. While there may be a need to involve a third-party intermediary, this should not be allowed to interfere with the Tiriti relationship between iwi and the Crown.

*What about whānau who do not want to engage with PSGE?*

Te Kāhui noted that some whānau may not wish to engage with PSGE and other organisations established as the result of settlement processes. This stance is likely to be associated with whānau who are politically aware and active. Some whānau might also be more comfortable dealing with an urban Māori organisation or the Kīngitanga. Consideration will need to be given to how design can avoid excluding such whānau from participation.

*Should information flow back to the Registrar-General?*

Subject to important conditions, Te Kāhui has tentatively endorsed the flow of agreed information back to the Registrar-General. The most important condition is that there will be no expectation that iwi should share validated information with the Registrar-General. If an iwi does choose to share any information, that would be their decision.

The information flow would make sense only if the Registrar-General is working in partnership with iwi Māori and there is value for both partners. If the flow of data back to the Registrar-General helps to achieve the primary purposes (see start of document), then it's a probable 'yes', provided iwi have clear ownership of the data.

For some, this will be an issue of trust. Iwi Māori will hold and govern the information about iwi affiliation. If the Registrar-General is notified by iwi when data is validated, the Crown

could update the status of that information. If the Crown has up-to-date information about iwi affiliation, at least at an aggregated level, it can be called to account for providing appropriate services to iwi Māori.

*What happens with unvalidated data?*

The information should be held at whatever status applies so it can be shared and/or verified as appropriate when consent is given, or an iwi joins the system.

*The Crown may be able to contribute to the verification process*

If the Registrar-General can verify the tātai tūpuna of a mokopuna, i.e. the linkages to their parents and possibly grandparents, this could help iwi with their own verification processes and with data quality. It could also help whānau to identify their own iwi affiliations, particularly in cases where connections have been lost.

However, Te Kāhui is clear that verification of iwi affiliation is ultimately a matter for iwi.

*People need to be able to change their iwi affiliation data*

Te Kāhui recognises the reality that there are many whānau who don't have good or complete knowledge about their iwi affiliations. People will need to be able to change their data over time.

*Keeping iwi affiliation information up to date and coordinated*

Te Kāhui has raised the point that, if there are multiple points of data collection and/or places where data is updated, it could be difficult to reconcile the data. This could have an unintended impact on the understanding of future generations.

Many people will affiliate to more than one iwi (the average for Tūhono is 3.1 iwi per person). There is recognised complexity in considering how this information can best be coordinated and kept consistent and up to date. As information is updated, the person providing the new information may also want this to be shared (e.g. with iwi organisations and possibly government agencies). If updates can be sent to government agencies that hold iwi affiliation information, even if not at the level of identified individuals, this could strengthen the ability of the Crown to provide appropriate services to iwi Māori.

One suggestion is to have a coordinated virtual dataset that could be held at a centralised location. This approach would require considerable technology investment. Another approach would be a networked approach that automatically updates information as it changes. The design will need to be dynamic and cope with future changes.

*How can a long-term approach be resourced?*

Te Kāhui has discussed the need for long-term thinking about how a solution for recording and appropriately sharing iwi affiliation data could be resourced. This would form an important foundation for allowing individuals to establish a verified identity, and proof of their existence for online services. It is important to think carefully about the design, as it

will have impacts on future generations. It is also important to break the journey to the vision into manageable chunks and ensure the mana of processes and data is upheld.

Broader thinking about a long-term solution or solutions could include elements such as:

- Scalability, so that the solution can meet the needs of a wide range of iwi
- Flexibility so that new information can be added or updated (e.g. newly recognised iwi)
- Including a broader range of information sources and hononga (e.g. native schools, church records, other verified databases)
- Including some way of updating all nominated organisations with information updates (using the consent of the person)
- Whether and how non-iwi organisations could participate, and under what conditions.

*When should the Registrar-General start collecting iwi affiliation information?*

Te Kāhui has discussed the balance between getting started as soon as possible, and getting a perfect solution. The general view is that it will be better to start with an imperfect solution that can evolve incrementally over time, rather than waiting for all elements of a solution to be fully in place.

At the same time, the Registrar General needs to also be moving in the right direction of travel when it comes to enabling iwi access to this data. There can be no excuses or bureaucratic reasons for not enabling iwi access to iwi affiliation data. Work on both these fronts need to be occurring at the same time.

It is also important to look towards a fuller long-term solution. This will include addressing questions around the investment required at both a system level and to enable iwi to participate. The role of the Crown in supporting and resourcing an elegant solution that benefits iwi Māori and Crown agencies needs to be considered when there is a clear, agreed view about the features of that solution.

*Digital arrangements between Te Tiriti partners*

Te Kāhui discussed the long-term unevenness of investment in digital and data infrastructure between the Crown and iwi Māori. The aim of a long-term solution is an equitable investment by the Crown into iwi systems that are responsive to iwi aspirations. Iwi are also at different stages of development and are using a very wide range of solutions for their own data, including spreadsheets, bespoke solutions and offshore systems. Given this complexity, a multi-phased development approach would allow a solution to move with the capability and capacity of iwi Māori to participate. This would also need Crown funding investment. It will be important for the Crown to approach implementation and funding in a way that ensures smaller iwi are equally able to participate, should they choose to, and to avoid exacerbating any existing inequalities.

*Investing to succeed*

Members of Te Kāhui are aware of the risks that can result from inadequate investment in robust data quality and systems, which can ultimately result in major reputational and legal issues. The right level of investment is also needed to ensure systems are developed in such a way that they help whānau to participate. This view has been strongly endorsed in feedback on the draft report.

It is important for the Crown to support iwi to succeed. In addition to financial investment, shared values, trust and respect are important success factors. This will be helped where the Crown is able to release power and build partnership and strengthen relationships with each iwi. It will be critical for Iwi to retain tino rangatiratanga over their own data.

Te Kāhui has also made that point that an investment in the success of iwi brings positive returns to the Crown as well, so should be considered a positive investment. Whānau participating in their iwi may be attracted by the benefits that come with settlement, but over time benefit from a cultural identity. The human connection needs to be included alongside the technology for this to succeed.

*Tātai Hono Certificate*

Another member of Te Kāhui presented an idea concerning the provision of special certificates. A "Tātai Hono" certificate would include all the information provided in a birth certificate but also include additional information pertaining to the parents and grandparents of the natural mother and father of the person the certificate relates to.

A Tātai Hono certificate would provide an official record to confirm an individual's direct genealogy over at least four generations to provide a reliable evidence base to support a robust process for identifying:

- Tupuna from which a person can claim Māori descent
- Tupuna from which iwi affiliations are derived and claimed.

The Tātai Hono certificate would provide a robust basis to assist iwi in verifying iwi affiliations.

This certificate is linked to a wider discussion about a dedicated Te Ao Māori digital repository, and an iwi managed and controlled data system that brings together government and iwi information and could ultimately provide a Tātai Tūpuna certificate to an applicant that could also confirm iwi membership.

Te Kāhui supported this idea.

*Data architecture*

A member of Te Kāhui presented a flow chart explaining a potential approach to data sharing between Crown, iwi and an intermediary. This diagram is attached.

Te Kāhui supported this idea.

**Next steps**

This report was open for feedback from August to November 2022 and has now been revised on the basis of feedback.

The report went to the National Iwi Chairs Forum for endorsement and to the Minister of Internal Affairs in February 2023.

Te Kāhui and Te Tari Taiwhenua will continue to work together to action the decisions included in the report.