

Frequently Asked Questions

Table of Contents

Table of Contents.....	1
Survivor participation	4
1. How can I get a copy of my Inquiry private session transcript and/or witness statement?	4
2. How can I get access to the photographs that were taken of me for Whanaketia?.....	4
3. How can I get access to my historical care records?.....	4
4. I was in care recently, why is my experience not included?	4
5. I gave my consent for my evidence or submission to be in the report, but I can't see it – why? .	4
6. Did the Inquiry assist survivors with legal representation to prosecute cases?	4
7. I am currently in prison, how can I get access to the witness statement, private session or survivor account I made?.....	5
8. I am currently in prison, how can I get a copy of the final report Whanaketia?	5
Terms of Reference.....	5
9. What are the Terms of Reference and who set them?.....	5
10. There have been a series of Terms of Reference changes, what did they all mean?.....	5
11. Why did the Inquiry only cover the period 1950-1999?	6
12. By not investigating beyond 1999, is the Inquiry setting a perception that abuse and neglect is no longer of concern?	6
13. What was investigated by the Inquiry?	6
14. Was there anything the Inquiry was prevented from investigating?	7
15. What did the Inquiry do?	7
16. Did the Inquiry follow the model of the Australian Inquiry by calling witnesses to be questioned - to get to the truth - rather than leaving the State or church to choose their own witnesses?	7
17. Did the Inquiry investigate forced adoption and the impact on mothers and adoptees?	8
How the Inquiry worked.....	9
18. How did the Inquiry identify survivors of abuse and neglect?.....	9
19. What is covered under the term 'abuse and neglect'?	9
20. How did the Inquiry engage?	9
21. How did the Inquiry ensure survivors' wellbeing was not further compromised through the work on the Inquiry?.....	9
22. How did the inquiry ensure that anonymity of individual contributors and their experiences was preserved?.....	10
23. How was evidence/ information / submissions documented? How did you accurately record all material?	10
24. When did the Inquiry have to report its findings for its final report?	11
25. Who decided when and how to publish the Inquiry's reports?	11
26. What happened to records received or prepared by the Inquiry?	11
27. How do I request information from the Inquiry if the Inquiry is now closed?	11
28. What criteria was used to select members of the Advisory and Reference Groups and Advisory Groups?.....	12
Compensation or redress	13
29. Did the Inquiry pay compensation or redress?	13
30. How do I claim compensation or redress from State and faith-based institutions?	13
31. Which survivors are eligible for the \$20,000 compensation from Government?	15
32. How do I get updates on whether the Government will set-up a new redress system?	16
33. How do I get more information on the public apology the Prime Minister has committed to make to survivors of abuse and neglect?	16
34. How do I get more information on a public apology a leader of a faith-based institution may make to survivors of abuse in faith-based care?	16

Inquiry members and officers (staff)	17
35. How were the Commissioners selected?	17
36. What criteria was used for selecting staff to work on the Inquiry?	17
37. How did you ensure that Inquiry staff had adequate training to engage with survivors of abuse and their whānau?	17
38. How was any real or perceived conflict of interest from secondees from State sector agencies working in the Inquiry managed?	17
39. How many people were employed by the Inquiry?	17
Costs	18
40. How was the Inquiry’s budget set? How was it spent?	18
41. What was the fee paid to each Commissioner?	18
42. What was the fee paid to each Counsel assisting the Inquiry?	18
43. What were the costs associated with decommissioning the Inquiry?	18
44. What were the additional costs incurred for the extensions in timeframes for the Inquiry that were pushed out a year from June 2023 to June 2024?	18
Whanaketia – process	19
45. Why have an Inquiry?.....	19
46. What led to the Inquiry being established?	19
47. Why did it take so long to establish an Inquiry?	19
48. How did the report get the name Whanaketia?	19
49. What does the imagery for Whanaketia mean?	20
50. Why did the Inquiry take longer than initially expected to deliver Whanaketia which was originally due in June 2023?	20
51. Whanaketia was presented in draft to the Minister of Internal Affairs ahead of the Governor-General. Why was this?.....	20
52. What happened after the report was finalised?	21
53. What was involved in decommissioning the Inquiry?	21
54. What’s happening now that the report was tabled?	21
Whanaketia – content	22
55. Why does Whanaketia reference 200,000 survivors of abuse and neglect but the MartinJenkins report talks about 256,000 – which number is correct?	22
56. I gave my evidence to the Inquiry but can’t see myself in the report, why?	22
57. I was in care, but the institution I was in does not feature in the report, why?	22
58. Why was the institution I was in not presented in a focused case study in the final report?	22
59. Why do the Jehovah’s Witnesses have a separate report?	22
60. What did the Jehovah Witnesses take court action about?.....	23
61. Why are there redactions in some of the external reports on the website?	23
62. Why aren’t all institutions mentioned in Parts 3, 4, 5 or 6 of Whanaketia?	23
63. Why don’t Parts 3, 4, 5 or 6 of Whanaketia include my experience?	23
64. Why has the Inquiry focused on historical pathways from 1950-1999 to care?	23
65. I have seen a document referenced that I would like to request, how do I do that?	24
66. The Inquiry investigated the Plymouth Brethren, why aren’t they in Parts 3, 4, 5, 6, 7 or 8 of Whanaketia?	24
67. The Inquiry investigated the Jehovah’s Witnesses, why aren’t they in Parts 3, 4, 5, 6, 7 or 8 of Whanaketia?	24
68. The Inquiry names a number of people or roles as having failed in their roles. What steps did the Inquiry taking to hold those named accountable?	25
69. Will the Inquiry’s findings result in any civil or criminal action being taken against those responsible?.....	25
Whanaketia – recommendations for the future	26
70. Did the Inquiry hear from survivors’ about their vision for the future of care?	26
71. What is the Inquiry’s Vision for the future of care?	26
72. When will know that the Inquiry’s vision has been achieved?	27
73. Did the Inquiry’s Terms of Reference put in place any limits for recommendations?.....	28
74. There are over 130 recommendations – can they be categorised succinctly?	28
75. What does the Vision mean?	28

76.	Why are there so many Recommendations?	29
77.	Who will be responsible for implementing the Inquiry’s recommendations?	29
78.	How will the Inquiry ensure that the recommendations from its report are implemented?	29
79.	Does the Government or faith-based institutions have to act on the recommendations? ...	30
80.	If there’s no obligation on the Government and / or faith-based institutions to act on the Inquiry’s report, then why does it matter?	30
81.	Why aren’t all faiths asked to apologise?	30
82.	How will the Inquiry ensure each of the faiths apologise?	30
	Whanaketia - publication	31
83.	How can I see a copy of Whanaketia?	31
84.	How can I get a printed copy of Whanaketia?	31
85.	How can I purchase a copy of Whanaketia?	31
86.	Is Whanaketia available in accessible/alternate formats?	31
87.	What languages is Whanaketia available in?	32
88.	Why is the entirety of Whanaketia not available in other languages/formats?	32
89.	I don’t have access to the internet [including in prison]. How can I read Whanaketia?	32

Survivor participation

1. How can I get a copy of my Inquiry private session transcript and/or witness statement?

With the Inquiry of Inquiry now closed, the Department of Internal Affairs is responsible for any wind-down activities of the Inquiry and is also now the holder of all of its records. Requests for the material you provided to the Inquiry should be sent to care-survivorrequest@dia.govt.nz with your name, date of birth and any other information that will assist the department to identify and locate your information, for example the name of the setting that you were in care.

2. How can I get access to the photographs that were taken of me for Whanaketia?

With Inquiry now closed, the Department of Internal Affairs is responsible for any wind-down activities of the Inquiry and is also now the holder of all of its records. Requests for the material you provided to the Inquiry should be sent to care-survivorrequest@dia.govt.nz with your name and date of birth.

3. How can I get access to my historical care records?

Te Rua Mahara o te Kāwanatanga Archives New Zealand has a guide and contact details to help you access a range of historical care documents. Please follow this link for more details: <https://www.archives.govt.nz/find-a-record/personal-records> .

4. I was in care recently, why is my experience not included?

Although the Inquiry was able to hear from all survivors, the Terms of Reference did not allow the Inquiry to examine current frameworks in care post 1999. Instead, all experiences and information received with respect to care after 1999 were considered and used to inform the Inquiry's recommendations.

5. I gave my consent for my evidence or submission to be in the report, but I can't see it – why?

The Inquiry sought consent for survivor content that was referred to in the final report. During natural justice processes some content was removed or modified.

However, all registered survivor content, and information received from engagements, was analysed to enable the identification of themes and patterns and to support the Inquiry's findings within the report and recommendations. Quotes were used as examples, and it was not possible to include everyone directly in the report.

6. Did the Inquiry assist survivors with legal representation to prosecute cases?

Lawyers provided by the Inquiry were not able to help those with a civil claim or a criminal case.

7. I am currently in prison, how can I get access to the witness statement, private session or survivor account I made?

You can seek a copy of your witness statement, private session or survivor account by writing to:

Care.Survivor Request
C/- DIA Inquiries directorate
P O Box 805
Wellington

8. I am currently in prison, how can I get a copy of the final report Whanaketia?

Copies of the full set of Whanaketia were provided to the Department of Corrections in August 2024 so that they could provide them to all libraries within correctional facilities.

Terms of Reference

9. What are the Terms of Reference and who set them?

The Terms of Reference describe the matters of public importance that were relevant to the scope and purpose of the Inquiry including dates on which some interim reports and the final report needed to be delivered. The Government established the Terms of Reference, defining what must be investigated and any restrictions.

The Terms of Reference changed over the course of the Inquiry, but generally required the Inquiry to report on abuse in State care and the care of faith-based institutions between 1950 and 1999.

10. There have been a series of Terms of Reference changes, what did they all mean?

The Abuse in Care Royal Commission was established on 1 February 2018.

Since its establishment, there were seven amendments to the original Terms of Reference as follows:

- 12 November 2018 –broadens the scope of the Inquiry to investigate the historical abuse of children, young people and vulnerable adults in State care and in the care of faith-based institutions.
- 15 November 2019– noting the appointment of Her Honour Judge Coral Shaw as Chair to replace The Right Honourable Sir Anand Satyanand, GNZM, QSO.
- 18 June 2020 – noting the appointment of Commissioner Julia Steenson
- 5 August 2021 – together with other changes, the Government removed the ability of the Inquiry to examine current frameworks to prevent and respond to abuse in care, including current legislation, policy, rules, standards and practices. It also extended the final reporting date to 30 June 2023.

- 15 June 2023 – changes were made to extend the timeframe for delivery of the final report to 28 March 2024, including limiting the circumstances where new evidence could be received after July 2023. It also required that the Inquiry’s recommendations were provided to the Minister of Internal Affairs by 30 November 2023.
- 8 September 2023– changes were made to confirm the interpretation of “in the care of faith-based institutions” that the Inquiry had taken and recorded in the Inquiry’s Minute 16.
- 28 March 2024 – changes were made to extend the timeframe for delivery of the final report to 26 June 2024. It also required that the Inquiry’s recommendations be provided to the Minister of Internal Affairs by 30 May 2024.

11. Why did the Inquiry only cover the period 1950-1999?

The government set the Inquiry’s Terms of Reference.

The Inquiry’s Terms of Reference stated the time period for its investigations into abuse and neglect in State and faith-based care were 1 January 1950- 31 December 1999.

However, the Terms of Reference also enabled the Inquiry, at its discretion, to consider issues and experiences prior to 1950, and after 1999 in relation to developing recommendations.

12. By not investigating beyond 1999, is the Inquiry setting a perception that abuse and neglect is no longer of concern?

The Inquiry was prevented by its Terms of Reference that the government set from investigating abuse and neglect of people in State care and in the care of faith-based institutions beyond 1999.

The Inquiry found that many of the factors that contributed to the pervasive abuse and neglect during the Inquiry period are not confined to the past. The Inquiry’s final report, *Whanaketia? through.pain.and.trauma?from.darkness.to.light*, is clear that fundamental changes are needed to safeguard the children, young people and adults who are in care today.

13. What was investigated by the Inquiry?

The focus on the Inquiry was to investigate:

- Why people were taken into care
- What abuse and neglect happened
- The impacts of the abuse and neglect
- The factors that led, or contributed, to abuse and neglect in care

With the disproportionate number of Māori, Pacific Peoples and those with disabilities in care, the Inquiry specifically focused on these communities, as directed by its Terms of Reference.

14. Was there anything the Inquiry was prevented from investigating?

Yes, the Inquiry's Terms of Reference prevented the Inquiry from reviewing any current frameworks and legislation (from 1999 to the present day). The Inquiry could only investigate abuse and neglect in State care and in the care of faith-based institutions between 1 January 1950 and 31 December 1999. In relation to developing recommendations, it could also consider issues and people's experiences before 1950 and after 1999.

The Inquiry's Terms of Reference also prevented the Inquiry from investigating abuse and neglect that happened in:

- fully private settings, except where a person was also in the care of the State or a faith-based institution.
- prisons, private or public hospitals, aged residential and in-home care, and immigration detention, unless the person was still in State care at the time.

The Inquiry could not review whether individual court decisions were correct. It could look at how court decisions were made in general, whether the right information was available to the court, and what laws and rules they had to follow at the time.

The Inquiry could not prosecute people or organisations, sue them or discipline them.

15. What did the Inquiry do?

Commissioners listened to survivors and their whānau, former and current staff and advocates share their experiences.

Investigations were conducted into different themes and care settings, public hearings were held along with wānanga, hui, fono and talanoa, and written statements and survivor accounts received. The Inquiry conducted research and engaged with communities.

The Inquiry's final report *Whanaketia - through pain and trauma from darkness to light* was presented to the Governor General on 25 June 2024. The report made recommendations on how Aotearoa New Zealand can better care for children, young people and adults in care.

16. Did the Inquiry follow the model of the Australian Inquiry by calling witnesses to be questioned - to get to the truth - rather than leaving the State or church to choose their own witnesses?

Yes, the Inquiry generally followed the same approach as the Australian inquiry. For example, in the State Redress hearings the Inquiry required representatives from the relevant State agencies to appear for questioning, and in one case the Inquiry insisted on one particular State witness attending to answer the Inquiry's questions. This approach was followed in the Faith-based Institutions Response hearing to ensure the right people could be called to account.

17. Did the Inquiry investigate forced adoption and the impact on mothers and adoptees?

Throughout the report there are experiences shared by women who had their children taken away from them. There are also eight summary documents that were created to shine a light on particular areas of abuse and neglect. The Women and Girls' Experience of Abuse and Neglect in Care summary document talks specifically to the experiences and impacts of forced adoptions which can be found at [Summary-Women-and-Girls.pdf \(abuseincare.org.nz\)](https://abuseincare.org.nz/Summary-Women-and-Girls.pdf)

How the Inquiry worked

18. How did the Inquiry identify survivors of abuse and neglect?

There were a range of ways to encourage survivors to share their experiences with the Inquiry. These included a public information programme to raise awareness, a series of haerenga / regional engagements across the country to learn from survivors, whānau and communities about the wider impacts of abuse and neglect in State and faith institutional care, a range of nationwide community events, working alongside existing survivor networks, and partnering with hapū, iwi, NGO and community groups.

19. What is covered under the term 'abuse and neglect'?

Abuse includes physical, sexual and emotional or psychological abuse and neglect. It includes inadequate or improper treatment or care that resulted in serious harm to the individual.

Neglect is an act of omission in care that leads to potential or actual harm. Neglect can include, for example, inadequate health care, education, supervision, and protection from environmental hazards, and unmet basic needs, such as clothing and food.

20. How did the Inquiry engage?

The Inquiry engaged with survivors and their whānau, witnesses, current and former staff and others in multiple ways, on their terms. These included:

- by providing sworn witness statements or written accounts
- by meeting privately with a commissioner or kaitakawaenga (a senior representative of the Inquiry)
- at community meetings, fono, talanoa or wānanga.

21. How did the Inquiry ensure survivors' wellbeing was not further compromised through the work on the Inquiry?

Ensuring the Inquiry's processes were culturally safe and that fit for purpose and trauma-informed support was in place was a priority. The design of wellbeing support was survivor-led so that those sharing their experiences of abuse and/or neglect and their whānau could access support that was tailored to their needs. Wellbeing programmes were established with a team of providers available throughout the country.

An example of ensuring cultural appropriateness and safety were met was the Pasefika strategy that was developed following talanoa (discussion) with then Commissioner Ali'imua Sandra Alofivae, to ensure that Inquiry processes were culturally safe for survivors, witnesses, families and the community, not only before and during their journey with the Inquiry, but afterwards. There were also talanoa around different options for survivors to present their stories, for example through a collective voice.

22. How did the inquiry ensure that anonymity of individual contributors and their experiences was preserved?

The Inquiry did not publicly release survivor names nor the names of their whānau, unless consent was provided. In some instances, survivors agreed to their experiences being discussed with their names anonymised.

The Inquiry did not publicly release submissions or the personal details of submitters.

A summary of the themes identified within submissions was released, but people's personal details were not shared.

Any person or organisation could choose to publicly release their own submission if they wished to. The Inquiry had no responsibility for any submissions made public in this way. It was up to individuals or organisations to decide whether and how to do so.

In prison settings, the Inquiry worked closely with the Department of Corrections to ensure the privacy and confidentiality of survivors was upheld. Private face-to-face sessions were held with survivors at prisons and calls to the Inquiry's 0800 number were not monitored or recorded like other phone calls in and out of prisons. Mail from the Inquiry was sent through an approved process to survivors and was not read by Corrections staff.

23. How was evidence/ information / submissions documented? How did you accurately record all material?

Evidence.and.information

All evidence and information received was entered into the Inquiry's evidence management system or information management systems. Where confidentiality was requested, this was noted in the Inquiry's systems. All evidence and information received was read, collated and analysed by an Inquiry officer and/or counsel assisting the Inquiry. Where evidence/information requested further confidentiality, this was noted in the evidence management system and the evidence/information was handled in confidence by an appropriate Inquiry officer and/or counsel assisting the Inquiry.

Submissions

Submissions received were acknowledged and entered into a database, which recorded basic information including topics covered by the submitter and a brief summary of the content of the submission. Digital records were made of any visual aids that were presented and our notes were annotated with descriptions as required.

Where submissions requested further confidentiality, this was noted in the database and the submission was handled in confidence by an appropriate Inquiry officer.

Where there was information in the submission that suggested further work was required, this was documented and referred to the appropriate Inquiry officer to action.

All submissions were read, collated and analysed.

24. When did the Inquiry have to report its findings for its final report?

The Government set the timeframe for delivering the Inquiry's first interim and final report. The Inquiry was established on 1 February 2018. There were three extensions to the delivery of the final report timeframe over the course of the Inquiry to allow the Inquiry to receive and analyse a significant volume of material. The final Terms of Reference changes required the Inquiry to report its recommendations by 30 May 2024 to the Minister of Internal Affairs and provide its final report including its findings and final recommendations by 26 June 2024 to the Governor-General.

Findings were also set out in the Inquiry's interim reports *Stolen Lives? Marked Souls.* - The Inquiry into the Order of the Brothers of St John of God at Marylands School and Hebron Trust and *Beautiful Children* - Inquiry into the Lake Alice Child and Adolescent Unit and the *Whanaketia? through pain and trauma? from darkness to light* case studies.

25. Who decided when and how to publish the Inquiry's reports?

The Inquiries Act 2013 sets out that a Public Inquiry must provide its report to the Governor-General and that the report must also be presented to the House of Representatives (the New Zealand Parliament) by the relevant Minister (in this case the Minister of Internal Affairs) as soon as practicable. It is therefore the Minister that determines when to publish the Inquiry's reports.

26. What happened to records received or prepared by the Inquiry?

Information on how Inquiry records, evidence, submissions, analysis and deliberations, and correspondence received or prepared are managed can be found in the Inquiry's final minute (Minute 30) on the Inquiry website at [Document library | Abuse in Care - Royal Commission of Inquiry](#). Evidence and submissions that are subject to non-publication orders made under section 15 of the Inquiries Act are not allowed to be published or accessed by the public.

Any individual who supplied information to the Inquiry will be able to access the information they provided through the Department of Internal Affairs at: care_survivorrequest@dia.govt.nz

Members of the public cannot access records provided by survivors or institutions that is not already publicly available due to the highly sensitive and personal information contained in those records.

Requests for information held by a public sector agency or a faith-based institution and provided to the Inquiry as evidence or submissions should be directed to those agencies.

All records held by the Inquiry have been retained and are the responsibility of the Department of Internal Affairs, as the administering agency for the Inquiry. Eventually these records will be transferred to Archives New Zealand.

27. How do I request information from the Inquiry if the Inquiry is now closed?

Requests for information held by the Inquiry can be sent to the Department of Internal Affairs at email: oiia@dia.govt.nz.

28. What criteria was used to select members of the Advisory and Reference Groups and Advisory Groups?

The Inquiry had five advisory groups and how each were established were different.

The Inquiry's Survivor Advisory Group of Experts (SAGE) was set up in 2019 to represent survivors of abuse and neglect in State and faith-based care. Nominations were sought at that time. A comprehensive safety checking system for SAGE members which included a Police and Ministry of Justice criminal history check for all members of the Group and the support people who accompanied them to meetings was put in place in September 2019. It was important there was diversity of lived experience in SAGE across State and faith based care and ensuring Māori, Pacific Peoples and Disability voices. In 2021/22 due to some resignations, a refresh of SAGE membership was undertaken and Commissioners identified survivors with particular expertise for inclusion as members.

The Inquiry's Te Taumata was set up in 2019 to represent lived experience, manawhenua interests in Auckland and Wellington where the Inquiry had offices, while other members were nominated either by the Māori Womens Welfare League, New Zealand Māori Council or National Iwi Chairs Forum.

The Royal Commission Forum was a self-appointed group of survivors, advocates and academics that was formed independently of the Inquiry. From late 2021, the Inquiry began to meet formerly and regularly with the Royal Commission Forum.

Te Ara Takatū was a self-appointed group of Māori survivors, kaupapa Māori advocates and academics that formed independently of the Inquiry. From late 2021, the Inquiry began to meet formerly and regularly with Te Ara Takatū.

Pou Tikanga were appointed by the Inquiry's Executive Director to provide tikanga and te reo Māori advice to the Inquiry. Members were chosen for their expertise.

In late 2021, to increase awareness of issues and in order to seek feedback on the drafting of interim reports and the final report, the Inquiry decided to set-up a number of Report Reference Groups. Members were chosen by Commissioners. Members were chosen for either their lived experience, and/or their expertise in particular topics, issues, kaupapa or culture.

Compensation or redress

29. Did the Inquiry pay compensation or redress?

No. The Terms of Reference did not enable the inquiry to receive claims for compensation or pay compensation.

The Inquiry was set up to investigate abuse in State and faith-based care. Under its Terms of Reference, the Inquiry was required to identify, examine, and report on the abuse of care children, young people and adults in in State and faith-based care. The final report made recommendations about how Aotearoa New Zealand can better care children, young people and adults in out-of-home care.

30. How do I claim compensation or redress from State and faith-based institutions?

For compensation-related matters, contact the Crown Response Unit which has been set up to respond to the recommendations made by the Commission, including the management of redress. Their website www.abuseinquiryresponse.govt.nz has information on how to make claims with four government agencies.

The following information relating to how to make a claim has been copied from the Crown Response Unit's website on 30 September 2024.

Seeking compensation or redress from State institutions

Currently, survivors of historical abuse in State care can make a claim with one of four government agencies (correct as at 4 September 2024):

Ministry of Social Development

if you were in care, custody, guardianship or came to the notice of the Child Welfare Division, the Department of Social Welfare, the New Zealand Children and Young Persons Service or Child, Youth and Family before 1 April 2017, contact:

- 0800 631 127 to speak with a Historic Claims staff member
- email historicclaims@msd.govt.nz

For more information, visit: <https://www.msd.govt.nz/about-msd-and-our-work/work-programmes/historic-claims/index.html>(external link)

Oranga Tamariki

Oranga Tamariki is responsible for resolving claims for abuse and neglect in state care relating to events from 1 April 2017, contact:

- email claims@ot.govt.nz
- call 0508 326 459, or
- let your social worker know you would like to make a claim.

For more information visit: [Claims for abuse while in care | Oranga Tamariki — Ministry for Children](#)(external link)

Ministry of Health

If you were abused or neglected at a residential hospital facility or in a psychiatric institution (e.g. Lake Alice), contact:

- email healthlegalexecutiveassistant@health.govt.nz
- call (04) 4962000
- write to the Historic Abuse Resolution Service, Postal - Health Legal, Ministry of Health, PO Box 5013, Wellington 6145

For more information visit: [Historic abuse claims | Ministry of Health NZ\(external link\)](#)

Ministry of Education

If you were abused or neglected at a residential special school run by the Department of Education before 1989, you can make a historic claim with the Ministry of Education, contact:

- call 0800 663 252
- email sensitive.claims@education.govt.nz

For more information visit: [Sensitive Claims of Abuse in State Schools – Education in New Zealand\(external link\)](#)

Seeking compensation or redress from a Faith-based institutions

Historical claims processes for abuse in the care of faith-based institutions – information correct as at 4 September 2024:

Please note that this list is not exhaustive and only includes those faiths the Inquiry has investigated that have a published process for claims of abuse and neglect:

Anglican Church in Aotearoa, New Zealand and Polynesia

If you experienced abuse and / or neglect in the care of the Anglican Church, you can:

- Call 0800 004 031
- Email registrar@ministrystandards.org
- Find more information at <https://www.anglican.org.nz/Complaints>

The Catholic Church in Aotearoa New Zealand

If you experienced abuse and / or neglect in the care of the Catholic Church, you can:

- Call 0800 114 622
- Email prof.standards@nzcbc.org.nz
- Find more information at <https://safeguarding.catholic.org.nz/report/>

Dilworth School

If you experienced abuse in the care of Dilworth School, you can:

- Call 0800 888 744
- Email administrator@dwredress.org.nz
- Find more information at <https://dilworthredress.org.nz>

Methodist Church

If you experienced abuse and / or neglect in the care of the Methodist Church, if appropriate you can contact your presbyter, minister or senior layperson in the first instance, or you can:

- Call 0800 266 639 extn. 824.
- Email generalsecretary@methodist.org.nz
- Find more information at <https://www.methodist.org.nz/tangata/wellness-and-safety/breaking-the-silence-on-historical-abuse/>

Presbyterian Church

If you experienced abuse and / or neglect in the care of the Presbyterian Church, you can:

- Call 0800 244 357
- Email ComplaintsandDisputesManager@presbyterian.org.nz
- Find more information at <https://www.presbyterian.org.nz/about-us/contact-us/historic-abuse>

The Salvation Army

If you experienced abuse and / or neglect in the care of The Salvation Army, you can:

- Call 04 384 5649
- Email abuse.support@salvationarmy.org.nz
- Find more information at <https://www.salvationarmy.org.nz/get-help/complaints-privacy>

31. Which survivors are eligible for the \$20,000 compensation from Government?

The Government announced on 13 August 2024 (see link: [Rapid payments for terminally ill Lake Alice survivors | Beehive.govt.nz](#)) that it will make an urgent payment of \$20,000 to eligible survivors of Lake Alice Psychiatric Hospital Child and Adolescent Unit who are terminally ill to help provide end of life care and assist with funeral expenses.

Eligible survivors are persons who were 17 years old or under and placed in Lake Alice between 1972 and 1977. These are survivors who are eligible to claim as part of the government's existing Lake Alice settlement process. The payment will be tax-free and will not affect the recipient's benefit status or other entitlements.

To apply for the payment, eligible survivors need to contact the Ministry of Health:

- email: healthlegalexecutiveassistant@health.govt.nz
- call: (04) 496 2000
- write: The Historic Abuse Resolution Service,
Postal - Health Legal,
Ministry of Health,
PO Box 5013,
Wellington 6145

32. How do I get updates on whether the Government will set-up a new redress system?

The Crown Response Unit is responsible for co-ordinating the development of advice on the government's response to the Inquiry's reports. This includes for the design and implementation of any possible new government redress system. As at 30 September 2024, the unit releases a pānui with general updates. You can register for the pānui by emailing - contact@abuseinquiryresponse.govt.nz .

33. How do I get more information on the public apology the Prime Minister has committed to make to survivors of abuse and neglect?

The Crown Response Unit has been set up to respond to the recommendations made by the Inquiry, including the management of redress and information (when available) on the public apology that the Prime Minister committed to making on 12 November.

The Crown Response Unit also releases a pānui with general updates, which you can register for. You can contact them at contact@abuseinquiryresponse.govt.nz .

34. How do I get more information on a public apology a leader of a faith-based institution may make to survivors of abuse in faith-based care?

The Crown Response Unit has been set up to respond to the recommendations made by the Inquiry, including the management of redress and information (when available) on the public apology that the Prime Minister committed to making on 12 November.

The Crown Response Unit also releases a pānui with general updates, which you can register for. You can contact them at contact@abuseinquiryresponse.govt.nz.

Inquiry members and officers (staff)

35. How were the Commissioners selected?

The Minister for Internal Affairs publicly sought nominations for membership of the Inquiry. Careful consideration was given to the desirability of the membership to have an appropriate balance of genders, ages, abilities and ethnic balance, taking into account also the need for specialist skills and experience. The Minister then consulted with relevant Ministers, including the Attorney General, and the Chair, on these proposed appointments before seeking approval from Cabinet.

Appropriate enquiries concerning probity and actual or perceived conflicts of interest for the proposed members were undertaken by the Department of Internal Affairs.

36. What criteria was used for selecting staff to work on the Inquiry?

All staff were interviewed for a role with the Inquiry by the Executive Director or his or her delegate and in some instances by a panel of two or more other individuals. All individuals that were employed or seconded to the Inquiry were assessed against a set of competencies for the particular role they were employed or seconded to.

37. How did you ensure that Inquiry staff had adequate training to engage with survivors of abuse and their whānau?

All staff supporting survivors had firsthand experience working within either social work settings, mental health experience, or had been involved looking after kids in state care). Training was also provided.

38. How was any real or perceived conflict of interest from secondees from State sector agencies working in the Inquiry managed?

During the recruitment process, the Inquiry applied a policy that all staff must declare any actual, potential or perceived interest or association in order to protect the integrity of the Inquiry. An internal panel consisting of a Senior Counsel Assisting the Inquiry and up to two senior managers scrutinized conflict of register applications and made recommendations to the Executive Director.

These were recorded for the purposes of transparency and if an interest required managing, a management plan was put in place. To avoid doubt, just because someone involved in the Inquiry had had an association relevant to their Inquiry work, it did not follow that they have any actual, potential, or perceived conflict of interest. Some situations were not clear-cut and involved questions of degree. Therefore, the need to exercise careful judgement on a case-by-case basis was necessary. A register was kept by the Executive Director and reviewed regularly.

A register was kept by the Office of the Executive Director and reviewed regularly.

39. How many people were employed by the Inquiry?

During the life of the Inquiry there have been over 400 fixed term employees and close to 50 counsel assisting the Inquiry (noting that generally most counsel assisting worked in a part-time capacity, on specific topics and for specific time periods) in total.

Costs

40. How was the Inquiry's budget set? How was it spent?

In total \$185,593 million was appropriated to support the Inquiry from FY18/19 to FY23/24. Expenditure was primarily departmental operating and capital costs. There were some non-departmental costs for Commissioner's fees, legal assistance and counselling costs

You can find the Inquiry's information about the establishment of the Inquiry, including how the Inquiry's budget was set, on the Department of Internal Affairs website.

Information concerning the Inquiry's financial position will be released as part of the Department of Internal Affairs' annual report, and annual financial review.

41. What was the fee paid to each Commissioner?

The Minister of Internal Affairs proposed a fee of \$1,350 per day for non-Chair members, which was supported by the Minister of State Services and approved by Cabinet. The daily fee for the Chair was set at \$1,400. These fees were based on working eight hours per day at an average of four days a week.

42. What was the fee paid to each Counsel assisting the Inquiry?

The Solicitor General, under the Inquiries Act, sets the fees for counsel assisting the Inquiry and the fees were based on working eight hours per day.

- Queen's / King's Counsel: \$1,800 per day
- Senior Counsel: \$1,600 per day
- Intermediate Counsel: \$1,400 per day
- Junior Counsel: \$1,200 per day

These fees were generally consistent with the fees set for other Public Inquiries established under the Inquiries Act.

43. What were the costs associated with decommissioning the Inquiry?

With the delivery of Whanaketia moving to June 2024, activity to decommission the Inquiry fell into the FY24/25 year. As the Inquiry was only funded to the end of FY23/24 this meant a need to transfer an existing \$800,000 along with any underspends into FY 24/25 from existing 23/24 budget. This covered the costs of decommissioning and ongoing wellbeing support until the Inquiry.

44. What were the additional costs incurred for the extensions in timeframes for the Inquiry that were pushed out a year from June 2023 to June 2024?

The financial costs associated with extending the timeframe for the Inquiry to deliver its final report from June 2023 to March 2024 were met within the Inquiry's overall budget. Underspends of \$800,000 identified within Vote Internal Affairs were transferred to meet operating, closure and survivor wellbeing costs as a result of the extension from March 2024 to June 2024 and for the costs associated with decommissioning the Inquiry.

Whanaketia – process

45. Why have an Inquiry?

Many people and organisations - survivors, community leaders, iwi and Māori, the Human Rights Commission and the United Nations - have, for many years, called for an Inquiry into abuse and neglect in care in Aotearoa New Zealand.

46. What led to the Inquiry being established?

On 4 December 2017, Cabinet agreed to establish an inquiry into abuse in state care under the Inquiries Act 2013. It also agreed that a Ministerial Working Group be set up to consider the potential scope and implementation of the Inquiry, led by the Minister for Children/of Internal Affairs supported by the Minister for Social Development. The terms of the inquiry were announced in November 2018, and at that time the scope was widened from covering abuse in state care to include abuse in faith-based institutions

47. Why did it take so long to establish an Inquiry?

Pressure on government grew throughout the 2000-2010s, as more and more claims of abuse and neglect in State care were brought by survivors. During the 2000s, the State's view that there was no evidence of systemic failure in State care. Many survivors were not satisfied with the way State agencies and faith-based institutions dealt with their redress claims, so they looked for other avenues to seek acknowledgement and redress, including the Human Rights Commission and the United Nations. Private individuals and advocacy groups began to pressure the Government to set up an independent inquiry into abuse and neglect in State care. In 2009, the United Nations Committee Against Torture raised concerns about how Aotearoa New Zealand handled historic abuse claims. In 2015, the final report of the Confidential Listening and Assistance Service recommended that the Government offer a public statement about abuse and neglect in State care and an acknowledgment of the wrongs of the past.

In 2017, the Human Rights Commission launched its “Never Again E Kore Anō” campaign calling for an independent inquiry into abuse in State care and a public apology from the Government. That same year, the United Nations Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination also called for an independent commission of Inquiry. In 2017 and 2018, the Waitangi Tribunal received seven applications seeking an urgent inquiry into historical grievances about Māori children in the care of Oranga Tamariki

The convergence of views, combined with the growing call for change, including through the media, led the Government to establish an Inquiry

48. How did the report get the name Whanaketia?

The report was named Whanaketia – through pain and trauma, from darkness to light by the Inquiry's Survivor Advisory Group of Experts and the Inquiry's Pou Tikanga.

49. What does the imagery for Whanaketia mean?

The kowhaiwhai design featured on the report represents the Inquiry's purpose and involvement in providing a space for survivors to share their experiences, the process of healing, the forming of relationships and the resilience and strength to move forward. The kowhaiwhai design is a view from above of two Toroa - Harongarangi and Tiungarangi. Their wings are wrapped around in a circle to represent the embracing of care and wellbeing for our survivors and their whānau. Each design element within the kowhaiwhai signifies relationships, whānau, health, wealth and wellbeing, whakapapa, protection, safety, strength and perseverance.

The ngutu kaka (kaka beak) from the kowhaiwhai pattern that borders each internal page represents the sharing of stories in safety. This protective pattern frames each page, harnessing the content within.

The colour palette for the report covers progresses from dark to lighter shades as a reflection of the report Whanaketia - through pain and trauma, from darkness to light.

50. Why did the Inquiry take longer than initially expected to deliver Whanaketia which was originally due in June 2023?

As at 30 September 2024, the Inquiry was the largest and most complex Royal Commission of Inquiry the government has ever established in Aotearoa New Zealand. When compared to recent international inquiries into abuse, the scope of this Inquiry was wider in terms of the nature of the abuse and neglect, the groups of survivors and the settings to be investigated. The Inquiry held 133 days of public hearings, heard evidence from over 2,300 survivors, and received over 1.1 million documents. The Inquiry's investigative approach evolved in response to what survivors shared, and as evidence of abuse and neglect in care was uncovered. The Inquiry had to make difficult choices about what could be investigated in depth within the timeframe and resources available and was not able to comprehensively investigate abuse and neglect in every care setting in its scope.

In addition, the Inquiry undertook complex natural justice processes to ensure fairness and balance in its reports. This included providing copies of relevant sections of the draft reports and the evidence the Inquiry was relying on to institutions and individuals where the Inquiry planned to make unfavourable comment or findings. The Inquiry received large amounts of feedback and commentary in response. The Inquiry was also a party to legal proceedings brought by the Jehovah's Witnesses in March 2023, seeking to be excluded from the Inquiry. These legal proceedings continued throughout the remainder of 2023 and into 2024.

These factors together contributed to the due date for the final report being extended three times until 26 June 2024.

51. Whanaketia was presented in draft to the Minister of Internal Affairs ahead of the Governor-General. Why was this?

The Inquiry's Terms of Reference directed that the Inquiry provide the Minister of Internal Affairs with a copy of the Inquiry's recommendations to be included in the final report. The recommendations were provided in draft to the Minister on 30 May 2024. The Governor-General received the full report – Whanaketia - through pain and trauma from darkness to light, including the finalised recommendations on 25 June 2024.

52. What happened after the report was finalised?

The Inquiry delivered its final report to the Governor-General on 25 June 2024. The Governor-General then made the report available to the Minister of Internal Affairs to table the report in Parliament as soon as practicable. The report was made publicly available on 24 July 2024 when the Minister of Internal Affairs tabled the report in Parliament.

53. What was involved in decommissioning the Inquiry?

Winding up the Inquiry involved the management of information and records to ensure it is stored appropriately and safely. More information on this can be found in Minute 30. It also involved:

- the management of the physical assets / equipment the Inquiry had required throughout its nearly six years of operation as well as the termination of office services, supplier agreements etc.
- providing for registered Inquiry survivors to make contact for wellbeing support (this was available until 30 September 2024).
- closing down all media and general correspondence channels.
- revising and finalising the Inquiry's website with material so that it could remain as an enduring record of the Inquiry's mahi.

54. What's happening now that the report was tabled?

The process following the tabling of the report in parliament is that Government and faith-based institutions will consider the report, its findings and recommendations, and then decide how to respond.

Whanaketia – content

55. Why does Whanaketia reference 200,000 survivors of abuse and neglect but the MartinJenkins report talks about 256,000 – which number is correct?

The difference in survivor numbers relates to the time period covered in the MartinJenkins report which is different to that from the Inquiry.

The 256,000 in the MartinJenkins report, is a high-level estimate of the number of people in care, and the number of people likely to have been abused and neglected in care, between 1950 and 2019.

The 200,000 survivors in the Inquiry’s final report relates to those estimated to be in State or faith-based care in the time period investigated by the Inquiry which was 1950-1999.

56. I gave my evidence to the Inquiry but can’t see myself in the report, why?

All evidence and information received was critical in informing Whanaketia and assisted in developing the underlying themes and patterns that were able to be identified. While quotes were used throughout the report, it simply wasn’t possible to present evidence from every individual that talked to the Inquiry in the final report.

There were instances where the Inquiry heard from people who fell outside the scope of the Terms of Reference. In those situations, the Inquiry appreciated those experiences being shared but was unable to report directly on any evidence provided.

57. I was in care, but the institution I was in does not feature in the report, why?

All evidence about institutions or organisations were considered, even if those institutions are not directly referred to in the report. There were hundreds of care institutions operating in Aotearoa New Zealand throughout the Inquiry period, and it wasn’t possible to reference every care institution in detail.

In some circumstances, some institutions, organisations or care scenarios did not fall within the Terms of Reference and the Inquiry was unable to report directly on those.

58. Why was the institution I was in not presented in a focused case study in the final report?

The Inquiry received information and evidence in relation to hundreds of institutions. Due to the volume, it was not possible to release a case study on each one. Instead, examples were chosen to illustrate a broad range of institutions to provide a more detailed insight into abuse and neglect in those care settings.

59. Why do the Jehovah’s Witnesses have a separate report?

The Jehovah’s Witnesses took court action against the Inquiry on the basis that they believed they did not provide care in accordance with the Inquiry’s Terms of Reference. To prevent the potential of a delay in the release of Whanaketia as a result of the court process, a decision was made to separate out most of the Jehovah’s Witnesses related content into a stand-alone case study.

60. What did the Jehovah Witnesses take court action about?

The Jehovah's Witnesses challenged their inclusion in the Inquiry. They submitted that they did not provide care and therefore did not fall within the Terms of Reference. The High Court and Court of Appeal dismissed their claims. At the time of publishing, the Jehovah's Witnesses had sought leave to appeal to the Supreme Court, and they had also filed a second judicial review challenging the content of the draft report content relating to them.

61. Why are there redactions in some of the external reports on the website?

Redactions have been made where material is considered to be sensitive, personal, legally privileged, confidential, or otherwise unable to be made public.

62. Why aren't all institutions mentioned in Parts 3, 4, 5 or 6 of Whanaketia?

All people who provided evidence and information about care institutions to the Inquiry were considered, even if those care institutions are not directly referred to Parts 3, 4 and 5 of the report. There have been hundreds of care institutions operating in Aotearoa New Zealand throughout the Inquiry period, and it wasn't possible to showcase the pathways to every care institution.

In some circumstances, some institutions, organisations or care scenarios did not fall within the Terms of Reference and the Inquiry was unable to report directly on those institutions, organisations or care scenarios. See FAQs 9- 17.

63. Why don't Parts 3, 4, 5 or 6 of Whanaketia include my experience?

All people who gave evidence to the Inquiry were considered by the Inquiry and analysed for the purpose of informing the report – even if not directly quoted. Quotes were used as examples, and it wasn't possible to include a quote from the 2,329 registered survivors or the 160 family members of survivors, 158 current or former staff members that registered and the 150 advocates, leaders and others that also registered with the Inquiry.

Sometimes, the Inquiry heard from people who did not fall within the Terms of Reference. The Inquiry did not gatekeep or prevent those people from sharing their experiences but was unable to report directly on the evidence provided. See FAQs 9- 17.

64. Why has the Inquiry focused on historical pathways from 1950-1999 to care?

Although the Inquiry was able to hear from all survivors, the Terms of Reference did not allow the Inquiry to examine current frameworks to prevent and respond to abuse in care post 1999.

Accordingly, the focus was on historical pathways to care (from 1950 to 1999) and experiences and information received with respect to care after 1999 were considered and used to inform the Inquiry's recommendations.

65. I have seen a document referenced that I would like to request, how do I do that?

The Inquiry has made a vast amount of evidence it has relied on public and available on its website. Public transparency and open justice are important to the Inquiry's work and it maximised legitimate access to material wherever possible and appropriate. The Inquiry has made available more than 1000 documents it has received and relied on in its reports and public hearings. This includes Inquiry reports, hearing transcripts and videos, witness statements, and other documents like academic research and literature, institutional evidence and other documents already accessible to the public.

You can access this material on the Inquiry's website. [LINK here] The published documents have been categorised by what report and what part of that report they were referenced in.

There is some evidence that was not made public due to the sensitive and personal nature of the information. For example, some survivors did not want their experiences made public.

In many cases, the publication of that material could harm individuals or entities or could prejudice legal proceedings.

Some survivors only agreed to publication on the condition of strict anonymity. Many of statements that are published on the website have had identifying information removed in line with the wishes of the survivor. Where they were in care and what happened to them in care will generally still be able to be read.

Minute 30 describes in more detail how evidence received by the Inquiry is to be managed [linked here].

66. The Inquiry investigated the Plymouth Brethren, why aren't they in Parts 3, 4, 5, 6, 7 or 8 of Whanaketia?

The Inquiry's terms of reference determined the scope and limits of faith-based care (see Minute 16, [linked here]). The terms of reference had criteria for individuals to be considered in the care of a faith-based institution, and the terms of reference required people to be in the care of a faith-based institution before they could be considered in part 3. Although the Inquiry received some evidence and information on Plymouth Brethren Church, it received limited evidence of abuse of children, young people or vulnerable adults being in the care of the faith-based institution when the abuse or neglect occurred (between 1950 and 1999).

However, content on Plymouth Brethren is considered in Part 7 (linked [here]) and all content was considered in the formulation of recommendations.

67. The Inquiry investigated the Jehovah's Witnesses, why aren't they in Parts 3, 4, 5, 6, 7 or 8 of Whanaketia?

The Jehovah's Witnesses took court action against the Inquiry on the basis that they believed they did not provide care in accordance with the Terms of Reference. To prevent the final report from being impacted by the court process, a decision was made to have most Jehovah's Witness related content in a separate case study [link to case study here].

68. The Inquiry names a number of people or roles as having failed in their roles. What steps did the Inquiry taking to hold those named accountable?

In accordance with the Inquiries Act 2013, an Inquiry has no power to determine civil, criminal or disciplinary liability of any person.

Findings and recommendations made by the Inquiry are not binding. The Government and faith-based institutions will consider the report and its response to the findings and recommendations will be independently announced.

69. Will the Inquiry's findings result in any civil or criminal action being taken against those responsible?

In accordance with the Inquiries Act 2013, an Inquiry has no power to determine civil, criminal or disciplinary liability of any person.

Any further steps being taken in response to the findings and recommendations in the final report are at the discretion of the Government and where relevant, faith-based institutions.

Whanaketia – recommendations for the future

70. Did the Inquiry hear from survivors' about their vision for the future of care?

The Inquiry heard about survivors' moemoeā (dreams) for the future. Survivors, their whānau and support networks told the Inquiry that they want to see an Aotearoa New Zealand where every child, young person and adult is loved, safe and cared for in a manner that supports their growth and development into a thriving contributor to society.

71. What is the Inquiry's Vision for the future of care?

The Inquiry's vision for the future includes one of the most fundamental changes to systems of care Aotearoa New Zealand has ever seen. It would see the State handing over power, funding and control of supports and services to individuals, groups and organisations chosen by collectives and/or local communities. Current systems of care will never truly serve or meet people's needs until people and communities are enabled and empowered to design, innovate, implement and control how the care systems operate.

The Inquiry sees collectives and local communities defining themselves and grouping together to design and deliver supports and services according to shared values, goals, experiences, needs, location, interests, ancestry, whakapapa, ethnicity, religion and/or culture. This is consistent with international practice, which has seen a shift towards the use of community-based services where possible, and consideration being given to how to best address the needs of and improve outcomes for whānau and communities more broadly.

Devolving power, funding and control from the State will take time. It will require several stepping stones along the pathway to get there. The Inquiry envisages that the first steps will include the care settings within the Inquiry's scope – social welfare, disability, mental health, education and transitional settings – but that, over time, other social services could be devolved to communities. At the same time, the Inquiry pictures significant downsizing and/or disestablishment of government agencies currently designing and delivering care. The Inquiry does not foresee Oranga Tamariki as part of he Māra Tipu. The Inquiry would expect to see other agencies involved in the care system, such as the Ministry of Health, Whaikaha and the Ministry of Education, reducing in size and shifting focus to supporting collectives and local communities.

72. When will know that the Inquiry's vision has been achieved?

The Inquiry's vision for the future includes one of the most fundamental changes to systems of care Aotearoa New Zealand has ever seen.

The Inquiry's vision for the future – he Māra Tipu – will be realised when the following outcomes are in place:

- a) survivors of abuse and/or neglect in care have the supports and tools they need to heal, thrive and live fulfilling and productive life
- b) the mana and mauri of every child, young person or adult in care is recognised, upheld and enhanced
- c) no child, young person or adult experiences abuse or neglect
- d) all individuals and whānau have everything they need to flourish
- e) any individuals or whānau who need support are safe, are loved, receive the supports they need, when they need them and for as long as they need them, to realise their full potential and live a good life as they define it
- f) te Tiriti o Waitangi rights and human rights protections, including those in the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, and economic, cultural and social rights, are given effect through incorporation into domestic law that is subject to a supermajority to change or repeal it
- g) whānau, hapū and iwi can exercise tino rangatiratanga over their kāinga and to care for their mokopuna, uri and whānau
- h) the human rights of Deaf and disabled people, and people who experience mental distress, are fully realised through standalone legislation that protects and strengthens these rights, including through giving effect to the United Nations Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities
- i) few, if any, children, young people or adults need out-of-whānau care
- j) collectives and local communities have the investment, capability and capacity to proactively prevent and reduce harm in their communities, and are empowered to design, implement and deliver locally led supports and services for people who need the entities and people providing supports and services are safe, highly trained, skilled and well paid, and representative of those in care.

73. Did the Inquiry's Terms of Reference put in place any limits for recommendations?

The Inquiry's Terms of Reference only allowed the Inquiry to make recommendations within only three categories:

- a) changes to redress processes (under clause 32(b))
- b) steps to address the harm of abuse in care (under clause 32(c))
- c) for changes to be made in the future to ensure that the factors that allowed abuse to occur during the relevant period in State care and in faith-based institutions do not persist (clause 32A).

74. There are over 130 recommendations – can they be categorised succinctly?

In summary the 138 recommendations can be grouped into four themes:

- a) Righting the wrongs of the past
- b) Safeguarding people in care
- c) Entrusting and empowering communities
- d) Implementing the Inquiry's recommendations now and beyond

75. What does the Vision mean?

The Vision reflects what the Inquiry heard about survivors' moemoeā (dreams) for the future. Survivors, their whānau and support networks told the Inquiry that they want to see an Aotearoa New Zealand where every child, young person and adult is loved, safe and cared for in a manner that supports their growth and development into a thriving contributor to society.

The Vision emphasises the need for a fundamental transformation in the care systems, in a future where the State has transferred power, funding, and control over supports and care services to local communities and groups. In the Vision, every whānau has the support they need to provide loving care independently and out-of-whānau care is rare. Faith-based institutions have exited direct care roles and adhere to national standards and transparent complaint processes. When out-of-whānau care is needed, it is short-term, community-managed, and focused on maintaining family connections and safeguarding children, with a clear plan for reunification.

Under the Vision the Crown has honored the promises of te Tiriti o Waitangi by ceding authority and allowing whānau, hapū, and iwi to exercise tino rangatiratanga in caring for their own. There is a focus on empowering communities to design and control care systems, with government investment in socially deprived areas to support early intervention and measure long-term outcomes. The Vision imagines a significant shift in the State's approach to care decision-making and investment, moving away from risk aversion and crisis management towards empowering local communities to provide care.

76. Why are there so many Recommendations?

The Inquiry's final report includes numerous recommendations because it aims to address complex and deeply entrenched issues involving historical and systemic abuse, including:

- a) **Wide Scope of Abuse and Neglect:** The Inquiry investigated a broad range of abuse and neglect across various care settings, including state and faith-based institutions.
- b) **Systemic Failures:** The Inquiry's final report highlights numerous systemic issues that contributed to abuse and neglect, such as lack of accountability, ineffective support systems, ineffective regulatory systems and processes and inadequate oversight. Addressing these systemic failures involves multiple reforms across different regimes and structures.
- c) **Complex Needs of Survivors:** Survivors' needs are diverse and multifaceted, ranging from immediate support and justice to long-term healing and systemic change. The recommendations cover various aspects, from improving survivor support services to reforming legal and care systems, to ensure a holistic response to these needs.
- d) **Long-term Impact:** Many of the issues identified have deep historical roots and have affected multiple generations. The recommendations aim to provide both immediate relief and long-term solutions to prevent future abuse and ensure that similar mistakes are not repeated.
- e) **Comprehensive Reform:** Effective reform requires changes at multiple levels, including legislative, institutional, and societal changes. The recommendations encompass a wide range of areas to ensure that reforms are thorough and sustainable.
- f) **Empowering Communities:** Many recommendations focus on shifting power and resources to local communities and affected groups to enhance their ability to provide care and support. This shift is a significant change from past practices and requires detailed and diverse recommendations to implement effectively.

77. Who will be responsible for implementing the Inquiry's recommendations?

The Inquiry set out in its final report – *Whanaketia?through.pain.and.trauma?from.darkness.to.light?* sets out an implementation timetable and the lead or co-ordinating entity/ies for each recommendation in Chapter 9 of Part 9. Overall it will be the leaders of the State and faith-based institutions that will need to consider and implement the Inquiry's recommendations. Everyone has a role to play in ensuring that abuse and neglect is eliminated from Aotearoa New Zealand society and for ensuring that State and faith-based leaders take action and implement the Inquiry's recommendations.

78. How will the Inquiry ensure that the recommendations from its report are implemented?

The Inquiry's role ended once the report was delivered to the Governor-General. Responsibility for accepting the findings and decisions on implementing recommendations sits solely with the Government.

79. Does the Government or faith-based institutions have to act on the recommendations?

Recommendations made by the Inquiry are not binding. The Government and/or faith-based institutions will consider the report and their specific responses to the findings and recommendations should be independently announced.

80. If there's no obligation on the Government and / or faith-based institutions to act on the Inquiry's report, then why does it matter?

The Government established and funded the Inquiry to develop an independent, authoritative and complete report into what happened to tamariki, rangatahi and adults in State and faith-based care in Aotearoa New Zealand between the years 1950-99 along with recommendations for better care.

The final report evidences over 200,000 children, young people and adults in care that were exposed to pervasive abuse and neglect, and provides over 130 recommendations on the fundamental changes that are required to safeguard those in care. The report is clear that while the Inquiry's Terms of References covered the period 1950-1999, the factors that led or contributed to this abuse and neglect are not confined to the past and without action, abuse and neglect in care will continue.

81. Why aren't all faiths asked to apologise?

Recommendation 3 asks the most senior leaders of all faith-based institutions to apologise for abuse and neglect in care.

The faith leaders who are specifically listed and asked to apologise are those faiths where the Inquiry received evidence of abuse in the care of the faith (based on the terms of reference definition) during the Inquiry period (1950 to 1999).

82. How will the Inquiry ensure each of the faiths apologise?

Recommendations made by the Inquiry are not binding. The faith-based institutions will consider the report and any response to the findings and recommendations should be independently announced.

Whanaketia - publication

83. How can I see a copy of Whanaketia?

All 16 volumes of Whanaketia is available on the Inquiry's website www.abuseincare.org.nz/whanaketia. The website has links and dropdown menus to all volumes and sections so you can click through to read each part.

84. How can I get a printed copy of Whanaketia?

Whanaketia, the Inquiry's final report, is over 2,800 pages in length and set out in 16 volumes. Due to the size of the report, a limited number of copies were printed for:

- the Governor-General and for being tabled in Parliament as this is required by the Inquiries Act.
- the National Library - as the legal deposit copy that must be deposited as a publication.
- the National Archives offices in Auckland, Christchurch and Dunedin.
- the Inquiry's survivor advisory group members and its reference group members.

Printed copies are also available in some public libraries around the country including: Kaitaia, Whangarei, Auckland Central, Manukau, Hamilton, Gisborne, Hastings, Napier, Whakatane, Rotorua, New Plymouth, Palmerston North, Levin, Masterton, Porirua, Upper Hutt, Wellington City, Tasman, Nelson, Blenheim, Hokitika, Christchurch, Dunedin, Queenstown, and Invercargill.

The Inquiry has made best efforts to make Whanaketia as accessible as possible to be read online. You can read the HTML version, or access and print a word or PDF version of the file on the Royal Commission of Inquiry into Abuse in Care website:

www.abuseincare.org.nz/reports/whanaketia

The executive summary is published in a range of accessible and alternative formats. These are: video with subtitles, New Zealand Sign Language, Braille, large print, audio file, easy read and a reo Māori translation.

85. How can I purchase a copy of Whanaketia?

Whanaketia is not available for purchase. The easiest way to read the report is to view or print from the Inquiry's website.

86. Is Whanaketia available in accessible/alternate formats?

The executive summary is published in: video with subtitles, New Zealand Sign Language, Braille, large print, audio file, easy read and a reo Māori translation.

87. What languages is Whanaketia available in?

The executive summary of the final report is available in New Zealand Sign Language and te reo Māori.

88. Why is the entirety of Whanaketia not available in other languages/formats?

The overall report is 16 volumes, approx 2,800 pages and over a million words long. When printed, paper copies of the report weigh over 14.5kg. The time and costs in translating the report in its entirety and making it accessible far exceeded the Inquiry's printing budget.

The executive summary is published in a range of accessible and alternative formats. These are: videop with subtitles, New Zealand Sign Language, Braille, large print, audio file, easy read and a reo Māori translation.

89. I don't have access to the internet [including in prison]. How can I read Whanaketia?

Full printed sets of Whanaketia are available at:

- the National Library and Archives New Zealand in Auckland, Christchurch and Dunedin.
- some public libraries around the motu including: Kaitaia, Whangarei, Auckland Central, Manukau, Hamilton, Gisborne, Hastings, Napier, Whakatane, Rotorua, New Plymouth, Palmerston North, Levin, Masterton, Porirua, Upper Hutt, Wellington City, Tasman, Nelson, Blenheim, Hokitika, Christchurch, Dunedin, Queenstown, and Invercargill.

Full sets of Whanaketia in hard copy were sent to the Department of Corrections in August 2024, to be distributed to all correctional facilities. The Inquiry was advised that the intent was for the report to be made available through the prison library service.