



4 September 2026

OIA 0105



Tēnā koe

I refer to your request received on 17 August 2026, which has been considered under the Official Information Act 1982 (OIA). For ease of reference, I have attached your request to this response. We understand your request is asking specifically for advice provided to the Lead Coordination Minister.

Response to your request

Please find the below table of documents along with my decision on each document within scope of parts one and three of your request. Additionally, the table below answers part seven of your request.

Item	Date	Document Description	Decision
001	10/12/2025	Advice paper – Appendix one: Abuse in Care Ministerial Advisory Group advice on wider and non-State Redress decisions*	Released in full
002	20/11/2025	Advice paper – Redress offerings: Ministerial Advisory Group recommendations	Released in full

**Please note, document 001 is an appendix to a Cover Note provided to Hon Erica Stanford. The Cover Note and other appendices are outside the scope of your request.*

I have decided to refuse all other parts of your request under section 18(e) of the OIA as the information you have requested does not exist.

We may publish this OIA response on www.abuseinquiryresponse.govt.nz (with your personal details having been removed). Publishing responses to OIA requests increases the availability of information to the public and is consistent with the purpose of the OIA to enable effective participation in the making and administration of law and policies, and to promote the accountability of Ministers and officials.

You have the right to seek an investigation and review by the Ombudsman of this decision. Information about how to make a complaint is available via www.ombudsman.parliament.nz or freephone 0800 802 602.

Nāku noa, nā

John Henderson
General Manager Enabling Services

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Crown Response Office OIA](#)
Subject: Official Information Act request – Ministerial Advisory Group advice on redress
Date: Sunday, 16 August 2026 6:34:44 pm

This email was sent from someone outside of Te Kawa Mataaho. Please take extra care.

Tēnā koutou,

I am writing to request information under the Official Information Act 1982 relating specifically to advice and recommendations provided to Hon Erica Stanford by the Ministerial Advisory Group established to advise the Government on its response to the Royal Commission of Inquiry into Historical Abuse in State Care and in the Care of Faith-based Institutions, insofar as that advice relates to redress for survivors.

I request the following information:

1. All advice, recommendations, reports, briefings, memoranda, papers, presentations, correspondence or other material provided by the Ministerial Advisory Group to Hon Erica Stanford concerning the Government's approach to redress for survivors.
2. All interim, draft and final reports or recommendations prepared by the Ministerial Advisory Group concerning redress, including material subsequently amended, superseded or not adopted.
3. All advice or recommendations from the Ministerial Advisory Group concerning:
 - the design and structure of the Government's redress system;
 - whether redress should be delivered through a new independent redress entity, a centralised process, existing government agencies, or another model;
 - financial redress, including payment levels, eligibility, assessment criteria and the methodology for determining payments;
 - the Government's financial provision or funding for historic and future redress;
 - treatment of survivors who have previously received redress, settlement payments or other forms of compensation;

Māori survivors and the incorporation of tikanga Māori, Te Tiriti o Waitangi, kaupapa Māori or Māori-led approaches within the redress system;

- implementation of the Royal Commission's recommendations relating to redress;
 - survivor participation in the design, governance, oversight or delivery of redress;
 - non-financial forms of redress, including apologies, records, rehabilitation, support and other measures; and
 - any concerns, risks, limitations or alternative approaches identified by the Ministerial Advisory Group in relation to the Government's proposed or eventual redress response.
4. All correspondence or substantive communications between Hon Erica Stanford, her office, officials supporting the Minister, and the Ministerial Advisory Group or its Chair concerning the Group's advice or recommendations on redress.
 5. Any records showing the Government or Minister's response to, consideration of, acceptance, rejection, modification or non-implementation of recommendations made by the Ministerial Advisory Group concerning redress.
 6. Any briefing, memorandum, table, matrix or other document comparing the Ministerial Advisory Group's recommendations on redress with the Government's final policy decisions or announced redress response.
 7. A schedule or list of all documents falling within the scope of this request, identifying, where available, the date, title or subject, author, recipient and document type. Where a document is withheld in full, I request that it nevertheless be identified in the schedule where permitted under the Act.

For the avoidance of doubt, this request is specifically directed at the advice and recommendations of the Ministerial Advisory Group, rather than general policy advice generated independently by government departments or agencies, except where such material records, discusses, assesses or responds to advice provided by the Ministerial Advisory Group.

Where information is withheld, please identify the specific provision of the Official Information Act relied upon and consider whether the information can be released with appropriate redactions rather than withholding documents in full.

Where any information within the scope of this request is held by another Minister, department or agency, I ask that the relevant portion of the request be transferred pursuant to section 14 of the Official Information Act 1982.

If substantial collation or research is considered an issue, I ask that you contact me before considering refusal under section 18(f), so that the scope can be discussed and refined while preserving access to the substantive advice and recommendations provided by the Ministerial Advisory Group.

Please provide the information electronically.

Noho ora mai

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

Published by the Crown Response Office

Appendix One

Ministerial Advisory Group advice paper

Abuse in Care Ministerial Advisory Group advice on wider and non-State Redress Decisions

For:	Hon Erica Stanford, Lead Coordination Minister for the Government's Response to the Royal Commission's Report into Historical Abuse in State Care and in the Care of Faith-based Institutions		
Date:	10 December 2025	Priority:	High
Security classification:		Tracking number:	CRACI 25/149

Purpose

1. This paper summarises the Abuse in Care Ministerial Advisory Group (MAG) feedback on the memo *Assistance and redress for wider State and non-State survivors*. The memo was provided by Crown Response Office (CRO) officials before the MAG meeting on 19 and 20 November 2025 and is attached as Appendix Two.

Summary of Ministerial Advisory Group feedback

2. The MAG discussed the proposals outlined in the memo and agreed on the following feedback. The feedback has been structured around the prompt questions included on pages 7 and 8 of the CRO memo.

Inform and connect function

3. The MAG queried the absence of navigation services for survivors in the inform and connect function. During the meeting, CRO officials advised that the proposals as outlined are a first step and that further process improvement work continues in the background. The MAG is concerned about the service processes of some faith-based institutions, noting that services provided by some of the larger institutions (such as navigation services) are not currently fit for purpose. The MAG recommends further work is done to make sure services provided by these institutions are up to standard and provide meaningful support to survivors.
4. There is a risk that an inform and connect function could be implemented without there being institutions to which survivors can be connected. While pathways will exist for some survivors, this is not consistent across the board, meaning the connect element will be inequitable. It is recommended that readiness before rollout is ensured to prevent inequitable access.
5. The MAG recommends that navigation services be provided, potentially through the Survivor Experience Services, or a non-State independent navigation service. The social sector has considerable expertise and experience in this, including as demonstrated by the role of the Whānau Ora Navigators.
6. In relation to this, the MAG discussed the operations of the Survivor Experience Services (SES), informed by members' Frances Tagaloa and Gary Williams' roles on the SES Independent Board. The discussion included:
 - a. The limited capacity of the SES to address the full extent of supports required, while still trying to provide information on a range of topics.

- b. Increased access for those in the Deaf community leading to higher levels of engagement, as well as overall increased engagement generally.
 - c. That its funding is only secured until June 2026.
 - d. That it is open to all survivors, including those who were in wider and non-State care.
 - e. That survivors have built positive relationships with some of the SES staff, even inviting one to Christchurch to meet survivors.
7. The MAG recommends the inform & connect function be expanded to include navigation and case-holding functions. It is also recommended that an expansion of SES navigation services for wider and non-State survivors is explored, including required upskilling of staff.

Further options for Health NZ, schools, and NGOs currently delivering services

8. The MAG agreed that the State is potentially responsible for abuse in wider and non-State care.
9. The MAG considered international wider-State redress processes, noting the potential of leveraging tax exemptions or other more coercive forms of compelling non-State redress in the Aotearoa New Zealand context.
10. The alignment of the Health NZ process with that of the Ministry of Health makes practical sense, and the MAG supports the alignment of these redress processes. MAG recognises the need for ongoing clarity for survivors. In the past, survivors' experience has been characterised by fragmentation. Aligning the Health NZ offerings with the Ministry of Health processes would bring some consistency to the offerings.
11. The MAG considered actively tracing survivors for redress. If a case has been built against an institution, then survivors should not be required to share their stories to obtain redress. The MAG recommends that survivors not be required to re-tell their stories where cases are already established. This is especially important for disabled people who face many barriers to telling, speaking, and remembering their experiences and understanding their abuse, but were nevertheless extremely impacted and traumatised by it.
12. It is not clear the extent to which the wisdom and experience of survivor communities are integrated into current processes, and the engagement and adoption of advice, strategies, and guidance developed or led by survivors. This may affect the relevance, effectiveness, and responsiveness of support and redress mechanisms. The MAG recommends that survivor leadership be strengthened and that a co-design approach is taken to process development.
13. The MAG is of the view that there are gaps across information sharing functions between agencies. Ensuring CRO receives fulsome information from relevant agencies should be a priority.

Next steps

14. The MAG requested the CRO provide further information on the availability of the proposed inform and connect function, options to fast-track phase two of redress,

Ministerial Advisory Group advice paper

and the cross-agency work programme and survivor engagement. The CRO has since provided this information, which is attached as Appendix Three.

15. The MAG plans to discuss this further at our next meeting, set down for 17 and 18 February 2026.

Released under the Official Information Act 1982

Ministerial Advisory Group advice paper

Redress offerings: Ministerial Advisory Group recommendations

For:	Hon Erica Stanford, Lead Coordination Minister for the Government's Response to the Royal Commission's Report into Historical Abuse in State Care and in the Care of Faith-based Institutions		
Date:	20 November 2025	Priority:	High
Security classification:		Tracking number:	CRACI 25/142

Purpose and background

1. This paper outlines our discussion with officials and our feedback to them on the memo *Redress Offerings for Abuse in State Care Claims: Common Payment Framework and Consistent Support Offerings* and its appendix.
2. The CRO sought MAG feedback on the purpose of supports to inform the design of support offerings that are being developed as part of redress improvements.

Expectations

3. The MAG outlined expectations that further framed its discussion:
 - A compassionate government will acknowledge a common experiences framework that reflects the shared experiences of survivors wherever abuse occurred. It would integrate an all-encompassing, trauma-responsive, and culturally grounded restorative healing process, including all components of a survivor's journey, such as (but not limited to):
 - Information gathering
 - Redress process
 - Ongoing mana and wellbeing
 - Whānau, 'aiga, family, and community connections
 - Navigating the system of support.
 - An innovative government will undertake a social investment approach to the Care system. This is in line with the specific priority groups for the first round of the new Social Investment Fund launched in August 2025 of children whose parent(s) have experienced the state care system. Data shows these children are more likely to experience poor outcomes later in life.
 - A consistent government will reflect on the Lake Alice process and would align its response on torture with those of the UN Conventions Against Torture. The New Zealand government is required by UN Treaties to provide redress that is accessible, effective, and considers human rights obligations for abuses in care, such as apologies, financial redress, and wellbeing support.
 - This is an opportunity for the government to do something new, novel, and world leading.

Ministerial Advisory Group advice paper

Pilot

4. The MAG discussed the proposed pilot and noted two main concerns:
 - Firstly, we note the small scale of the pilot. We are concerned that this will limit representation of survivor experiences.
 - Secondly, we are concerned about the time it will take for other survivors to receive these supports after the pilot has occurred. By the time support services are implemented survivors may have already passed on and therefore be unable to access a full range of services.

Current funding for support offerings

5. MAG appreciates the existence of support offerings. However, we see it as an overall integration of redress.
6. We have serious concerns with the current support systems funding of approximately \$5,000 per survivor. This does not consider the broad experiences of survivors, such as those with disabilities or those in rural areas with lack of access to various services.
7. The CRO discussed supporting survivors during the redress process. We think this statement limits the timeframes of the restorative process and does not acknowledge that healing is lifelong.

Common Payment Framework

8. The MAG discussed the ranking system used for the Common Payment Framework (the Framework).
9. There are unintended consequences for survivors. They must retell their stories and could unintentionally incentivise them to overstate the abuse they experienced.
10. We unanimously agreed it is not fit-for-purpose for a culturally grounded Framework for restoration and healing. It appears to be driven by legal obligations of the Crown, rather than survivor focused. Its purpose should be on the recognition of abuse on survivors.
11. If the purpose is to minimise spending, there is still a way to do so with compassion. Just because there is a financial constraint, we do not believe the Framework needs to be worded so bluntly. We find the nature of explaining the different levels of abuse in such a stark manner re-traumatising.
12. We also shared concerns regarding the low payments listed in the Framework, generally and compared to other payments internationally. Payments should be comparable (at a minimum) to those in similar jurisdictions such as Australia.
13. There is a risk that ranking severity of abuse may require survivors to disclose more detail than they are comfortable with and expose them to further unnecessary harm.
14. We consider that the nature of the Framework places the burden of proof onto the survivor. These risks making survivors feel that they are subject to investigation rather than entitled to redress, instead of placing accountability on the abusers. It needs to be made clear how this Framework will be used by those assessing redress so that survivors feel believed.

Ministerial Advisory Group advice paper

Recommendations

15. We recommend that the purpose of the supports funding is to:

- enhance the mana and wellbeing of survivors and their whānau
- enable a restorative approach that supports survivors' long-term wellbeing
- be flexible enough to cover more immediate well-being needs and a wide range of services, while enabling survivors to exercise agency in determining which offerings will best meet their individual needs and circumstances. For example, redress offering could include tattoo removal, a safe home, primary healthcare, supported decision-making, and financial advice.

16. We further recommend that:

- A safe and independent place is established for survivors to navigate and share their experiences. This place would need to recognise that it is unreasonable for survivors to be repeating their stories (which is retraumatising). This repetition can compound harm and places an unnecessary burden on the survivor.
- Further work is done to exceed the Common Payment Framework to payments for similar offerings internationally.
- Support offerings continue beyond the redress process, for as long as needed (ideally for life). This will lead to sustained outcomes for survivors, whānau, 'aiga, and the wider community. Funding should not be full and final.
- The offerings are focused on the survivor, their whānau and community, and their individualised needs.
- Whānau have access to the funding if the survivor has passed on for their own support needs.
- The offerings can be accessed by survivors who are yet to come forward. There is a need to create community awareness and provide a friendly entry point for survivors. This could include using data to provide trauma-informed tracing for survivors. Further investigation needs to be done to reach those who are unable to come forward independently and would include mechanisms that allow equitable access for survivors without relying on self-disclosure.
- The support offerings process acknowledges that it can potentially be both harmful and healing, but overall, the process must be restorative.
- Is meaningful and culturally responsive.

17. We strongly encourage future governments to continue funding support offerings beyond June 2029 to enable meaningful and enduring resolution and healing.