

**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**

Response Plan

Date of Issue: 5 June 2025

The following documents are proactively released:

Abuse in Care Inquiry Crown response (May 2025)

Appendix Two – Summary of decisions on recommendations

ECO-25-MIN-0060 Cabinet Committee Minute

CAB-25-MIN-0151 Report of the Cabinet Economic Policy Committee Minute

Summary of redactions:

- Section 9(2)(f)(iv) to enable the confidentiality of advice tendered by Ministers of the Crown and officials:
- Where appropriate, information not relevant to the work of the Crown Response to the Abuse in Care Inquiry has been removed.

Office of the Lead Co-ordination Minister responsible 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

Cabinet Social Outcomes Committee

Abuse in Care Inquiry: Crown response (May 2025)

Proposal

- 1 This paper provides the Crown response to the Royal Commission of Inquiry into Historical Abuse in State Care and in the Care of Faith-based Institutions (the Royal Commission) as of May 2025 (attached as Appendix one) and a summary table of decisions to date (attached as Appendix two).
- 2 It also seeks decisions to support the Crown response, including on approaches to engagement, monitoring and reporting on the response.

Relation to government priorities

- 3 This paper progresses the Government's response to the Royal Commission.

Executive Summary

- 4 The Crown Response Office has worked with 21 agencies to develop the Crown response document. The document sets out work to respond to the 207 recommendations for State action. It groups them under three high level objectives to: address the wrongs of the past, make the care system safe, and empower those in care, their families, whānau and communities. It describes work completed, work underway and future work to respond to the Royal Commission. It will be updated as the response progresses. The response document incorporates recent decisions on delivering an enhanced redress system as well as Budget 2025 investment in the care system.
- 5 The Crown response identifies initial priorities but does not include detailed timeframes or seek policy decisions for any specific work that sits under it, as it is not a 'delivery' plan. The policy and delivery decisions will be made using established Cabinet, Ministerial, or agency processes, as appropriate.
- 6 Decisions on the following matters are needed to finalise the response:
 - 6.1 confirming the high-level phasing of the response;
 - 6.2 annual reporting to Cabinet; and
 - 6.3 establishment of a Ministerial advisory group to complement existing stakeholder engagement mechanisms.

Background: Cabinet directed officials to prepare a response to the Royal Commission's reports and recommendations

- 7 On 24 July 2024, the Royal Commission's final report, *Whanaketia – Through pain and trauma, from darkness to light* (Whanaketia), was tabled in Parliament. It was the Royal Commission's fifth substantive report, and the second to contain recommendations. The first was *He Purapura Ora, He Māra Tipu from Redress to Puretumu Torowhānui* (He Purapura Ora) in 2021.
- 8 Across its five substantive reports¹, the Royal Commission details widespread and sometimes extreme abuse of children, young people, and adults, across a wide range of care settings. These included disability, mental health, social services and educational settings, and community and faith-based care.
- 9 The Royal Commission made 138 recommendations in *Whanaketia* and 95 in *He Purapura Ora*. Of these 233 recommendations, 207 are directed at the Crown. One recommendation was specifically directed to the judiciary and 25 were directed to faith-based institutions only.
- 10 On 25 September 2024, Cabinet Social Outcomes Committee (SOU) directed officials from Crown response agencies, led by the Crown Response Office, to develop a full response plan and invited the 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 (the Lead Coordination Minister), to report back with the Response Plan by early 2025 [SOU-24 Min-0118 refers].

Some actions to respond to the Royal Commission are already completed and others are underway

- 11 Since Whanaketia was tabled in July 2024, the Government has taken action to reflect a commitment to respond, including:
 - 11.1 formal public apologies made by the Prime Minister and seven public sector leaders on 12 November 2024;
 - 11.2 acknowledgement that torture occurred at Lake Alice Psychiatric Hospital Child and Adolescent Unit (Lake Alice);
 - 11.3 an end-of-life payment of \$20,000 for Lake Alice survivors along with work to address inequities in the reimbursement of legal fees;
 - 11.4 an investment of \$32 million to increase capacity in current redress and claims systems from approximately 1350 to 1550 claims per year while work of improve redress for survivors continues;
 - 11.5 a \$2 million dual purpose survivor-focussed fund for local authorities, non-governmental organisations and community groups;

¹ The other three reports are: *Stolen Lives, Marked Souls: The inquiry into the Order of the Brothers of St John of God at Marylands School and Hebron Trust* (July 2023), *Beautiful Children: Inquiry into the Lake Alice Child and Adolescent Unit* (December 2022), and *Tāwharautia: Pūrongo o te Wā* (the Interim Report) (December 2020).

- 11.6 the Responding to Abuse in Care Legislation Amendment Bill which supports the Crown response to a range of recommendations;
 - 11.7 commitment to an annual day of reflection on the one-year anniversary of the public apology, 12 November 2025
 - 11.8 agreeing an approach, and funding of \$533 million over four years, for an enhanced redress system;
 - 11.9 Budget 2025 investment of \$138 million over four years to progress our commitment to improve the safety of state care.
- 12 These actions build on previous work to respond to recommendations in *He Purapura Ora* from December 2021. This included setting up a Survivor Experiences Service, establishing Design and Advisory groups to advise Ministers on redress, introducing rapid payments for survivors', and five initiatives to improve survivors' access to personal records.

The Crown response document maps the recommendations across work completed, work underway and future work

- 13 The Crown Response Office worked with 21 agencies to develop the draft Crown response document. Relevant agencies and portfolio Ministers will remain responsible for delivery of the work and will seek decisions from Cabinet where required. The Lead Coordination Minister will be responsible for high-level coordination and leadership of the overall Crown response.
- 14 The response document is not a delivery plan, it identifies initial priorities but does not include detailed timeframes or seek policy decisions for any specific work that sits under it. These decisions will be made through established Cabinet, Ministerial, or agency processes, as appropriate.
- 15 The draft response document:
 - 15.1 groups all 207 recommendations under three objectives (to address the wrongs of the past, make the care system safe and empower those in care, their families, whānau and communities). These objectives are broken down into 10 action areas that contain 36 recommendation groupings;
 - 15.2 records the current response (accept, accept intent, partially accept, further consideration required, or decline) and status (complete, underway, ongoing or not started) for each recommendation;
 - 15.3 describes work completed to date, work underway and future work that contributes to each group of recommendations, where it is known;
 - 15.4 describes responses to 'implementation' recommendations (that focus on how recommendations should be implemented, including issues like engagement and reporting that sit across all recommendations); and
 - 15.5 sets out high-level priorities for the next phase of the response.

- 16 The Crown response will be updated as the work progresses. It will provide a baseline for quarterly and annual reporting on the status of each recommendation.
- 17 Reporting against each recommendation addresses part of Whanaketia recommendation 131, to have “formal public responses” on whether each recommendation is “accepted, accepted in principle, rejected or subject to further consideration”. Table One summarises current responses and status across all the recommendations, below.

Table One: Current response and status of the Crown recommendations

	Complete	Underway	Ongoing	Not started
Accept	3	6	10	
Accept intent	4	28	6	-
Partially accept	6	13	8	1
Further consideration required	-	38		61
Decline	23	-	-	-
Total	36	85	24	62

- 18 Appendix two provides a summary table of decisions to date setting out where agencies, Ministers or Cabinet have already decided a recommendation.
- 19 I am seeking Cabinet agreement to finalise and approve for publication the Crown response document.

Priorities for the next phase are redress implementation, any structural and system-level care system changes, and early actions to improve safety

- 20 Several recommendations have multiple sub-parts, meaning there are more than 207 matters for the Crown to respond to. Many recommendations interconnect and/or have dependencies. The number and complexity of recommendations require a multi-year and multi-agency work programme. A phased approach is also consistent with the Royal Commission’s vision of a 15-year change process, looking out to 2040.
- 21 Table Two below details proposed phasing. This phasing reflects our current focus on redress and our commitment to make the care system safe.

Table Two: Proposed high-level phasing for the Crown response

Phase one <i>(Work to June 2025)</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Deliver public apologies and actions to acknowledge victims and survivors. • Improve recordkeeping practices and initial redress enhancements. • Immediate actions to strengthen care safety and improve the justice system. • Develop overarching Crown response.
--	---

Phase two <i>(July 2025 - June 2027)</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Complete design and implementation of redress system changes. • Identify and implement any structural or other system-level changes to care. • Continue early actions to strengthen care safety and improve the justice system.
Phase three <i>(July 2027 and beyond)</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Embed, monitor and review redress system changes. • Continue identified structural and other system-level changes to care. • Continue early actions to strengthen care safety and improve the justice system.

Priority one: Design and implementation of redress system changes

- 22 Cabinet agreed to improve the existing State redress system [CAB-25-MIN-0101]. Implementing these Cabinet decisions will be a priority for the next phase of the response, along with the further work to respond to the redress recommendations in *He Purapura Ora* and *Whanaketia*.
- 23 Redress work includes eligibility issues such as whether access to the State redress system will be available to survivors from outside the core State care system, and the prospective roles and responsibilities of the Crown and faith-based institutions. This work is set out in the Crown response document under *Objective one: Address the wrongs of the past*.

Priority two: Decisions on structural and other system-level changes to care

- 24 Cabinet decisions are needed to respond to recommendations for structural and other care system-level change. The Royal Commission recommended a centralised Care Safe Agency be established (*Whanaketia*, recommendation 41) with a wide remit to lead across multiple care systems and bring together many functions currently performed by other agencies.
- 25 Further work is needed on whether such cross-system leadership is useful, and if so for which functions, along with the best options for implementing it. This work will also build our understanding of system performance, strengths, and gaps (including identifying where harm occurs and setting outcomes).
- 26 I propose to report back to Cabinet with advice on any structural or system-level change to the care system s9(2)(f)(iv) including a response to *Whanaketia*, recommendation 41 (to establish a Care Safe Agency).
- 27 These decisions will substantially affect the approach to several other recommendations and inform funding and strategic priorities for the next year and beyond. This work is described in the Crown response under Objective two: *Make the current care system safe* in the action area *Provide care system leadership*.

Priority three: Continue early actions to strengthen care safety [Budget Sensitive]

- 28 Work is already underway to strengthen care safety in existing settings, as detailed throughout the Crown response. This work will continue along with new initiatives supported through Budget 2025. These include:
- 28.1 improvements to the independent oversight of compulsory mental health, addiction and intellectual disability care;
 - 28.2 work to better understand and address the risks that may trigger the abuse of children and young people in residential care;
 - 28.3 work to assess and improve mental health inpatient units, to ensure they are safer and more responsive to people's needs;
 - 28.4 a central advisory service to provide expert advice to agencies that respond to queries from providers about care records; and
 - 28.5 a new system to capture and enable analysis of critical incidents and complaints in Disability Support Services.

I propose the establishment of a Ministerial advisory group to complement existing stakeholder engagement mechanisms

- 29 The Royal Commission recommended the Crown response be delivered in partnership with Māori to give effect to te Tiriti o Waitangi/the Treaty of Waitangi and the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (UNDRIP), and co-designed with care system participants and stakeholders.² This is set out in *He Purapura Ora* recommendations 2, 6-8, 13 and 14 and *Whanaketia* recommendations 14, 117, 126, 127 and 129.
- 30 The intent of these recommendations has been accepted because the Crown is committed to te Tiriti o Waitangi/the Treaty of Waitangi and UNDRIP. However, this commitment will not be delivered in the specific ways set out by the Royal Commission, as full partnering and co-design across the response would involve trade-offs, particularly impacting on the speed of change.
- 31 Instead, following consultation with Crown response joint Ministers in February 2025, I propose portfolio Ministers and agencies engage with Māori and other stakeholders using existing reference and advisory groups and drawing on known insights where they can. Targeted engagement will also be done and/or new groups set up, depending on the requirements of specific projects. This approach reflects that different aspects of the work will require different levels of engagement with different stakeholders.
- 32 I also propose the establishment of a Ministerial advisory group. The advisory group will give Ministers an independent stream of advice on the work overall and expert input into priority work, as required. Appendix Three provides the draft Terms of Reference for the proposed Ministerial advisory group.

² Including children, young people and adults in care, survivors, Māori, Pacific Peoples, culturally and linguistically diverse communities, Deaf, disabled people, people who experience mental distress, and Takatāpui, Rainbow and MVPFAFF+ people. MVPFAFF+ is mahu, vakasalewa, palopa, fa'afafine, akavai'ne, fakaleiti (leiti), fakafifine, and more.

- 33 If agreed, an appropriate nomination process would be used to identify nominees, with names submitted to Cabinet Appointments and Honours Committee for confirmation. Nominees will include relevant lived experience, an appropriate level of standing, and the ability to offer robust, constructive, strategic, advice to support relevant Ministers and agencies to navigate the complex choices and decisions involved in the Crown response.
- 34 The group can be set up to cover the next phase of work to June 2027. It will have a primary focus on the care system but will also advise on the implementation of Cabinet's recent redress decisions.

Cross party agreement was recommended

- 35 The Royal Commission recommended cross-party agreement to implement its recommendations (*Whanaketia* recommendation 132). This is proposed to be partially accepted. Some cross-party agreement has been sought (for example for the public apologies). However, it is not practical to engage across parties on every action given the complexity and size of the response, so case-by-case decisions will be made.

Progress will be reported quarterly to Ministers, and I propose annual reporting to Cabinet

- 36 Recommendation 131 of *Whanaketia* recommended that the final report should be responded to in full within four months of being tabled in the House. This recommendation is "declined" because the four-month timeframe for response was not realistic in the context of the almost six years taken by the Commission to complete their work, and the volume and complexity of the recommendations. Other recommendations seek:

- 36.1 annual public reporting for at least nine years, on the implementation status of each recommendation and any identified issues and risks, starting 12 months after *Whanaketia* is tabled in the House of Representatives (recommendation 133);
- 36.2 an independent review of progress to implement the recommendations, improve care safety, and ensure survivors obtain justice and support, nine years after the tabling of *Whanaketia* (recommendations 136 and 138); and
- 36.3 tabling the annual reports and the nine-year review in the House of Representatives and referring them to a parliamentary select committee for consideration (recommendations 134 and 137).

- 37 After consultation with Crown response joint Ministers in February 2025, I propose quarterly reporting to joint Ministers on progress against the actions in the document and proactive release of an annual report to Cabinet, starting s9(2)(f)(iv) but further consideration of the option for nine-year reporting. This means recommendation 133 would be partially accepted and further consideration is needed of recommendations 136 and 138.

- 38 I do not recommend tabling progress reports in the House of Representatives or referring them to a select committee, which would mean declining recommendations 134 and 137. This is because proactive release of annual reports after Cabinet consideration and select committee questions to Chief Executives as part of the usual Parliamentary accountability process will ensure public scrutiny.

Redress implementation update

- 39 In April 2025, Cabinet made decisions on enhancing the current redress system for survivors of abuse in state care. These included increasing average redress payments by 50 percent, providing for “top-ups” of previous settlements, and changes to ensure consistency across redress agencies [CAB-25-MIN-0101 refers].
- 40 Cabinet was advised that top-up amounts would be determined by both the increase to the average payment amount and the new common payments framework in order to address previous inequities in redress payments. Detailed implementation decisions were delegated to the Lead Coordination Minister, Minister of Health, and Minister for Social Development, in consultation with other relevant Ministers.
- 41 Delegated Ministers have agreed a straightforward process that broadly ensures consistency and equity between past and future claimants. This will enable timely processing of top-up payments applications before the common payment framework is developed and avoids adding to the backlog of claims waiting to be assessed. The two-step approach entails lifting payments made by the Ministry of Health to a level that is broadly comparable to other redress agencies and then applying a 50 percent increase to each individual’s previous settlement amount.

Financial Implications – Budget Sensitive

- 42 Current work on the Crown response is funded through agency baselines and Budget 2025, including a \$700 million (over four years) Crown Response package.
- 43 Nothing in the Crown response document commits Government to funding beyond that already allocated. There may be future requests for funding for the Crown response. What funding may be needed for, and how much, cannot be determined for work that has not yet started. Any decisions to fund (or not fund) new work or initiatives would be part of future budget processes, that would include considering reprioritising funding.

Legislative Implications

- 44 There are no direct legislative implication arising from this paper. Work on the response currently includes legislative change already agreed by Cabinet, for example, the Responding to Abuse in Care Legislation Amendment Bill. It is likely there will be further legislative bids. However, whether new legislation is needed or not cannot be determined for work that is not yet started.

Regulatory Impact Statement

- 45 A Regulatory Impact Statement has not been developed since there are no decisions sought in this paper that would impact on regulations.

Population Implications

- 46 Several population groups are over-represented both as survivors of abuse in care and in the care system today. They include: tamariki, rangatahi and pakeke Māori, Pacific Peoples, culturally and linguistically diverse communities, Deaf and disabled people including whaikaha Māori, people who experience mental distress, Takatāpui, Rainbow and MVPFAFF people.

Human Rights

- 47 The proposals in this paper do not negatively impact on the New Zealand Bill of Rights Act 1990, the Human Rights Act 1993, or any international human rights instruments to which New Zealand is a signatory.
- 48 *He Purapura Ora* recommendation 3 and *Whanakeia* recommendations 15 and 118, recommended the Crown uphold the rights agreed under various international human rights instruments³. The response document notes that the intent of these recommendations is accepted in the context of continuing work to deliver Ministerial and Cabinet priorities.

Use of External Resources

- 49 No external resources have been used to develop this proposal, nor are any anticipated to be used to develop or deliver any further work described here. External resource was used to design the Crown response document.

Consultation

- 50 The Crown response was developed in collaboration with the Ministries of and for Health, Education, Justice, Culture and Heritage, Business, Innovation and Employment, Social Development, Disabled People (Whaikaha), Pacific Peoples, along with Health New Zealand, Crown Law, the Public Service Commission, the New Zealand Police, the Department of Corrections, Te Puni Kōhiri, Archives New Zealand, ACC, the Department of Internal Affairs, the Social Investment Agency, WorkSafe New Zealand and Oranga Tamariki. The Department of Prime Minister and Cabinet and Treasury were informed.

Communications

- 51 I propose to release the response as part of Budget 2025 announcements on investment in redress and in the care system and published on the Crown

³ These include: The United Nations Declaration of the Rights of Indigenous peoples, the Convention on the Elimination of all forms of Racial Discrimination, the Convention on the Elimination of all forms of Discrimination Against Women, and the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities.

Response Office website. Relevant portfolio Ministers and agencies will need to respond to questions on the response that are specific to their portfolios.

Proactive Release

- 52 I propose to release the Cabinet paper and the response document proactively following Budget 2025 announcements.

Recommendations

It is recommended that the Committee:

- 1 **note** the attached Crown response to the Royal Commission of Inquiry into Historical Abuse in State Care and in the Care of Faith-based Institutions;
- 2 **agree** to the following high-level phasing of the Crown response:

Phase one <i>(Work to June 2025)</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Deliver public apologies and actions to acknowledge victims and survivors. • Improve recordkeeping practices and initial redress enhancements. • Immediate actions to strengthen care safety and improve the justice system. • Develop the overarching Crown response.
Phase two <i>(July 2025 - June 2027)</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Complete design and implementation of redress system changes. • Identify and implement any structural or other system-level changes to care. • Continue early actions to strengthen care safety and improve the justice system.
Phase three <i>(July 2027 and beyond)</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Embed, monitor and review redress system changes. • Continue identified structural and other system-level changes to care. • Continue early actions to strengthen care safety.

- 3 **invite** the Lead Coordination Minister to report back to Cabinet in s9(2)(f)(iv) with advice on any structural and other system-level changes to care, including *Whanaketia* recommendation 41, to establish a Care Safe Agency;
- 4 **agree** to the establishment of a Ministerial advisory group and the draft terms of reference for the group set out in Appendix Three;
- 5 **agree** to accept the intent of:
 - 5.1 *He Purapura Ora* recommendations 2 and 3 and *Whanaketia* recommendations 14, 117, 126, 127 and 129 on partnership with Māori, te Tiriti o Waitangi and the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples;
 - 5.2 *He Purapura Ora* recommendations 6-8, 13 and 14 and *Whanaketia* recommendations 14, 127 and 129 on co-design and engagement with care system participants and stakeholders; and

- 5.3 *He Purapura Ora* recommendation 3 and *Whanaketia* recommendations 15 and 118 on national and international human rights obligations;
- 6 **agree** to partially accept:
- 6.1 *Whanaketia* recommendation 132 with regard to cross-party agreement to the Crown response;
- 7 **agree** to an annual report to Cabinet on progress against the Crown response, that is proactively released which means Cabinet is:
- 7.1 partially accepting *Whanaketia* reporting recommendation 133 to publicly report on the implementation of the inquiry's recommendations, and to publish the report for at least nine years; and
- 7.2 declining to accept *Whanaketia* recommendations 134 and 137 for reporting to be tabled in the House of Representatives and considered by a parliamentary select committee;
- 8 **authorise** the Lead Coordination Minister to make any additional updates and finalise the Crown response document in consultation with relevant portfolio Ministers before approving it for public release; and
- 9 **invite** the Lead Coordination Minister to report back to Cabinet with the first annual monitoring report s9(2)(f)(iv) [REDACTED];
- 10 **note** the Lead Coordination Minister, Minister of Health, and Minister for Social Development, acting under Cabinet delegation [CAB-25-MIN-0101] have agreed a two-step approach to establishing top-up redress payments that entails lifting payments made by the Ministry of Health to a level that is broadly comparable to other redress agencies and then applying a 50 per cent increase to each individual's previous settlement amount.

Authorised for lodgement

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

Cabinet paper Appendix Two: Summary of decisions on the Royal Commission recommendations to date

The table below sets out the decisions to “accept”, “accept intent”, “partially accept” or “decline” Royal Commission recommendations to date, using the definitions in the Crown response. It:

- includes decisions or actions that have already been taken, where recommendations are underway or have been completed;
- sets out decision maker(s) (authorised person, chief executive or portfolio Minister); and
- includes recommendation(s) that are being delivered, as part of the existing strategy, policy, or operation of an agency or agencies.

Of note, the redress responses are currently subject to Ministerial consultation via the cross-Ministerial briefing, *Responding to the Royal Commission’s redress recommendations*, [CRACI 25/038]. They may be subject to change.

Recommendation	Response	Rationale for response	Decision maker and reference
He Purapura Ora, he Māra Tipu			
1 – establish a puretumu torowhānui (holistic redress) scheme	Decline	He Purapura Ora recommendations 1, 4, 12, 15, 17, 50, 52 and 61 have been “declined” as these are the Royal Commission’s recommendations for the establishment of a new, independent and principles-based redress system. The Government has decided to prioritise improving the existing system.	Reference: <i>Responding to the Royal Commission’s redress recommendations</i> , cross-Ministerial briefing [CRACI 25/038]
2 – give effect to te Tiriti o Waitangi in the redress system	Accept intent	Recommendations 2 and 13 from He Purapura Ora and 14 from Whanaketia relate to the response to the Royal Commission being delivered in partnership with Māori and consistently with te Tiriti o Waitangi. The intent of these recommendations is accepted, as the Crown’s commitment to te Tiriti o Waitangi the Treaty of Waitangi will not be	Reference: <i>Abuse in Care Inquiry Response Plan Framework</i> cross-ministerial briefing [CRACI 25/014] <i>Responding to the Royal Commission’s redress</i>

Recommendation	Response	Rationale for response	Decision maker and reference
		delivered in the specific ways detailed in the recommendations.	<i>recommendations</i> , cross-Ministerial briefing [CRACI 25/038]
3 – give effect to international human rights commitments in the redress system	Accept intent	<p>The Crown is committed to meeting New Zealand's human rights obligations, consistent with the intent of recommendations 3 from He Purapura Ora and 15 from Whanaketia. This commitment is made in the context of continuing work to deliver Ministerial and Cabinet priorities in the care and justice systems, some of which will be in tension with these recommendations.</p> <p>There are established processes for considering Aotearoa New Zealand's human rights obligations when making decisions about legislation, regulations and policy, and in delivering government services. This enables decisions about how to ensure compliance to be made on a case-by-case basis.</p>	<p>Reference:</p> <p><i>Responding to the Royal Commission's redress recommendations</i>, cross-Ministerial briefing [CRACI 25/038]</p>
4 – establish a redress scheme based on survivor-focused principles, values and concepts	Decline	He Purapura Ora recommendations 1, 4, 12, 15, 17, 50, 52 and 61 have been “declined” as these are the Royal Commission's recommendations for the establishment of a new, independent and principles-based redress system. The Government has decided to prioritise improving the existing system.	<p>Reference:</p> <p><i>Responding to the Royal Commission's redress recommendations</i>, cross-Ministerial briefing [CRACI 25/038]</p>
5 - establish and fund Māori Collective to support redress system decisions	Accept intent	Recommendation 5 of He Purapura Ora, to establish and fund a well-resourced independent Māori Collective to assist it in responding to the report, is recorded as “accept intent” and this work is complete. It is recorded as accept intent because it	<p>Reference:</p> <p>CAB-22-MIN-0513</p> <p>CAB-23-MIN-0122</p>

Proactive release - open and transparent Government

Recommendation	Response	Rationale for response	Decision maker and reference
		<p>was done in a different way than the Royal Commission recommended.</p> <p>A Redress Design Group was established, with Māori representation. It also had people who could speak about the supports and services needed by all survivors, including Pacific People and Deaf and disabled people. The Redress Design Group proposals were publicly released in May 2025.</p>	<p>CAB-25-MIN-0101</p> <p><i>Responding to the Royal Commission's redress recommendations, cross-Ministerial briefing [CRACI 25/038]</i></p>
6 – consult survivors to support redress system decisions and the response to He Purapura Ora	Accept intent	<p>Recommendations 6-8 from He Purapura Ora are about co-designing the response, or parts of it, with survivors, Deaf and disabled, Pacific peoples, other experts, young people, rainbow community, faith-based institutions, interested parties and the public. The Crown is committed to this, for example, the Redress Design Group was supported by an advisory group with a careful gender balance and diverse membership including Māori, Pacific people, disabled people, Deaf people, rainbow people, young people and, State and faith-based care survivors.</p> <p>Engagement with survivors and others may not always occur in the specific ways detailed across the recommendations. This is why the responses to recommendations 6-8 from He Purapura Ora, and recommendation 127 from Whanaketia are recorded as “accept intent”</p>	<p>Reference:</p> <p><i>Abuse in Care Inquiry Response Plan Framework cross-ministerial briefing [CRACI 25/014]</i></p> <p><i>Responding to the Royal Commission's redress recommendations, cross-Ministerial briefing [CRACI 25/038]</i></p>
7 - survivors, experts and other interested people to	Accept intent	Recommendations 6-8 from He Purapura Ora are about co-designing the response, or parts of it, with survivors, Deaf and disabled, Pacific peoples, other experts, young people, rainbow community, faith-based institutions, interested	<p>Reference:</p> <p><i>Abuse in Care Inquiry Response Plan Framework cross-</i></p>

Recommendation	Response	Rationale for response	Decision maker and reference
support redress system decisions		<p>parties and the public. The Crown is committed to this, for example, the Redress Design Group was supported by an advisory group with a careful gender balance and diverse membership including Māori, Pacific people, disabled people, Deaf people, rainbow people, young people and, State and faith-based care survivors.</p> <p>Engagement with survivors and others may not always occur in the specific ways detailed across the recommendations. This is why the responses to recommendations 6-8 from He Purapura Ora, and recommendation 127 from Whanaketia are recorded as “accept intent”.</p>	<p>ministerial briefing [CRACI 25/014]</p> <p><i>Responding to the Royal Commission’s redress recommendations, cross-Ministerial briefing [CRACI 25/038]</i></p>
8 - consult faith-based institutions, indirect State care providers, other interested parties and the public to support redress system decisions	Accept intent	<p>Recommendations 6-8 from He Purapura Ora are about co-designing the response, or parts of it, with survivors, Deaf and disabled, Pacific peoples, other experts, young people, rainbow community, faith-based institutions, interested parties and the public. The Crown is committed to this, for example, the Redress Design Group was supported by an advisory group with a careful gender balance and diverse membership including Māori, Pacific people, disabled people, Deaf people, rainbow people, young people and, State and faith-based care survivors.</p> <p>Engagement with survivors and others may not always occur in the specific ways detailed across the recommendations. This is why the responses to recommendations 6-8 from He Purapura Ora, and recommendation 127 from Whanaketia are recorded as “accept intent”.</p>	<p>Reference:</p> <p><i>Abuse in Care Inquiry Response Plan Framework cross-ministerial briefing [CRACI 25/014]</i></p> <p><i>Responding to the Royal Commission’s redress recommendations, cross-Ministerial briefing [CRACI 25/038]</i></p>

Recommendation	Response	Rationale for response	Decision maker and reference
10 – the Governor-General, Prime Minister and heads of relevant faith-based institutions and indirect State care providers should apologise addressing a range of matter	Partially accept	<p>The Prime Minister and seven public sector leaders formally apologised to survivors of abuse in care on 12 November 2024. In his apology, the Prime Minister acknowledged specifically that torture occurred at Lake Alice.</p> <p>The Government response to the recommendations for public apologies is “partially accept”. This is because there was considerable specificity across the recommendations and their sub-parts, and the apologies did not meet the specificity set out in every sub-part.</p>	<p>References:</p> <p>CAB-24-MIN-0019</p> <p><i>Progressing the apology text, announcements and arrangements for the 12 November Public Apology event, ministerial briefing to the Lead Minister [CRACI 24/034]</i></p> <p><i>Responding to the Royal Commission’s redress recommendations, cross-Ministerial briefing [CRACI 25/038]</i></p>
11 – there should be a collective and consultative approach to the making of the apologies	Partially accept	<p>This recommendation relates to the Redress Design Group process, which has been completed.</p> <p>The Government response to the recommendations for public apologies is “partially accept”. This is because there was considerable specificity across the recommendations and their sub-parts, and the apologies did not meet the specificity set out in every sub-part.</p>	<p>References:</p> <p>CAB-24-MIN-0019</p> <p><i>Progressing the apology text, announcements and arrangements for the 12 November Public Apology event, ministerial briefing to the Lead Minister [CRACI 24/034]</i></p> <p><i>Responding to the Royal Commission’s redress recommendations, cross-</i></p>

Recommendation	Response	Rationale for response	Decision maker and reference
			Ministerial briefing [CRACI 25/038]
12 - The Crown should set up a fair, effective, accessible and independent puretumu torowhānui scheme	Decline	He Purapura Ora recommendations 1, 4, 12, 15, 17, 50, 52 and 61 have been “declined” as these are the Royal Commission’s recommendations for the establishment of a new, independent and principles-based redress system. The Government has decided to prioritise improving the existing system.	Reference: CAB-22-MIN-0513 CAB-23-MIN-0122 CAB-25-MIN-0101 <i>Responding to the Royal Commission’s redress recommendations</i> , cross-Ministerial briefing [CRACI 25/038]
13 - the principles, values, concepts, te Tiriti obligations and international law commitments that will guide the design of the puretumu torowhānui system should guide the design and implementation of the puretumu torowhānui scheme	Accept intent	Recommendations 2 and 13 from He Purapura Ora and 14 from Whanaketia relate to the response to the Royal Commission being delivered in partnership with Māori and consistently with te Tiriti o Waitangi. The intent of these recommendations is accepted, as the Crown’s commitment to te Tiriti o Waitangi the Treaty of Waitangi will not be delivered in the specific ways detailed in the recommendations.	Reference: <i>Abuse in Care Inquiry Response Plan Framework</i> cross-ministerial briefing [CRACI 25/014] <i>Responding to the Royal Commission’s redress recommendations</i> , cross-Ministerial briefing [CRACI 25/038]
14 - membership of the governance body for the	Accept intent	The intent of this recommendation is accepted in line with obligations under the Public Service Act 2020. A final decision	References:

Recommendation	Response	Rationale for response	Decision maker and reference
redress scheme should give effect to te Tiriti o Waitangi, and reflect the diversity of survivors, as well as including people with relevant expertise.		about whether it can be fully accepted can only be made when decisions for redress have been fully decided. This response may change.	Public Service Act 2020 <i>Abuse in Care Inquiry Response Plan Framework</i> cross-ministerial briefing [CRACI 25/014]
15 - State and faith-based institutions should phase out their current claims processes	Decline	He Purapura Ora recommendations 1, 4, 12, 15, 17, 50, 52 and 61 have been “declined” as these are the Royal Commission’s recommendations for the establishment of a new, independent and principles-based redress system. The Government has decided to prioritise improving the existing system.	Reference: CAB-22-MIN-0513 CAB-23-MIN-0122 CAB-25-MIN-0101 <i>Responding to the Royal Commission’s redress recommendations</i> , cross-Ministerial briefing [CRACI 25/038]
17 – the redress system should operate independently of care institutions	Decline	He Purapura Ora recommendations 1, 4, 12, 15, 17, 50, 52 and 61 have been “declined” as these are the Royal Commission’s recommendations for the establishment of a new, independent and principles-based redress system. The Government has decided to prioritise improving the existing system.	Reference: <i>Responding to the Royal Commission’s redress recommendations</i> , cross-Ministerial briefing [CRACI 25/038]
18 – all survivors should have access to the redress system including previously	Partially accept	Recommendation 18 from He Purapura Ora has been “partially accepted” because redress will continue to focus on survivors. The family and whānau of survivors will not be able to access	Reference: CAB-25-MIN-0101

Recommendation	Response	Rationale for response	Decision maker and reference
settled claimants and the whānau of survivors		redress, as recommended by the Royal Commission, except in the situation where a survivor dies after initiating a claim.	<i>Responding to the Royal Commission's redress recommendations</i> , cross-Ministerial briefing [CRACI 25/038]
19 – the types of abuse and neglect that should be covered by the redress system	Partially accept	The types of abuse and neglect covered by the current State redress system will be retained. This is physical, sexual, emotional, and psychological abuse and neglect. Redress will not cover cultural, racial and spiritual abuse and neglect as recommended by the Royal Commission. It will cover historical and contemporary claims of abuse. No decision has been taken yet on an 'end date' for core State redress. For this reason, recommendation 19 from He Purapura Ora has been “partially accepted”.	Reference: CAB-25-MIN-0101 <i>Responding to the Royal Commission's redress recommendations</i> , cross-Ministerial briefing [CRACI 25/038]
23 – the redress system should be trauma-informed, flexible and be responsive to all survivors	Accept	Government has made clear its intention to deliver a better experience for survivors who are seeking redress through State claims processes, so recommendation 23 from He Purapura Ora is accepted. Processes will be made easier to access and navigate by implementing coordinated policy frameworks, shared governance arrangements, and a single point of entry. These measures will build on improvements agencies have already implemented in recent years, particularly since the receipt of He Purapura Ora.	Reference: CAB-25-MIN-0101 <i>Responding to the Royal Commission's redress recommendations</i> , cross-Ministerial briefing [CRACI 25/038]

Proactive release, open and transparent Government

Recommendation	Response	Rationale for response	Decision maker and reference
26 – a listening service should be offered to survivors accessing redress	Accept	The Government has confirmed the Survivor Experiences Service, which is hosted by the Department of Internal Affairs will continue to operate while improvements are made to State redress services.	Reference: CAB-25-MIN-0101 <i>Responding to the Royal Commission's redress recommendations</i> , cross-Ministerial briefing [CRACI 25/038]
27 – the redress system should (with survivor consent) use information disclosed to the listening service in support of claims	Accept	All State redress services work with the Survivor Experiences Service in the way outlined by the Royal Commission. This is why recommendation 27 from He Purapura Ora has been accepted.	Reference: <i>Responding to the Royal Commission's redress recommendations</i> , cross-Ministerial briefing [CRACI 25/038]
28 – survivors should be able to make both brief and standard claims	Decline	Recommendations 28 and 29 from He Purapura Ora are “declined” Survivors accessing redress through the Ministries of Education and Social Development will continue to have a choice of 'brief' claim (a rapid or expedited assessment) or a 'standard' claim (individual assessment) which is broadly consistent with the Royal Commission's recommendations, noting 'standard' claims do not consider impact. They will not be able to make both a brief and standard claim. Survivors accessing the Ministry of Health or Oranga Tamariki's claims processes do not currently have access to a 'brief' claim.	Reference: <i>Responding to the Royal Commission's redress recommendations</i> , cross-Ministerial briefing [CRACI 25/038]

Proactive release, open and transparent Government

Recommendation	Response	Rationale for response	Decision maker and reference
29 – both brief and standard claims should enable survivors to achieve restoration	Decline	Recommendations 28 and 29 from He Purapura Ora are “declined”. Survivors accessing redress through the Ministries of Education and Social Development will continue to have a choice of 'brief' claim (a rapid or expedited assessment) or a 'standard' claim (individual assessment) which is broadly consistent with the Royal Commission’s recommendations, noting 'standard' claims do not consider impact. They will not be able to make both a brief and standard claim. Survivors accessing the Ministry of Health or Oranga Tamariki's claims processes do not currently have access to a 'brief' claim.	Reference: <i>Responding to the Royal Commission’s redress recommendations</i> , cross-Ministerial briefing [CRACI 25/038]
30 – principles for assessing standard claims	Decline	Recommendations 30 and 31 from He Purapura Ora are “declined”. The government has decided to prioritise building on existing assessment processes used by State redress services and so the introduction of the assessment approach envisioned by the Royal Commission would be a significant expansion of existing processes and would likely go beyond the parameters set by Cabinet. The purpose of redress payments will continue to be to acknowledge but not compensate for the harm of abuse and neglect in State care.	Reference: CAB-25-MIN-0101 <i>Responding to the Royal Commission’s redress recommendations</i> , cross-Ministerial briefing [CRACI 25/038]
31 – principles for assessing brief claims	Decline	Recommendations 30 and 31 from He Purapura Ora are “declined”. The government has decided to prioritise building on existing assessment processes used by State redress services and so the introduction of the assessment approach envisioned by the Royal Commission would be a significant expansion of existing processes and would likely go beyond the parameters set by Cabinet. The purpose of redress payments	Reference: CAB-25-MIN-0101 <i>Responding to the Royal Commission’s redress recommendations</i> , cross-

Recommendation	Response	Rationale for response	Decision maker and reference
		will continue to be to acknowledge but not compensate for the harm of abuse and neglect in State care.	Ministerial briefing [CRACI 25/038]
32 – the redress system should offer meaningful apologies to survivors and others affected by abuse in care	Partially accept	The Government's decisions for the redress system address several of the Royal Commission's recommendations regarding redress offerings, including the provision of apologies which take explicit responsibility for what happened to a survivor as per recommendations 32-36 in He Purapura Ora. Work on whether there is a need for legislative change to allow for more meaningful apologies is underway. Recommendation 32 is "partially accepted" because apologies made by redress agencies are provided to the claimant, not others affected by abuse in care. Cabinet will consider options for change in 9(2) and recommendations 33-36 from He Purapura Ora will be recorded as needs further consideration until further decisions are made.	Reference: CAB-25-MIN-0101 <i>Responding to the Royal Commission's redress recommendations</i> , cross-Ministerial briefing [CRACI 25/038]
40 – redress payments should meaningfully recognise abuse and its impact, but not compensate for harm or loss	Partially accept	The Government has announced an increase in the funding for redress payments to enable all redress payments to be raised and for higher top-end payments for egregious abuse experienced by a small proportion of survivors. The response to recommendation 40 from He Purapura Ora is "partially accept" because payments made by the State redress system do not consider the impact of abuse or neglect in care.	Reference: CAB-25-MIN-0101 <i>Responding to the Royal Commission's redress recommendations</i> , cross-Ministerial briefing [CRACI 25/038]
41 – principles for determining the size of payments	Partially accept	Recommendation 41 is "partially accepted" as several components of this recommendation can be used to inform work on a common payment framework. This is a partial	Reference: CAB-25-MIN-0101

Recommendation	Response	Rationale for response	Decision maker and reference
		accept because no significant change will be made to assessment processes used by State redress services, which the principles also speak to.	<i>Responding to the Royal Commission's redress recommendations</i> , cross-Ministerial briefing [CRACI 25/038]
42 – payments should not affect a survivor's financial status	Accept	Recommendation 42 from He Purapura Ora, that redress payments should not adversely affect survivors' financial position, has been accepted. State redress payments will continue to be tax-free and not affect individual's tax liabilities. Work is also underway to correct a regulatory inconsistency relating to redress payments made to survivors of the Lake Alice Psychiatric Hospital Child and Adolescent Unit survivors. This will ensure that any redress provided to that cohort of survivors will be treated the same as survivors from other cohorts.	Reference: CAB-24-MIN-0516 CAB-25-MIN-0101 <i>Responding to the Royal Commission's redress recommendations</i> , cross-Ministerial briefing [CRACI 25/038]
44 – the redress system should offer a 'common experience payment'	Decline	Recommendation 44 from He Purapura Ora is "declined" because the State redress system will not offer common experience payments as envisioned by the Royal Commission.	Reference: <i>Responding to the Royal Commission's redress recommendations</i> , cross-Ministerial briefing [CRACI 25/038]
46 – the redress system should give survivors a written record of decisions	Partially accepted	Existing State redress services all provide survivors with a written record of decision. These records are not available in te reo Māori or New Zealand Sign Language which is why this recommendation 46 has been "partially accepted".	Reference: <i>Responding to the Royal Commission's redress recommendations</i> , cross-

Recommendation	Response	Rationale for response	Decision maker and reference
			Ministerial briefing [CRACI 25/038]
47 – the effect of a survivor accepting redress on taking further action	Partially accept	Settling a claim does not limit a survivor’s right to make a complaint (as per the Crown Resolution Strategy), but does limit a survivor’s ability to take civil proceedings. Recommendation 47 of He Purapura Ora is “partially accepted”.	Reference: <i>Responding to the Royal Commission’s redress recommendations</i> , cross-Ministerial briefing [CRACI 25/038]
48 – redress decisions should not have legal effect on organisations or individuals	Accept	Redress decisions within the existing system have no legal effect on a named person or organisation as per recommendation 48 of He Purapura Ora. This because they are not the result of an investigation.	Reference: <i>Responding to the Royal Commission’s redress recommendations</i> , cross-Ministerial briefing [CRACI 25/038]
50 – the government should legislate to establish a redress scheme	Decline	He Purapura Ora recommendations 1, 4, 12, 15, 17, 50, 52 and 61 have been “declined” as these are the Royal Commission’s recommendations for the establishment of a new, independent and principles-based redress system. The Government has decided to prioritise improving the existing system.	Reference: <i>Responding to the Royal Commission’s redress recommendations</i> , cross-Ministerial briefing [CRACI 25/038]
51 – expectations for how the redress system should operate	Accept in part	The package of improvements announced by the Government in May 2025 aligns with this recommendation. In particular, the emphasis on ensuring a consistent redress experience for survivors regardless of which agency is responsible for their	Reference: CAB-25-MIN-0101

Recommendation	Response	Rationale for response	Decision maker and reference
		claim, and the introduction of an independent review where survivors are unhappy with a claims decision. The response to this recommendation is recorded as “accept intent” but could be updated to a full or partial accept following the implementation of improvements to redress processes or following the 2027 review.	<i>Responding to the Royal Commission’s redress recommendations</i> , cross-Ministerial briefing [CRACI 25/038]
52 – powers given to the redress system to request information	Decline	He Purapura Ora recommendations 1, 4, 12, 15, 17, 50, 52 and 61 have been “declined” as these are the Royal Commission’s recommendations for the establishment of a new, independent and principles-based redress system. The Government has decided to prioritise improving the existing system.	Reference: <i>Responding to the Royal Commission’s redress recommendations</i> , cross-Ministerial briefing [CRACI 25/038]
53 – survivors should be able to ask for a review of redress decisions	Accept intent	Recommendation 53 from He Purapura Ora is recorded as “accept intent”. A new process for independent review of claims decisions where survivors are dissatisfied with the outcome will be introduced, but this will not directly affect claims outcomes. This new review process is designed to be a quicker and easier process than going to the Ombudsman, with that remaining as an option if survivors want to pursue a complaint through that route.	Reference: CAB-25-MIN-0101 <i>Responding to the Royal Commission’s redress recommendations</i> , cross-Ministerial briefing [CRACI 25/038]
54 – redress decisions should be open to review	Partially accept	Recommendation 54 from He Purapura Ora is “partially accepted”. Principle 3 of the Crown Resolution Strategy, which guides State redress agencies’ approach to resolving claims, states says that if claimants become aware of additional material information or circumstances that were not	Reference: <i>Responding to the Royal Commission’s redress recommendations</i> , cross-

Recommendation	Response	Rationale for response	Decision maker and reference
		considered by the Crown at that time, the Crown may consider that new information and whether any additional response should be made. This does not fully align with the Royal Commission's recommendation as the onus to provide additional material is on the claimants (not the redress services).	Ministerial briefing [CRACI 25/038]
55 – redress system should keep confidential any information it receives	Accept	Recommendation 55 and 56 from He Purapura Ora are accepted as they both align with existing practice for State redress services.	Reference: <i>Responding to the Royal Commission's redress recommendations</i> , cross-Ministerial briefing [CRACI 25/038]
56 – alleged perpetrators' names should be redacted from redress decisions	Accept	Recommendation 55 and 56 from He Purapura Ora are accepted as they both align with existing practice for State redress services.	Reference: CAB-25-MIN-0101 <i>Responding to the Royal Commission's redress recommendations</i> , cross-Ministerial briefing [CRACI 25/038]
57 – the redress system should have consistent processes for referrals	Accept	Recommendation 57 from He Purapura Ora is accepted and will be considered as part of the design and implementation of common referral policies for the core State redress system.	Reference: CAB-25-MIN-0101 <i>Responding to the Royal Commission's redress recommendations</i> , cross-

Recommendation	Response	Rationale for response	Decision maker and reference
			Ministerial briefing [CRACI 25/038]
58 – survivors should be able to disclose any redress they receive	Accept	He Purapura Ora recommendation 58 is accepted because there are no limits on a settled claimants' ability to disclose what redress they receive from a State redress service.	Reference: <i>Responding to the Royal Commission's redress recommendations</i> , cross-Ministerial briefing [CRACI 25/038]
60 – there should be an independent review of the redress system after two years	Partially accept	As part of the redress system improvements announced in May 2025, an independent review of the impact of the changes will be undertaken by 9(2)(f)(iv). The review will inform subsequent decisions about further potential system changes, including matters of integration, independence and capacity. Cabinet will agree a Terms of Reference for the review by March 2027. This is recorded as "partially accept" because while the recommended review will be undertaken by independent persons it will focus on reviewing the impact of changes to redress system. It will not be a further review of the entire redress system.	Reference: CAB-25-MIN-0101 <i>Responding to the Royal Commission's redress recommendations</i> , cross-Ministerial briefing [CRACI 25/038]
61 – powers given to the redress scheme to report on and make recommendations to care institutions	Decline	He Purapura Ora recommendations 1, 4, 12, 15, 17, 50, 52 and 61 have been "declined" as these are the Royal Commission's recommendations for the establishment of a new, independent and principles-based redress system. The Government has decided to prioritise improving the existing system.	Reference: <i>Responding to the Royal Commission's redress recommendations</i> , cross-Ministerial briefing [CRACI 25/038]

Recommendation	Response	Rationale for response	Decision maker and reference
68 – the Māori collective in conjunction with the Purapura Ora Collective should commission an expert review of support services available to survivors	Decline	Recommendation 68 from He Purapura Ora has been “declined” as this was outside of the scope of the work of the Redress Design Group.	Reference: CAB-22-MIN-0513 CAB-23-MIN-0122 <i>Responding to the Royal Commission’s redress recommendations, cross-Ministerial briefing [CRACI 25/038]</i>
69 – the government should consider establishing a fund to support improving services based on findings of the review in recommendation 68	Decline	Recommendation 69 from He Purapura Ora is “declined” because the review stipulated in recommendation 68 was not completed.	Reference: <i>Responding to the Royal Commission’s redress recommendations, cross-Ministerial briefing [CRACI 25/038]</i>
71 - acknowledgements and apologies should, where appropriate, be accompanied by tangible demonstrations of goodwill and reconciliation	Accept intent	The intent of this recommendation is accepted, but is it not being delivered in the specific way set out by the Royal Commission. This work is being progressed with the Survivor-Focused Fund and the National Day of Reflection.	References: CAB-24-MIN-0412 <i>Responding to the Royal Commission’s redress recommendations, cross-Ministerial briefing [CRACI 25/038]</i>

Recommendation	Response	Rationale for response	Decision maker and reference
			Fund to better recognise and support survivors Beehive.govt.nz
72 - fund a national project to investigate potential unmarked graves and urupā or graves at psychiatric hospitals and psychopaedic sites	Accept intent	The intent of this recommendation is accepted, but it is not being delivered in the specific way set out by the Royal Commission. This work is being progressed with the Survivor-Focused Fund and the National Day of Reflection.	References: CAB-24-MIN-0412 <i>Responding to the Royal Commission's redress recommendations</i> , cross-Ministerial briefing [CRACI 25/038] Fund to better recognise and support survivors Beehive.govt.nz
79 – consider obstacles to litigation for abuse and neglect	Decline	The Minister of Justice has directed officials to progress work addressing obstacles to civil litigation identified by the Royal Commission (including recommendations 78 and 37). Dedicating resource to identifying additional obstacles, as proposed by recommendation 79, is not considered necessary at this point. This recommendation is, therefore, “declined”.	The Minister for Justice is responsible for this decision. Reference: Briefing to the Minister of Justice, <i>Response to Ministry of Justice-led recommendations of the Royal Commission of Inquiry into Abuse in Care</i> .

Recommendation	Response	Rationale for response	Decision maker and reference
80 - review and consider raising the rates available for abuse in care work	Accept intent	The intent of this recommendation is accepted, but it is not being delivered in the specific way set out by the Royal Commission. Changes were made to legal aid through Budget 2022. A 12 percent increase in hourly rates came into effect on 1 July 2022. In addition, an increase in eligibility rates, increase in debt repayment thresholds, removal of interest and removal of the \$50 user charge came into effect for people accessing legal aid on 1 January 2023.	References: Provider rates & special rates New Zealand Ministry of Justice Get legal aid New Zealand Ministry of Justice
85 – support survivors to access their records	Accept intent	The intent of this recommendation is accepted, but is it not being delivered in the specific way set out by the Royal Commission. Chief Executives endorsed a collaboratively-developed Care Records Framework. Records redaction guidance was published on the Crown Response Office website in April 2023. Supporting information for survivors was also published. The Survivor Experiences Service offers support to access care records, and a new records website has been launched.	References: CAB-22-MIN-0589 Chief Executive paper, <i>Seeking CE endorsement of the Care Records Framework</i> The care records definition Care records protection Shared Redaction Guidance Home Kōnae SES Records Support CAB-25-MIN-0101 <i>Responding to the Royal Commission's redress recommendations, cross-</i>

Proactive release - open and transparent Government

Recommendation	Response	Rationale for response	Decision maker and reference
			Ministerial briefing [CRACI 25/038]
86 – improve approaches to redaction of care records	Accept intent	<p>The intent of this recommendation is accepted, but is it not being delivered in the specific way set out by the Royal Commission.</p> <p>Records redaction guidance was published on the Crown Response Office website in April 2023. Supporting information for survivors was also published.</p>	<p>References:</p> <p>CAB-22-MIN-0589</p> <p>Shared Redaction Guidance</p> <p>CAB-25-MIN-0101</p> <p><i>Responding to the Royal Commission's redress recommendations, cross-Ministerial briefing [CRACI 25/038]</i></p>
87 – develop guidelines on records creation, maintenance and access	Accept intent	<p>The intent of this recommendation is accepted, but is it not being delivered in the specific way set out by the Royal Commission.</p> <p>Chief Executives endorsed a collaboratively-developed Care Records Framework. This is to support care record holders to improve their practice of creating, managing and providing access to care records.</p>	<p>Reference:</p> <p>CAB-22-MIN-0589</p> <p>Chief Executive paper, <i>Seeking CE endorsement of the Care Records Framework</i></p> <p>Shared Redaction Guidance</p> <p>CAB-25-MIN-0101</p> <p><i>Responding to the Royal Commission's redress recommendations, cross-Ministerial briefing [CRACI 25/038]</i></p>

Recommendation	Response	Rationale for response	Decision maker and reference
88 – streamline the way agencies handle survivor records	Accept intent	<p>The intent of this recommendation is accepted, but is it not being delivered in the specific way set out by the Royal Commission.</p> <p>Chief Executives endorsed a collaboratively-developed Care Records Framework. This is to support care record holders to improve their practice of creating, managing and providing access to care records.</p>	<p>This is an operational decision, in line with agency, ministerial and Government priorities.</p> <p>CAB-22-MIN-0589</p> <p>Chief Executive paper, <i>Seeking CE endorsement of the Care Records Framework</i></p> <p>Shared Redaction Guidance</p> <p>CAB-25-MIN-0101</p> <p><i>Responding to the Royal Commission's redress recommendations</i>, cross-Ministerial briefing [CRACI 25/038]</p>
89 – review disposal authorities for care records, consider a care record standard and consider a service to help survivors find their records	Accept intent	<p>The intent of this recommendation is accepted, but is it not being delivered in the specific way set out by the Royal Commission.</p> <p>Matters associated with disposal authorities and record standards were addressed by the Chief Archivist. Archives New Zealand (Archives) developed and published a definition of 'care records'.</p> <p>The Survivor Experiences Service offers support to access care records, and a new records website has been launched.</p>	<p>References:</p> <p>Chief Executive paper, <i>Seeking CE endorsement of the Care Records Framework</i></p> <p>The care records definition</p> <p>Care records protection</p> <p>Shared Redaction Guidance</p> <p>Home Kōnae</p>

Recommendation	Response	Rationale for response	Decision maker and reference
			SES Records Support CAB-25-MIN-0101 <i>Responding to the Royal Commission's redress recommendations, cross-Ministerial briefing [CRACI 25/038]</i>
91 – use best endeavours to resolve claims in the lead-up to the establishment of a new redress scheme and should offer settlements that do not prejudice survivors' rights	Decline	Recommendation 91 from He Purapura Ora is “declined”. Existing State redress agencies have continued to resolve claims while the Royal Commission's redress recommendations were considered. Nonetheless settlement offers did not guarantee access to an improved redress system for survivors with settled claims, and there is no proposal to establish a redress system through legislation at this time.	Reference: CAB-19-MIN-0651 <i>Responding to the Royal Commission's redress recommendations, cross-Ministerial briefing [CRACI 25/038]</i>
93 – set up and fund a mechanism to make advance payments to survivors who, because of serious ill health or age	Partially accept	Existing claims agencies' prioritisation of claims from ill or older claimants, and the provision of terminal illness payments to Lake Alice Psychiatric Hospital Child and Adolescent Unit survivors align with recommendation 93 from He Purapura Ora. The response is recorded as “partially accept” because agencies will continue to prioritise these claimants, and there is no 'start date' for the system. In August 2024, the Government also made payments available to any survivor of the Lake Alice Psychiatric Hospital	References: CAB-22-MIN-0266 CAB-24-MIN-0300 CAB-25-MIN-0101 <i>Responding to the Royal Commission's redress recommendations, cross-Ministerial briefing [CRACI 25/038]</i>

Recommendation	Response	Rationale for response	Decision maker and reference
		Child and Adolescent Unit who had a diagnosis of six-months or less to live.	
94 - – fund a listening service for survivors until a new redress scheme is in place	Accept	Recommendation 94 from He Purapura Ora is accepted. The Survivor Experiences Service has operated as an interim listening service while work has progressed on an improved redress system.	Reference: CAB-22-MIN-0266 CAB-22-MIN-0589 Survivor Experience Service
95 – respond to the recommendation within four months	Decline	Given the complexity of the recommendations and the need to give them due consideration, the four month timeframe for responding to them was not met. This is why recommendation 95 from He Purapura Ora has been “declined” (and recommendation 131 from Whanaketia is “partially accepted”). While the previous government publicised how it would respond to the redress report soon after receiving it, the response does not sufficiently canvas all the matters recommended by the Royal Commission to say this is accepted in full or in part.	Reference: SWC-21-MIN-0204 <i>Abuse in Care Inquiry Response Plan Framework</i> cross-ministerial briefing [CRACI 25/014]

Proactive release - open and transparent Government

Recommendation	Response	Rationale for response	Decision maker and reference
Whanaketia			
2 – The Prime Minister should make an apology covering a range of matters	Partially accept	Recommendation 2 is partially accepted because there was considerable specificity across the apology recommendations and their sub-parts, and the 12 November 2024 apology did not meet the specificity set out in every sub-part.	References: CAB-24-MIN-0019 <i>Progressing the apology text, announcements and arrangements for the 12 November Public Apology event, ministerial briefing to the Lead Minister [CRACI 24/034]</i>
3 - Public acknowledgments and apologies for historical abuse and neglect in the care should be made by faith-based and public sector leaders	Partially accept	Recommendation 3 is partially accepted because there was considerable specificity across the apology recommendations and their sub-parts, and the 12 November 2024 apology did not meet the specificity set out in every sub-part.	References: CAB-24-MIN-0019 <i>Progressing the apology text, announcements and arrangements for the 12 November Public Apology event, ministerial briefing to the Lead Minister [CRACI 24/034]</i>
5 – review the appropriateness of things named after or memorialising proven perpetrators of abuse and neglect	Accept intent	Recommendation 5 is recorded as “accept intent” because Government is relying on local authorities to commit resources to this task and act as needed. Government agencies are undertaking reviews of things they are responsible for, and the Government has written to local authorities to ask them to review things under their control.	Reference: CAB-24-MIN-0412

Recommendation	Response	Rationale for response	Decision maker and reference
6 – Police to re-open cases specific action against torture, or cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment	Accept intent	Recommendation 6 is “accept intent” as Police investigations cannot be initiated without a complaint or allegation being made, and capacity constraints and current investigative demands, mean Police will generally not be re-opening previous investigations proactively.	This is an operational matter for the Police, with decisions made by the Chief Assurance Officer, under delegated authority from the Police Executive.
7 – take specific action against torture, or cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment	Accept intent	Recommendation 7 is “accept intent” as any Government response to torture, cruel, inhumane or degrading treatment will be thorough and robust, but may not occur consistently with the specific sub-parts of this recommendation. This is why the response is recorded as accept intent.	This is an operational matter for agencies to decide as and when necessary.
10 – Backdate the start of the puretumu torowhānui system and scheme	Decline	Recommendation 10 from Whanaketia is “declined” as access to redress for survivors of abuse in State care will not be backdated. Survivors with settled claims will be able to access a top up payment which aims to address inequities in previous settlement payments made by claims agencies.	Reference: CAB-22-MIN-0513 CAB-23-MIN-0122 CAB-25-MIN-0101 <i>Responding to the Royal Commission’s redress recommendations, cross-Ministerial briefing [CRACI 25/038]</i>
14 – The government should ensure that the puretumu torowhānui system and scheme is designed and operated in a	Accept intent	Recommendations 2 and 13 from He Purapura Ora and 14 from Whanaketia relate to the response to the Royal Commission being delivered in partnership with Māori and consistently with te Tiriti o Waitangi. The intent of these recommendations is accepted, as the Crown’s commitment to	Reference: <i>Abuse in Care Inquiry Response Plan Framework cross-</i>

Recommendation	Response	Rationale for response	Decision maker and reference
manner that gives effect to te Tiriti o Waitangi and its principles		te Titiri o Waitangi the Treaty of Waitangi will not be delivered in the specific ways detailed in the recommendations.	ministerial briefing [CRACI 25/014] <i>Responding to the Royal Commission's redress recommendations, cross-Ministerial briefing [CRACI 25/038]</i>
15 – The government should ensure that the puretumu torowhānui system and scheme is designed and operated in a manner consistent with te Tiriti and human rights	Accept intent	The Crown is committed to meeting New Zealand's human rights obligations, consistent with the intent of recommendations 3 from He Purapura Ora and 15 from Whanaketia. This commitment is made in the context of continuing work to deliver Ministerial and Cabinet priorities in the care and justice systems, some of which will be in tension with these recommendations. There are established processes considering Aotearoa Zealand's human rights obligations when making decisions about legislation, regulations and policy, and in delivering government services. This enables decisions about how to ensure compliance to occur on a case-by-case basis.	Reference: <i>Responding to the Royal Commission's redress recommendations, cross-Ministerial briefing [CRACI 25/038]</i>
18 – The government should: appoint an independent person to promptly review all Lake Alice settlements	Partially accept	Recommendation 18 from Whanaketia is recorded as “partially accept” because an independent review of previous settlements was not undertaken as part of implementing this process. Cabinet noted that the Lead Coordination Minister did not believe it necessary or fiscally responsible to appoint and fund an independent review, given that the facts of the inequities related to the first round of settlements are well established.	<i>Responding to the Royal Commission's redress recommendations, cross-Ministerial briefing [CRACI 25/038]</i>

Recommendation	Response	Rationale for response	Decision maker and reference
20 – The government and faith-based institutions should provide contestable funding for projects that promote effective community healing from the collective impacts of abuse and neglect	Partially accept	The Government has established a established for non-governmental initiatives that support survivors and local councils to respond to some of the Royal Commission's recommendations. The recommendation is "partially accepted" as it was not established with faith-based institutions as recommended and Cabinet agreed to a refocus on the priority being on supports and services for survivors delivered by non-governmental organisations.	Reference: CAB-23-MIN-0139 CAB-24-MIN-0412
21 – a whānau harm payment be provided for members of whānau who have been cared for by survivors	Decline	This recommendation is "declined" as the Government has decided the redress system should remain primarily focused on acknowledging and apologising for the experiences of survivors themselves, not their family and whānau.	Reference: CAB-22-MIN-0513 CAB-23-MIN-0122 CAB-25-MIN-0101 <i>Responding to the Royal Commission's redress recommendations, cross-Ministerial briefing [CRACI 25/038]</i>
22(a) – amend the suite of prosecution guidelines to address a range of matters	Accept intent	This sub-recommendation is complete. It is accept intent as, while the guidelines are drafted to support prosecutors' compliance with the law, including all relevant human rights law, they do not it is not workable in guidance of this type to specify compliance with New Zealand's international human	These guidelines are the responsibility of the Solicitor-General. References: Prosecution Guidelines » Crown Law

Recommendation	Response	Rationale for response	Decision maker and reference
		rights obligations and other relevant international law obligations.	
22(b),(d)	Accept	The scheduled review of the Solicitor-General Guidelines has been completed by the Crown Law Office. T	These guidelines are the responsibility of the Solicitor-General. References: Prosecution Guidelines » Crown Law
22(c),(e) – establish a review process for complainants who allege offences falling under Parts 7 or 8 of the Crimes Act 1961 where a decision has been made not to prosecute	Partially accept	<p>Sub-recommendation 22(c) is “partially accepted” as , while the public interest test is not explicit that harm in State care weighs in favour of prosecution, the guidelines provide general guidance about how victims’ circumstances should be taken into account (including providing guidance relevant to disabled people and victims who have experienced trauma).</p> <p>There were six, specific sub-parts to recommendation 22(e). This sub-recommendation is “partially accepted”. The Guidelines provide a detailed process for reviewing decisions in cases involving sexual violation. In respect of all other offences in Parts 7 and 8 of the Crimes Act the Guidelines do not expressly require a review process. They do, however, have a general requirement for a clear explanation for a decision not to prosecute, and they recognise that prosecuting agencies may review prosecution decisions in certain circumstances.</p>	These guidelines are the responsibility of the Solicitor-General. Reference: Prosecution Guidelines » Crown Law

Recommendation	Response	Rationale for response	Decision maker and reference
23 – The Solicitor-General should issue specific guidelines to prosecutors on how to approach cases involving complainants, witnesses and defendants with multi-layered needs	Accept	The scheduled review of the Solicitor-General Guidelines has been completed by the Crown Law Office.	These guidelines are the responsibility of the Solicitor-General. Reference: Prosecution Guidelines » Crown Law
24 – train prosecutors in the Solicitor General’s prosecution guidelines	Accept	Police is working to have all prosecutors and frontline staff trained on the revised Guidelines, in advance of them coming into effect on 1 January 2026.	This is an operational matter for the Police, with decisions made by the Chief Assurance Officer, under delegated authority from the Police Executive. References: Prosecution Guidelines » Crown Law <i>Royal Commission of Inquiry (RCOI) into Abuse in Care – Police response to the recommendations [ELT/24/274]</i>
25 – support and invest in judicial-led initiatives, such as Te Ao Mārama – Enhancing Justice for All	Accept	In May 2024, \$25.3 million of the Te Ao Mārama funding (Budget 2022: \$47.4m over four years, 1 July 2022 – 30 June 2026) was put into tagged contingency while the Ministry of Justice focuses on delivery to the eight locations where work is advanced and gathers information on the effectiveness of Te Ao Mārama interventions.	The Minister for Justice is responsible for this recommendation. Reference:

Recommendation	Response	Rationale for response	Decision maker and reference
			Briefing to the Minister of Justice, <i>Response to the Ministry of Justice-led recommendations of the Royal Commission of Inquiry into Abuse in Care.</i>
26 – amend the Crimes Act 1961 to specifically include disability within the definition of a Vulnerable adult.	Accept	The Responding to Abuse in Care Legislation Amendment Bill amends the Crimes Act 1961 to specifically include disability within the definition of a vulnerable adult.	Reference: CAB-24-MIN-0380
27(a) – amend the Sentencing Act to the vulnerability of a victim as an aggravating factor	Accept intent	Cabinet agreed to two amendments to existing aggravating factors in the Sentencing Act 2002. In responding to recommendation 27(a) instead of adding a new aggravating factor as recommended by the Royal Commission, Cabinet has “accepted the intent” of the recommendation, and made an amendment to an existing aggravating factor.	Reference: CAB-24-MIN-0426
27(b) – amend the Sentencing Act to consider aggravating factors in abuse and neglect cases involving those under 18 years old	Accept	This recommendation is “accepted” and completed. Amendments to the Sentencing Act 2002 were incorporated into the Sentencing (Reform) Amendment Bill, which was passed on 26 March 2025.	Reference: CAB-24-MIN-0426
27(c) – include a requirement in the Sentencing Act that people convicted for offences	Declined	This recommendation has been “declined” because consideration of offenders’ backgrounds, including the circumstances of any previous convictions, are already adequately provided for under several provisions in the	Reference: CAB-24-MIN-0426

Recommendation	Response	Rationale for response	Decision maker and reference
committed in response to abuse and/or neglect in care are not unduly penalised		Sentencing Act 2002. In addition, there were concerns about the workability of implementing recommendation 27(c) within the existing sentencing framework.	
31 – a list of specialist lawyers available to provide legal advice to victims on redress	Accept	This recommendation is “accepted” and underway. Work is being led by the Ministry of Justice to establish a list of lawyers available to provide legal advice on abuse in care cases.	The Minister for Justice is responsible for this recommendation. Reference: Briefing to the Minister of Justice, <i>Response to the Ministry of Justice-led recommendations of the Royal Commission of Inquiry into Abuse in Care</i> .
33 – ensure that investigators, prosecutors, lawyers, and judges receive education on the Commission and a range of other matters	Accept intent	This recommendation is for Police as it applies to investigators and Police prosecutors. Police have begun work to deliver on this recommendation. It may not be delivered in the specific way set out by the Commission, which is why accept intent has been recorded. The recommendation also extends to Te Kura Kaiwhakawā Institute of Judicial Studies and the New Zealand Law Society and other relevant legal professional bodies. It has been brought to their attention.	As it relates to investigators and Police prosecutors, this is an operational matter for the Police, with decisions made by the Chief Assurance Officer, under delegated authority from the Police Executive.
34 – review the Police Manual to reflect and refer to Aotearoa New Zealand	Accept	Police have begun work to deliver on this recommendation.	This is an operational matter for the Police, with decisions made by the Chief Assurance Officer,

Recommendation	Response	Rationale for response	Decision maker and reference
international human rights obligations and other relevant international law obligations			under delegated authority from the Police Executive.
35 – establish a specialist unit dedicated to investigating and prosecuting those responsible for historical or current abuse	Accept intent	The Police Executive has made an operational decision to “accept the intent” of the recommendation but manage demand through Police’s existing specialist investigative capacity.	This is an operational matter for the Police. Reference: <i>Royal Commission of Inquiry (RCOI) into Abuse in Care – Police response to the recommendations</i> [ELT/24/274]
44 – Until the Care Safe Agency is established, as an interim measure the government should enable the new Care System Office to perform a range of functions...	Partially accept	The Crown Response Office has been established but it is not performing all the functions described by the Commission. A final decision on this recommendation cannot be made until further advice and decision have been taken to Cabinet. This is why this recommendation is recorded as “partially accept” at this stage.	Reference: CAB-24-MIN-0331
58(b) – ensure the regime for children’s worker safety checking remains fit for purpose	Accept	Cabinet has directed officials to undertake further work on options for improved safety checking requirements, including to enable employers to better identify prospective core workers who have criminal convictions from overseas jurisdictions.	Reference: CAB-24-MIN-0380

Recommendation	Response	Rationale for response	Decision maker and reference
59 – ensure all prospective staff have a satisfactory report from the applicable vetting regime and up to date registration status	Accept	This is a matter of existing policy, and in some cases, a legislative requirement for care agencies. For example, agencies and their care providers have obligations under the Children’s Act 2014.	Reference: Numerous
62 – recruit for and support a diverse workforce, including in leadership and governance roles, so far as practicable	Accept	This is a matter of existing policy for care agencies consistent with the requirements of the Public Service Act 2020. The Act places requirements on leaders to promote diversity and inclusiveness within our workforce and workplaces.	Reference: Public Service Act 2020
63(j) – protect workers who report abuse and a neglect from recrimination	Accept	This is a matter of existing policy for care agencies consistent with the requirements of the Protected Disclosures (Protection of Whistleblowers) Act 2022 covers protection of workplace disclosures. It includes protecting staff who raise complaints and allegations of abuse and neglect in care. This addresses recommendation 63(k).	Reference: Protected Disclosures (Protection of Whistleblowers) Act 2022
71 – prioritise, support and invest in models of care that do not perpetuate institutional environments that enable abuse	Accept intent	Government agencies have “accepted the intent” of this recommendation in the context of the work they are already undertaking to improve the care system, consistency with existing strategies, policies and programmes.	This is an operational decision, in line with agency, ministerial and Government priorities.
78 – seek the best possible understanding of the background, culture, needs and vulnerabilities of those	Accept intent	Government agencies have “accepted the intent” of this recommendation in the context of the work they are already	This is an operational decision, in line with agency, ministerial and Government priorities.

Recommendation	Response	Rationale for response	Decision maker and reference
in care, and protect and enhance the mana and mauri of Māori in care		undertaking to improve the care system, consistency with existing strategies, policies and programmes.	
81 – comply with a set of record-keeping principles	Accept intent	This work is underway as part of work to improve record request and record keeping. There is significant specificity in the recommendation, so it may not be possible to fully accept it. A final response can be made at the end of records work.	Reference: CAB-22-MIN-0589 Chief Executive paper, <i>Seeking CE endorsement of the Care Records Framework</i>
82 – care providers should, together with a person in care, document an account of their life in care	Accept intent	This work is underway as part of work to improve record request and record keeping. A final response can be made at the end of records work.	Reference: CAB-22-MIN-0589 Chief Executive paper, <i>Seeking CE endorsement of the Care Records Framework</i>
88 – The government should take all practical steps to ensure the ongoing safety of children, young people and adults in care at Gloriavale	Accept intent	Recommendation 88 is “accept intent” as there is ongoing work to ensure safety at Gloriavale. Regional operational leads from Health New Zealand, the Ministries of Education, Social Development, and Business, Innovation and Employment (Labour Inspectorate) along with the New Zealand Police, the Department of Internal Affairs (Charities Services), WorkSafe New Zealand and Oranga Tamariki meet monthly for information sharing purposes on work agencies are doing in relation to the community at Gloriavale. Regional leaders from these agencies meet with the Regional Public Service Commissioner on a six weekly basis.	This is an operational decision, in line with agency, ministerial and Government priorities.

Recommendation	Response	Rationale for response	Decision maker and reference
113 – disseminate and publicise the findings and recommendations of this Inquiry in the widest and most transparent manner possible	Accept	Most Crown response agencies, including the Crown Response Office, have put information and links on their websites and many have used their other existing channels to inform staff and key stakeholders about Whanaketia. The Department of Corrections has purchased copies and distributed them in prisons.	Reference: CAB-24-MIN-0380
114 – accelerate and prioritise current work to enable those in care to better participate in decisions about them	Accept intent	Government agencies have “accepted the intent” of this recommendation in the context of the work they are already undertaking to improve the care system, consistency with existing strategies, policies and programmes.	This is an operational decision, in line with agency, ministerial and Government priorities.
117 – partner with hapu iwi and Maori to give effect to te Tiriti o Waitangi and the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples in relation to care functions	Accept intent	Recommendation 117 is accepted intent as a range of different engagement approaches are, and will be, undertaken in the delivery of care services to those who need it.	Engagement approaches will be decided in line with agency, ministerial and Government priorities. Reference: <i>Responding to the Royal Commission’s redress recommendations</i> , cross-Ministerial briefing [CRACI 25/038]
118 – all agencies delivering care should uphold all relevant international	Accept intent	Agencies have “accepted the intent” of this recommendation in the context of the work they are already undertaking to	This is an operational decision, in line with agency, ministerial and Government priorities.

Recommendation	Response	Rationale for response	Decision maker and reference
human rights obligations, and “Enabling Good Lives” principles		improve the care system, consistency with existing strategies, policies and programmes.	Reference: <i>Responding to the Royal Commission’s redress recommendations</i> , cross-Ministerial briefing [CRACI 25/038]
123(a), (b) – establish an independent Care System Office to later become a Ministry for the Care system in a central agency	Partially accept	<p>The Government has established the Crown Response Office. Further decisions are needed on whether a Care System Office and Ministry will be established before a final decision on recommendation 123(a) and (b) can be made.</p> <p>Recommendation 123(c) that the Care System Office does not employ senior officials or middle management who have been involved in the care system is “declined”. To provide quality, credible advice the Crown Response Office and care agencies need knowledge and understanding of the existing system, including the history of what changes have been tried, what has and hasn’t worked and why.</p>	<p>Recommendation 123(c) is an operational decision, in line with employment legislation, and agency, ministerial and Government priorities.</p> <p>Reference: CAB-24-MIN-0331 <i>RCOI Abuse in Care – options for implementation Office</i>, Briefing to the Minister for the Public Service [2024-0219]</p>
124 – establish a Care System Office to lead the response and implement the Care Safe Agency and Act	Partially accept	<p>The Government has established the Crown Response Office. Further decisions are needed on whether a Care System Office and Ministry will be established before a final decision on the Government response can be recorded.</p>	<p>Reference: CAB-24-MIN-0331</p>

Recommendation	Response	Rationale for response	Decision maker and reference
126 – the response should be done in partnership with iwi, and deliver on te Tiriti o Waitangi and United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples	Accept intent	Recommendation 126 is accept intent as the Crown response and work towards decisions on changes to redress systems have been developed by Government alone, so the specific detail and intent of this recommendation has not been met. A range of different engagement approaches will be undertaken to consider te Tiriti obligations across the response.	Reference: <i>Abuse in Care Inquiry Response Plan Framework</i> cross-ministerial briefing [CRACI 25/014]
127 – the response should be researched, designed, piloted, implemented and evaluated with all affected communities	Accept intent	Engagement with survivors and others may not always occur in the specific ways detailed across the recommendations. This is why the responses to recommendations 6-8 and 14 from He Purapura Ora, and recommendation 127 from Whanaketia are recorded as “accept intent”.	Reference: <i>Abuse in Care Inquiry Response Plan Framework</i> cross-ministerial briefing [CRACI 25/014]
129 – reflect survivor experience, and diversity in employment processes, and give effect to te Tiriti o Waitangi	Accept intent	The intent of this recommendation is accepted consistent with the requirements of the Public Service Act 2020. The Act places requirements on leaders to promote diversity and inclusiveness within State sector workforce and workplaces. A final decision about whether it can be fully accepted can only be made when the response is finalised.	Reference: Public Service Act 2020
130 - – publish responses to this report and the Inquiry’s interim reports on whether they accept each of the Inquiry’s findings in whole or in part	Partially accept	The Government has broadly accepted the findings in Whanaketia and is committed to publishing a response to the Royal Commission’s findings and each recommendation. However, given the complexity of the recommendations and the need to give them due consideration, the timeframes set by the Royal Commission have not been met. This is why recommendation 95 from He Purapura Ora has been	References: CAB-24-MIN-0234 <i>Abuse in Care Inquiry Response Plan Framework</i> cross-ministerial briefing [CRACI 25/014]

Recommendation	Response	Rationale for response	Decision maker and reference
		"declined" and recommendations 130 and 131 from Whanaketia is "partially accepted".	
131 – issue formal responses to the findings and recommendations within four months	Partially accept	The Government has broadly accepted the findings. It intends to respond to all recommendations, but the four month timeframe was has not met. This is why this recommendation is partially accepted.	References: CAB-24-MIN-0234 <i>Abuse in Care Inquiry Response Plan Framework</i> cross-ministerial briefing [CRACI 25/014]
132 – seek cross-party agreement to implementing the recommendations	Partially accept	Cross party-agreement has already been sought on some elements – such as the public apology. It may not be practical to engage on every matter associated with the response, given the size, complexity and timeframe it will cover. Case by case decisions will be made. This is why this recommendation is partially accepted.	Reference: To be obtained via cross-ministerial consultation
133 – publish an annual report for at least 9 years, after the report is tabled in Parliament	Partially accept	The government is committing to annual public reporting on the Crown response. Agencies may be asked about the response during scrutiny week so separate reports to Select Committee are not needed. This is why this recommendation is partially accepted.	Reference: <i>Abuse in Care Inquiry Response Plan Framework</i> cross-ministerial briefing [CRACI 25/014]
134 – refer annual implementation reports to Select Committee	Decline	The Government is committing to public reporting on the Crown response. Agencies may be asked about the response during scrutiny week so separate reports to Select Committee	Reference: <i>Abuse in Care Inquiry Response Plan Framework</i> cross-

Recommendation	Response	Rationale for response	Decision maker and reference
		are not needed. This is why this recommendation is “declined”.	ministerial briefing [CRACI 25/014]
135 – to implement the recommendations in the timeframes set out by the Commission	Decline	The government is working at pace on the response, consistent with its other priorities and with available resources, with initial timeframes set out by the Royal Commission having passed. This is why this recommendation is “declined”.	Reference: CAB-24-MIN-0234
137 – table reports in Parliament and refer them to Select Committee	Decline	The Government is committing to public reporting on the Crown response. Agencies may be asked about the response during scrutiny week so separate reports to Select Committee are not needed. This is why this recommendation is “declined”.	Reference: <i>Abuse in Care Inquiry Response Plan Framework</i> cross-ministerial briefing [CRACI 25/014]

Proactive release - open and transparent Government



Cabinet Economic Policy Committee

Minute of Decision

This document contains information for the New Zealand Cabinet. It must be treated in confidence and handled in accordance with any security classification, or other endorsement. The information can only be released, including under the Official Information Act 1982, by persons with the appropriate authority.

Abuse in Care Inquiry: Crown Response

Portfolio Government's Response to the Royal Commission's Report into Historical Abuse in State Care and in the Care of Faith-based Institutions

On 7 May 2025, the Cabinet Economic Policy Committee:

- 1 **noted** the *Crown response to the Royal Commission of Inquiry into Historical Abuse in State Care and in the Care of Faith-based Institutions* (the Crown response), attached to the submission under ECO-25-SUB-0060;
- 2 **agreed** to the following high-level phasing of the Crown response:

Phase one <i>(Work to June 2025)</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Deliver public apologies and actions to acknowledge victims and survivors. • Improve recordkeeping practices and initial redress enhancements. • Immediate actions to strengthen care safety and improve the justice system. • Develop the overarching Crown response.
Phase two <i>(July 2025 to June 2027)</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Complete design and implementation of redress system changes. • Identify and implement any structural or other system-level changes to care. • Continue early actions to strengthen care safety and improve the justice system.
Phase three <i>(July 2027 and beyond)</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Embed, monitor and review redress system changes. • Continue identified structural and other system-level changes to care. • Continue early actions to strengthen care safety.

- 3 **invited** the 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 (Lead Coordination Minister) to report back to Cabinet s9(2)(f)(iv) with advice on any structural and other system-level changes to care, including Whanaketia recommendation 41 (to establish a Care Safe Agency);
- 4 **agreed** to the establishment of a ministerial advisory group to support the Crown response, and to the group's draft terms of reference, attached as Appendix Three to the submission under ECO-25-SUB-0060;
- 5 **agreed** to accept the intent of:
- 5.1 He Purapura Ora recommendations 2 and 3 and Whanaketia recommendations 14, 117, 126, 127, and 129 on partnership with Māori, te Tiriti o Waitangi, and the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples;
 - 5.2 He Purapura Ora recommendations 6-8, 13 and 14 and Whanaketia recommendations 14, 127, and 129 on co-design and engagement with care system participants and stakeholders;
 - 5.3 He Purapura Ora recommendation 3 and Whanaketia recommendations 15 and 118 on national and international human rights obligations;
- 6 **agreed** to partially accept Whanaketia recommendation 132 with regard to cross-party agreement to the Crown response;
- 7 **agreed** to an annual report to Cabinet on progress against the Crown response that is proactively released, which means that Cabinet is:
- 7.1 partially accepting Whanaketia reporting recommendation 133 to publicly report on the implementation of the inquiry's recommendations, and to publish the report for at least nine years; and
 - 7.2 declining to accept Whanaketia recommendations 134 and 137 for reporting to be tabled in the House of Representatives and considered by a parliamentary select committee;
- 8 **authorised** the Lead Coordination Minister to make any additional updates and finalise the Crown response document, in consultation with relevant portfolio Ministers, before approving it for public release;
- 9 **invited** the Lead Coordination Minister to report back to Cabinet by s9(2)(f)(iv) with the first annual monitoring report;
- 10 **noted** that:
- 10.1 in April 2025, the Cabinet Social Outcomes Committee authorised the Minister of Health, the Minister of Education and Lead Coordination Minister, and the Minister for Social Development and Employment (joint Ministers), in consultation with any relevant Ministers as appropriate, to take detailed design and implementation decisions within the overall approach and parameters set out in the paper and within the final Budget 2025 envelope, informed by the findings and recommendations of the Royal Commission and Redress Design Group [SOU-29-MIN-0039];

- 10.2 joint Ministers have agreed a two-step approach to establishing top-up redress payments that entails lifting payments made by the Ministry of Health to a level that is broadly comparable to other redress agencies, and then applying a 50 percent increase to each individual's previous settlement amount.

Rachel Clarke
Committee Secretary

Present:

Rt Hon Winston Peters
Hon David Seymour
Hon Nicola Willis (Chair)
Hon Chris Bishop
Hon Shane Jones
Hon Erica Stanford
Hon Paul Goldsmith
Hon Tama Potaka
Hon Andrew Hoggard
Hon Nicola Grigg
Hon Scott Simpson
Hon Mark Patterson
Hon James Meager
Hon Karen Chhour
Simon Court MP

Officials present from:

Office of the Prime Minister
Office of Hon Chris Bishop
Office of Hon Erica Stanford
Office of Hon James Meager
Officials Committee for ECO

Proactive release - open and transparent Government



Cabinet

Minute of Decision

This document contains information for the New Zealand Cabinet. It must be treated in confidence and handled in accordance with any security classification, or other endorsement. The information can only be released, including under the Official Information Act 1982, by persons with the appropriate authority.

Report of the Cabinet Economic Policy Committee: Period Ended 9 May 2025

On 12 May 2025, Cabinet made the following decisions on the work of the Cabinet Economic Policy Committee for the period ended 9 May 2025:

ECO-25-MIN-0060 **Abuse in Care Inquiry: Crown Response** CONFIRMED
 Portfolio: Government's Response to the Royal
 Commission's Report into Historical Abuse in
 State Care and in the Care of Faith-based
 Institutions

Withheld as not part of the Crown Response to the Royal Commission of Inquiry into Abuse in Care

Diana Hawker
 for Secretary of the Cabinet