Discussion of findings from the 2016 review of the statistical standard for iwi

Liability

While all care and diligence has been used in processing, analysing, and extracting data and information in this publication, Statistics New Zealand gives no warranty it is error free and will not be liable for any loss or damage suffered by the use directly, or indirectly, of the information in this publication.

Citation

Published in October 2016 by
Statistics New Zealand
Tatauranga Aotearoa
Wellington, New Zealand

Contact
Statistics New Zealand Information Centre: info@stats.govt.nz
Phone toll-free 0508 525 525
Phone international +64 4 931 4600
www.stats.govt.nz

Contents

List of tables and figures

List of tables

1   Purpose of this report

Discussion of findings from the 2016 review of the statistical standard for iwi presents a range of options for revising the statistical standard for iwi.

We are undertaking this review to understand the current and future needs of users of iwi statistics.

During the research and consultation phase of the review, we worked closely with working group members representing Statistics NZ, Māori, and other government agencies. The findings and options in this report were given to working group members to consider and provide feedback for revising the standard.

The information presented in this report, together with feedback from working group members, informed the development of recommendations for revising the statistical standard for iwi.

See Recommendations from the 2016 review of the statistical standard for iwi.

4 November 2016: We have corrected 'Māori advisors' to read 'the working group' in this report. For clarity the working group is comprised of members representing Statistics NZ, cross-government agencies, and Māori. We apologise for any misunderstanding.

2   Background

The Treaty of Waitangi (Treaty) provides the framework that defines the relationship between the Crown and Māori as tangata whenua (Constitutional Advisory Panel, 2012). As a Treaty partner and leader of the Official Statistics System (OSS), Statistics NZ is responsible for reflecting the principles of the Treaty and for being responsive to Māori information needs. Statistics NZ has to consider the implications of Māori information, by reflecting the post-Treaty settlement environment, and ensuring information is useful and accessible to both the Crown and Māori.

Over recent years, Māori and government agencies have expressed dissatisfaction with the existing statistical standard and classification for iwi. The standard has been criticised for losing relevance and for not reflecting the needs of contemporary New Zealand society. Since the standard was developed, the way government is engaging with Māori has evolved (Statistics NZ, 2015). Government is engaging with a more diverse range of Māori groups (including merging and emerging iwi, hapū, marae, and non-kinship groups) across a range of social, economic, and political issues (Statistics NZ, 2015).

Māori groups take an active role in the development and well-being of their people. These groups want statistics to support the planning and provision of services, and to enable the self-determination of their development as Māori. For example, Māori statistical information is used by Māori to build capability and strengthen social, cultural, and economic development.

Statistical standards and classifications enable the provision of consistent, accurate, and reliable statistics. We are reviewing the statistical standard for iwi for the first time since its inception (Statistics NZ, 2016a). Underpinning this review is the need to understand whether the statistical standard is useful for deriving information to meet existing data needs, and whether the classification allows groups to be organised in a way that is meaningful and useful.

About the current standard and classification for iwi

Statistical standards and classifications guide the collection of official statistics to inform decision-making and policymaking (Statistics NZ, nd.a). Standards provide guidelines for collecting information using consistent procedures, and classifications enable the grouping of information in a way that is consistent, meaningful, and systematic. Using statistical standards and classifications to produce statistics allows the integration of data over time and across different sources.

The statistical classification for iwi (Statistics NZ, nd.b) was first developed in 1991, as an outcome of the 1988 review of official ethnic statistics (Department of Statistics, 1988). At that time, the Crown – but not necessarily Māori – considered iwi as the most appropriate means for grouping statistical data, as this reflected how they were engaging with Māori in Treaty and Fisheries settlements. The Crown also saw iwi as a key focal point for Māori development.

The current statistical classification for iwi allows the coding of iwi responses by rohe. The classification comprises two levels:
- Level 1
  - Rohe (total: 11)
- Level 2
  - Iwi (total: 100)
  - Rohe not further defined (total: 11)

While the current classification allows for the collection of hapū, this information is not output as a distinct and separate category. Rather, hapū are coded to the iwi grouping they are part of.

Depending on the response given, responses can also be coded to residual categories, namely:

- waka (total: 12)

- iwi confederations (total: 5)

- hapū affiliated to more than one iwi (total: 1)

- admin (total: 5) – don't know, refused to answer, unidentifiable, out of scope, not stated.

Since 2000, updates to the classification have occurred prior to each Census of Population and Dwellings (census), to standardise the spelling of iwi names and to add additional iwi categories (see Appendix 1).

Following the creation of the iwi classification, the statistical standard was developed in 1994 to provide guidelines for collecting and reporting iwi information, and to support the implementation of the classification. However, no reviews of the standard have occurred since its development.

3 Review of the statistical standard and classification for iwi

Statistics NZ, in collaboration with Māori group representatives and government agencies, is reviewing the statistical standard and classification for iwi.

Aims of review

The overarching aim of the review is to investigate whether the existing statistical standard and classification for iwi meets the current and future data needs of users (Statistics NZ, 2016a). The findings of the review will help determine what changes might need to be made to the existing statistical standard and classification.

Stakeholder feedback was sought from Māori, iwi, government, and the public on concepts, definitions, rationale, criteria, and procedures, with a specific focus on understanding:

- whether the current concepts and definitions remain useful for measuring iwi and Māori identity groups
- whether different types of information (eg hapū, marae, or location), in addition to iwi, could improve the quality and use of iwi statistics
- how to decide which groups, and which types of groups, are included in our classification(s) (list of groups).

Review process

We reviewed the statistical standard and classification for iwi with methodology informed by the classifications and standards review process (Statistics NZ, nd.c). The process reflects section 7 of the Statistics Act 1975, which prescribes periodic review of official statistics.

We conducted research and consultation as part of this process. The process comprised:

- ongoing consultation with working group members representing Statistics NZ, Māori, and cross-government agencies

- a literature review of Māori groupings in New Zealand (Statistics NZ, 2016b)

- interviews with representatives from government agencies (Statistics NZ, 2015)

- a formal consultation phase that ran from April to June 2016 (Statistics NZ, 2016c). This included:

  o 10 hui across the North Island, led by the Statistics NZ Kaihautū Māori

  o an online submission process from 9 May to 12 June, resulting in 31 submissions from iwi, Māori groups, government agencies, and the public.

4   Discussion of review findings

This chapter draws together themes that emerged from the review of the statistical standard and classification for iwi research and consultation. Below we present a summary of the findings in response to each of the three review aims. These findings informed a range of options for revising the standard, which were shown to the working group for feedback.

Aim 1: Evaluate whether the current concept and definition remain useful for measuring iwi and Māori identity groups

The existing standard defines iwi as the "economic and political unit of traditional Māori descent and kinship-based hierarchy of waka (founding canoe), iwi (tribe), hapū (sub-tribe), and whānau (family)" (Statistics NZ, nd.b). At the time the statistical standard and classification for iwi was developed, iwi was considered the most appropriate unit for statistical measurement.

Statistical standards and classifications guide the collection of data across the OSS (Statistics NZ, nd.a). Currently, however, there is no agreement on how to reflect statistics for and about Māori in the New Zealand data ecosystem. The concepts and definitions used in the current statistical standard have received ongoing criticism for not reflecting contemporary New Zealand society because evolving and emerging Māori groups (including emerging iwi and non-kinship groups) are not captured.

A revised statistical standard and classification might better reflect a personal sense of belonging for iwi and Māori identity groupings. Exploring whether the current concept and definition of iwi remains relevant, or whether it needs to change, is important for enabling the provision of meaningful and useful data, for both the Crown and Māori.

Hapū and marae are an important part of identity

Iwi affiliation is most commonly used to identify Māori groups. Yet iwi affiliation is merely one part of the larger whole that is Māori identity (Statistics NZ, 2016b). For many Māori, the concepts of iwi, hapū, and marae are fluid expressions of identity (Statistics NZ, 2016b). Findings from submissions (Statistics NZ, 2016c) and from academic literature (Statistics NZ, 2016b) show connections to iwi, hapū, marae, whānau, and location are important to Māori and help to provide a wider understanding of whakapapa.

Hapū: The current classification for iwi allows for the collection of hapū. However, hapū responses are coded to an iwi where possible, and are not output as a separate category. The value of collecting hapū as a distinct and separate concept, in addition to iwi, was emphasised through the review process (Statistics NZ, 2015; Statistics NZ, 2016c). Hapū received wide-ranging support in submissions and was the most frequently requested identity marker (Statistics NZ, 2016c). Government agencies are also in favour of collecting hapū information (Statistics NZ, 2015).

Marae: Some submitters consider marae to be an important identity marker for Māori (Statistics NZ, 2016c). Similarly, academic literature shows marae is an important physical marker, connecting a group of related people (Statistics NZ, 2016b).

Although hapū and marae are an important part of Māori identity, the working group expressed concern with Statistics NZ collecting this data. The feasibility of collecting hapū and marae was questioned. In addition, there were concerns relating to data access, confidentiality, and ownership. The benefits and costs of collecting hapū and marae are discussed in detail under Aim 2.

See Confidentiality, accessibility, and ownership.

Non-kinship cultural affiliation groups

The relevance of the current standard for understanding contemporary New Zealand society came up as a theme, with discussions focusing on the evolving nature of Māori groupings – particularly the emergence of non-kinship cultural affiliation groups.

For some Māori, non-kinship groups form an important part of belonging and identity (Statistics NZ, 2016c). A literature review of Māori groupings indicates urban Māori – living away from their tribal lands and other group members – have adapted to build non-traditional tribes based on residential location rather than whakapapa (Statistics NZ, 2016b). While urban Māori may feel a connection to their ancestors, they may affiliate more with physical markers (eg an urban marae, church, or club) to fulfil their need for collective belonging (Statistics NZ, 2016b).

We need to better understand and capture non-affiliated Māori. Government agencies identified urban Māori authorities as important, particularly in representing urban Māori interests (Statistics NZ, 2015). Government agencies have criticised the statistical information available, for its limited flexibility and for not reflecting the range of Māori groups that government works with (Statistics NZ, 2015). Some submitters also identified information on non-kinship groups as important (Statistics NZ, 2016c).

The ability to identify non-kinship groups is important for understanding and providing information for Māori and the Crown in relation to aspects such as economic development, social well-being, and housing. Excluding non-kinship groups may hinder the ability to inform policymaking and funding decisions relating to these areas. There was a strong feeling among government agencies that "official statistics need to be more responsive to the requirements of emerging Māori entities and groups" (Statistics NZ, 2015). If the data is solely about a traditional non-urban, marae-based population, Crown responsiveness to non-kinship and emerging Māori groups is limited.

The working group expressed concern with integrating the concepts of kinship and non-kinship groups within a statistical standard (eg a Māori grouping standard), noting fundamental differences between these groups. For example, kinship groups are based on whakapapa and genealogical connection, whereas Māori can choose to belong, or not, to a non-kinship group. Non-kinship groups are more about helping Māori, rather than identity. There was concern that a Māori groupings standard might define Māori identity, because of its influence on the OSS.

The working group identified the fluidity of non-kinship groups as concerning, with the existence of many of these groups dependent on funding and resourcing. Non-kinship groups are more likely to come and go over time. The working group questioned the ability to structure a classification around such a fluid concept.

It is evident there are diverging perspectives regarding the integration of kinship and non-kinship groups within a standard or classification. It is important to consider the primary purpose of the standard, its scope, and what the options are for measuring kinship and non-kinship groups. The purpose of a standard is to provide guidelines for collecting statistical information (Statistics NZ, nd.a), and government agencies and submitters have expressed the need for data on non-kinship groups. At the same time, there is strong opposition to integrating kinship and non-kinship concepts. As part of the decision-making process, we need to consider the broader implications for measuring Māori identity and the need to be responsive to Māori data needs.

Statistical versus legislative purposes

The current classification for iwi was introduced in 1991, in part to be responsive to Māori and in part to assist with the provision of information in relation to Treaty and Fisheries settlements. At that time, the limited information about iwi was a major obstacle to Māori

development. The iwi classification was included in the 1991 Census of Population and Dwellings to aid the Iwi Transition Authority to determine groups to negotiate with and to determine the scope of settlements.

New Zealand is now moving towards a post-Treaty settlement environment, with many historical claims settled or in the process of settlement (Statistics NZ, 2015). As progress towards a post-Treaty settlement environment continues, data needs are changing and evolving (Statistics NZ, 2015; Statistics NZ, 2016c).

Both Māori and the Crown have a greater need for official statistics to inform decision-making and policymaking. As such, the rationale in the current standard, which emphasises Waitangi Tribunal settlements and resource allocation, is outdated. The purpose of the revised statistical standard for iwi / Māori groups needs to move beyond traditional data requirements and better reflect the statistical needs of contemporary New Zealand society.

Aim 2: Explore whether different types of information (eg hapū, marae, or location), in addition to iwi, could improve the quality and use of iwi statistics

It is crucial, and expected, that Statistics NZ collects information relevant to Māori development, to support decision-making and policymaking.

Statistics about and for Māori are required

Traditionally, iwi statistics have been driven by government's interest in understanding the Māori population relative to the New Zealand population, and in the context of engaging with Māori in Treaty settlement and post-settlement development (Statistics NZ, 2014a). These data needs have resulted in a range of statistics **about** Māori (Statistics NZ, 2014a).

With many historical Treaty claims now settled or in the process of settlement, there is an increasing requirement for statistics **for** Māori (Statistics NZ, 2014a). Post-settlement iwi are now able to play an important role in improving the well-being of their people. To plan and implement services effectively, these groups need high-quality and detailed statistical information.

The review process shows there is agreement that statistics both **about** Māori and **for** Māori are important, particularly as the Crown and Māori increasingly engage and collaborate for mutual benefit (Statistics NZ, 2015; Statistics NZ, 2016c). The effective planning and provision of services requires a wide range of statistics. Submitters cited education (with particular reference to kōhanga reo), health, location, economic and social measures, and demographics as important current and future data needs (Statistics NZ, 2016c).

The statistical standard was originally designed to enable the provision of iwi data relating to population, social, and household measures. However, feedback from submissions and from government agencies indicates iwi data is now also required for economic purposes (Statistics NZ, 2015; Statistics NZ, 2016c). It is worth considering whether two types of standards are needed to capture these different types of information.

Collection of rohe/location

Currently the collection of rohe alongside iwi occurs in Statistics NZ's questionnaires, but this concept does not represent true rohe boundaries. In the iwi classification, rohe is similar to regional council boundaries. As such, Statistics NZ's interpretation of rohe does not necessarily align with the physical markers Māori identify with. These differences have led to confusion and misunderstanding among respondents. A few submitters expressed dissatisfaction with these differences (Statistics NZ, 2016c).

Rohe is not directly comparable to other geospatially enabled boundaries or Te Puni Kōkiri boundaries (Te Puni Kōkiri, nd), limiting comparability across regions. Given the limited utility rohe information currently provides, the working group recommended removing rohe from our questionnaires. However, a number of iwi groups share the same name across different locations. In these cases, rohe or other location data is integral in enabling the coding of iwi to the correct area. The utility of rohe or location data needs to be balanced against the relevancy of the geographic measures for Māori.

Collection of hapū and marae

As part of this review, the option of creating additional response-based category sets, to reflect contemporary New Zealand society, are being explored. Feedback from government agencies (Statistics NZ, 2015) and submissions (Statistics NZ, 2016c) indicates a requirement for hapū and marae data. These identity markers may increase knowledge and understanding of whakapapa connections, improve data quality, and help with analyses.

The usefulness of iwi data is reliant on the accuracy of the data, in terms of both collection and coding. Data from the 2013 Census shows over 10,000 responses to the iwi question were unable to be coded.

Collecting hapū- and marae-level information, in addition to iwi, might improve coding of iwi affiliation, and subsequently the quality of data. Given all marae are geographically located, the addresses could be used to create an administrative dataset or be based off a property frame/address register. The inclusion of additional response fields (eg hapū and marae) would also allow those with limited knowledge of their whakapapa to complete as many fields as they can with the knowledge they have.

There is an opposing view that hapū and marae will not necessarily improve the accuracy and quality of the data. The ability to code hapū- and marae-level information is constrained by current survey processing systems. The working group also notes that coding data might be difficult in cases where there are multiple hapū and marae with similar names.

The working group was concerned that hapū and marae data might be difficult to collect from Māori with limited knowledge of their whakapapa. Findings from Te Kupenga – a survey of Māori well-being – show 55 percent of respondents know their hapū and 71 percent know their marae (Statistics NZ, 2014b). In comparison, 89 percent of respondents know their iwi. Responding to questions on hapū or marae might require additional support and guidance from family or kaumātua. There was also concern that the inclusion of additional hapū and/or marae questions will contribute to respondent burden, without necessarily any additional benefit.

Confidentiality, accessibility, and ownership

Iwi and government agencies have indicated that access to iwi data cross-tabulated with other variables is important for informing decision-making and policymaking. However, there are currently constraints around the ability to access cross-tabulated iwi data. Confidentiality, accessibility, and ownership emerged as dominant themes through the review process. Most of these findings are, however, outside the scope of the review of the statistical standard.

Confidentiality

The working group was concerned that if Statistics NZ collect hapū and marae data it creates the unrealistic expectation that the data is available for release. They note confidentiality thresholds currently restrict output of some iwi data, particularly at demographic and geographic levels. Consequently, the working group questioned whether hapū- and marae-level data could be disseminated beyond basic classification counts. There is a strong feeling that if government are collecting granular-level data, then disseminating the data back to iwi and Māori groups should be a requirement.

Changing the confidentiality rules is outside the scope of the review of the standard and classification. However, the Statistics Act 1975 is currently under review, which presents an opportunity to highlight some of the points raised by users of iwi statistics. Work to address the confidentiality rules and to explore options for releasing lower-level data to iwi is in progress.

Accessibility and capability

Stakeholders observed that access to data is constrained by capability and capacity (Statistics NZ, 2015; Statistics NZ, 2016c). While there is acknowledgement that iwi statistics are currently available, there is converging evidence to show that these statistics are not widely known about, nor understood, especially by Māori (Statistics NZ, 2015; Statistics NZ, 2016c). Feedback from submitters indicates the ability to know what data is available and how to access it is challenging and can be costly (Statistics NZ, 2016c). The working group also noted that capability and capacity are more limited at hapū- and marae-level.

These issues extend beyond the scope of the review of the standard. However, Statistics NZ can work to create greater awareness and increase transparency of the information held about Māori and for Māori.

Ownership

The review has raised questions about who owns, and who should have access to, iwi and Māori data (Statistics NZ, 2016c). The working group felt that if the Crown collects low-level information (eg hapū or marae); they are receiving more information than necessary to improve coding. Feedback from a few submitters also highlights that access to information via an Official Information Act request was of concern, as this allows third parties to access iwi data without iwi consent (Statistics NZ, 2016c).

Currently iwi and Māori data fall under the same jurisdiction as other data. Māori are, however, seeking a platform with the Crown to have in-depth conversations regarding the treatment of data as a taonga. Statistics NZ may wish to consider whether iwi/Māori data should be treated uniquely to reflect obligations under the Treaty, recognising the uniqueness of Māori as tangata whenua.

Consistency

Government agencies are engaging with multiple Māori groups and entities (Statistics New Zealand, 2015). However, submissions (Statistics NZ, 2016c) and interviews with government agencies (Statistics NZ, 2015) show there is limited consistency in the concepts, definitions, and lists used to collect iwi and/or Māori grouping information. We also identified that data is aggregated across the government sector in different ways. Stakeholders indicated that the ability to develop accurate time-series information would increase the utility of iwi data (Statistics NZ, 2015; Statistics NZ, 2016c).

If the revised statistical standard is widened to support the use of iwi Māori statistics from an economic sense, then developing a standard that takes into account the multitude of Māori entities the government is engaging with is important. This would enable better integration of data now and in the future (Statistics NZ, 2015; Statistics NZ, 2016c). In addition, it would be important to work collaboratively with representatives across government to develop and promote the revised standard.

Māori descent

In some surveys, collection of iwi affiliation follows a question on Māori descent. There are, however, respondents who record an iwi after leaving the Māori descent question blank, or responding "no" or "don't know" to the question. At present, we do not output iwi data in these instances.

A secondary objective of the review was to explore whether iwi outputs should include all those who report an iwi (Statistics NZ, 2016a). We recommended all those who report an iwi be counted, even those who report "no" or "don't know" to the Māori descent question. However, potential effects to time series warrant consideration.

Aim 3: How to decide which groups, and which types of groups, are included in our classification(s)

The final aim of the review centres on understanding how to, and who should, decide on the groups to include in the classification. This aim was in part driven by ongoing dissatisfaction with the current iwi classification, as it prevents the inclusion of new groups.

Criteria

A criticism of the current classification is that it does not reflect the multitude of Māori entities government agencies are engaging with (Statistics NZ, 2015). Feedback from submissions indicates the current inclusion criteria are too rigid, and most submitters are seeking change (Statistics NZ, 2016c). The current criteria were criticised for not allowing applicant groups (eg hapū acquiring or petitioning for iwi status) to be included (Statistics NZ, 2016c). For groups not currently reflected in the iwi classification, the application and usability of iwi data is limited.

The current criteria to classify iwi take into account:

- whether the group has been separately categorised in earlier iwi or tribal classifications

- whether the group has been identified by respondents in previous surveys or censuses

- whether there is a history of the group operating as a separate iwi in a business or resource management capacity, with legal and/or administrative recognition as such

- whether historical and genealogical tradition identify the group as distinctive

- whether the group (as hapū of a larger iwi) is moving to acquire or petition for iwi status (Statistics NZ, nd,b).

However, the operationalisation of these criteria are constrained by an additional criterion stating, "Statistics NZ will consult with the larger iwi to obtain its view on the group's position in relation to the five criteria listed above" (Statistics NZ, nd.b). Larger iwi therefore have the capacity to veto the inclusion of applicant groups into the classification.

In making a decision about whether the additional criterion should remain or be removed, the costs and benefits of the decision should be considered. Removing the criterion may result in the potential alienation of some larger iwi groups, however, continuing to include it limits Statistics NZ's ability to be responsive to Māori and to reflect contemporary New Zealand society.

If the criteria do change (and as a result, the scope of the population), we need to consider the potential implications to time-series data. Raising awareness and educating users of potential changes to times series will be important.

Groups not in the classification

Statistics NZ has received ongoing petitioning from applicant groups who want to be recognised and included in the iwi classification. Often driving this is applicant groups' desire to have access to their own data. Currently, iwi included in the classification have

access to their data, whereas those not in the classification either do not have access to their data or can only access their data at a cost.

There is also a perception the census guide notes reflect a definitive (legal) list of iwi, which they do not. This perception indicates there is a need to raise awareness that the primary purpose of a standard is for producing official statistics and that the guide notes are there to assist respondents fill in their forms. This statistical focus should be explicit in the rationale and messaging of the statistical standard.

Standard and classification review cycle

Minor reviews of statistical standards and classifications generally occur on a four- to five-yearly cycle, and major reviews on a 10-yearly cycle (Statistics NZ, nd,c). In the context of the fluid nature of both kinship and non-kinship Māori groups (Statistics NZ, 2016b), the cyclical review process adds constraints to maintaining a relevant classification. In addition, the need to fit within the census development timelines affects the ability to deliver change.

The classification criteria need to be less restrictive to enable the ongoing inclusion of groups. Statistics NZ's new tool, Ariā, will enable dynamic updating of concepts and category sets. Ariā will also enable the grouping of data to support different views. For example, iwi and other users can create and maintain their own output data views for Fisheries, Treaty settlements, boundaries, or for other purposes.

Statistics NZ's role

Determining which groups to include in the revised iwi classification is a contentious issue. Statistics NZ's role (implied or otherwise) in deciding which groups to include or exclude from the classification has been questioned in the literature (Statistics NZ, 2016b), by government agency representatives (Statistics NZ, 2015), and by submitters (Statistics NZ, 2016c). Increasing the transparency of the processes used to develop classification criteria should be considered.

If Statistics NZ remains in the position of 'decision maker', tensions and dissatisfaction are likely to be ongoing (Statistics NZ, 2015). Statistics NZ is exploring the option of relinquishing the custodianship of other standards to appropriate agencies or subject matter experts. For example, the Ministry of Business, Innovation and Employment is now the custodian of the research standard. In the case of the standard and classification of iwi, there is no one agency with the authority or expertise to take responsibility for cross-data ecosystem governance. Statistics NZ is therefore likely to retain custodianship of this standard.

5 Options for revising the statistical standard and classification for iwi

We have grouped the key findings and options under 11 main categories:

- [Purpose and rationale for the statistical standard for iwi](#)
- [Structure of Māori groupings classifications and standards](#)
- [Iwi classification criteria](#)
- [Including hapū](#)
- [Including marae](#)
- [Including non-kinship groups](#)
- [Including rohe/location](#)
- [Data access and capability](#)
- [Consistency](#)
- [Census processing](#)
- [Review cycle](#)

As a result of the research and consultation, a range of options for revising and updating the statistical standard and classification for iwi emerged. Working group members representing Statistics NZ, cross-government agencies, and Māori provided feedback on the options presented in this chapter. This feedback, together with the research and consultation findings, informed the final recommendations.

[See Recommendations from the 2016 review of the statistical standard for iwi](#).

Explanatory note 1: The options presented below refer to the Census of Population and Dwellings. However, to reflect use of the standard beyond the census (eg in administrative collections), references to census were removed from *Recommendations from the 2016 review of the statistical standard for iwi*.

Explanatory note 2: We presented the options in this chapter to the working group in table format ([see Appendix 2](#) for the original table).

Purpose and rationale for the statistical standard for iwi

Key findings about purpose and rationale for the statistical standard for iwi:

- The current iwi standard was developed to reflect how the Crown was engaging with Māori in Treaty of Waitangi and Fisheries claims. This approach does not reflect the post-Treaty settlement environment.

- Removing references to Treaty of Waitangi settlements and Waitangi Tribunal decisions (land ownership, fishing rights etc) would enable a more responsive approach for measuring statistics for and about Māori.

- Update the purpose and rationale of the statistical standard to address changing data needs.

Option 1 for purpose and rationale for the statistical standard for iwi

Change the rationale to emphasise a statistical focus. Remove references to Treaty settlements, Waitangi Tribunal, and resource allocation, as these are no longer relevant in a post-Treaty settlement environment.

Positive impacts of Option 1:

- changes the focus on the purpose for collecting the data
- enables a more responsive approach for measuring iwi and reflecting a post-Treaty settlement environment.

Negative impact of Option 1:

- no identifiable impact.

Option 2 for purpose and rationale for the statistical standard for iwi

Change the rationale to emphasise a more statistical focus. Remove reference to Treaty settlements, Waitangi Tribunal, and resource allocation. Replace with rationale that reflects and acknowledges commitments as a Treaty partner.

Positive impact of Option 2:

- enables a change in focus of the standard.

Negative impact of Option 2:

- potential confusion that Treaty/resource is still in rationale.

Option 3 for purpose and rationale for the statistical standard for iwi

Maintain the current rationale.

Positive impact of Option 3:

- maintains consistency in time series.

Negative impact of Option 3:

- not able to reflect contemporary New Zealand society.

Structure of Māori groupings classifications and standards

Key findings about the structure of Māori groupings classifications and standards:

- The current standard and classification needs to better reflect a personal sense of belonging for Māori identity groupings. We need to ensure the concepts remain relevant.
- Look to expand the underlying concepts to include hapū, marae, and/or non-kinship to broaden the structure and content of the classification.
- Look to introduce a suite of standards and classifications under a wider framework.
- Investigate the viability of incorporating the Māori statistical framework.
- Investigate the need to review the Māori descent standard to improve linkage with the iwi standard.

Option 1 for structure of Māori groupings classifications and standards

Introduce new concepts and/or create separate standards and classifications for each identity collection via a staged approach with iwi first.

Positive impact of Option 1:

- will lead to better quality data – more granular and detailed. There will be no confusion over which aspect of Māori group identity is being considered.

Negative impact of Option 1:

- will require the continued work of Statistics NZ. The standard for Māori descent will need review, and development of further standards will be required. Implementation and resourcing (time and cost) will also be a factor.

Option 2 for structure of Māori groupings classifications and standards

Create all classifications under an umbrella standard.

Positive impacts of Option 2:

- will lead to data that is more granular and extends the scope of the current standard

- an education strategy will be required to mitigate concerns that Statistics NZ is defining Māori identity.

Negative impacts of Option 2:

- further classifications will need to be developed and implemented

- there is a high risk that Statistics NZ will be seen as defining Māori identity.

Option 3 for structure of Māori groupings classifications and standards

Continue with existing concepts and definitions but reapply these to reconfigure the classification or retain status quo.

Positive impact of Option 3:

- least amount of work required from Statistics NZ in the immediate future; least change, therefore least impact to users and survey areas in Statistics NZ.

Negative impact of Option 3:

- least responsive option for addressing more recognition for Māori group identity.

Option 4 for structure of Māori groupings classifications and standards

Create an umbrella standard for kinship-based classifications and a separate standard for non-kinship (which could be developed at a later date).

Positive impact of Option 4:

- will lead to data that is more granular, and extends the scope of the current standard.

Negative impact of Option 4:

- further classifications will need to be developed and implemented (for hapū, marae, and non-kinship); additional statistical standards will need to be developed.

Iwi classification criteria

Key findings for iwi classification criteria:

- The current criteria are too rigid and do not enable evolving Māori groups to be included.

- Investigate whether custodianship of the standard and classification may be better placed with a more appropriate agency.

- A change in criteria could affect time series, particularly for the Census of Population and Dwellings.

- The classification is not an exhaustive list of statistically feasible (yet to be defined) iwi (iwi missing due to criteria constraint).

- There is a need to increase coverage and quality of iwi information (to enable release of lower-level information). Measures that may improve quality are:

  o maintaining a geographical reference to iwi (to help code iwi that are located in a number of locations)

  o asking additional information to improve the accuracy of the iwi coding (hapū and marae).

- Revision of inclusion criteria of iwi standard may result in change in population of interest (iwi).

Option 1 for iwi classification criteria

Replace the classification criteria to better reflect a post-Treaty settlement environment and contemporary New Zealand society.

Positive impacts of Option 1:

- allows smaller/emerging iwi to be recognised

- meets data needs that are currently unavailable

- easier to apply changes to the classification and data

- the classification will be more reflective of the real world.

Negative impacts of Option 1:

- change in time series because of criteria change (ie measure of what is included)

- potential alienation of major iwi by reversing commitments by a previous Government Statistician.

Option 2 for iwi classification criteria

Remove only the criterion stating, "In addition, Statistics NZ will consult with the larger iwi to obtain its view on the [applicant] group's position in relation to the five criteria".

Positive impacts of Option 2:

- allows smaller/emerging iwi to be recognised

- meets data needs that are currently not being met

- easier to get changes applied to the classification and data.

Negative impacts of Option 2:

- potential alienation of major iwi by reversing commitments by a previous Government Statistician commitments

- potential for legal challenges.

Option 3 for iwi classification criteria

Create a more collaborative and inclusive partnership with Māori to facilitate updating and maintenance of the classification.

Positive impact of Option 3:

- improved relationship with users and Māori.

Negative impact of Option 3:

- dependent on funding.

Option 4 for iwi classification criteria

Maintain current criteria (including the clause stating the requirement to consult with larger iwi).

Positive impact of Option 4:

- maintains time series.

Negative impact of Option 4:

- least responsive option for addressing more recognition for Māori group identity.

Option 5 for iwi classification criteria

Statistics NZ relinquishes custodianship of the standard and classification.

Positive impact of Option 5:

- the standard and classification resides with appropriate subject matter experts/agencies.

Negative impact of Option 5:

- there is no one agency with the authority or expertise to take responsibility for cross-data ecosystem governance.

Including hapū

Key findings for including hapū:

- There is support to include hapū as an identity marker (in addition to iwi). Hapū connections are important for Māori people and provide a wider understanding of whakapapa.

- Users would like data at hapū level.

- Including a question on hapū may, but not necessarily, improve coding and quality of iwi data.

- The ability to code hapū is constrained by current survey processing systems.

- There is concern that the quality of hapū information is unknown. Release of information will be dependent on quality.

- Limited cognitive testing to date indicates respondents have a varying ability to report hapū. Including a question on hapū in the census increases respondent burden and takes up valuable space on the form.

Option 1 for including hapū

Do not include hapū question in 2018 Census and continue to develop. Aim to include hapū in another survey in the future (such as Māori well-being survey, or a household sample survey). Further investigation is required.

Positive impacts of Option 1:
- enables concerns about data access, respondent burden, cost, and quality to be addressed
- allows more informed decision-making.

Negative impacts of Option 1:
- no data from 2018 Census

- no granular information

- potential difficulty in using hapū to improve iwi coding, due to technical constraints

- potentially increases respondent burden in future data collections

- resourcing required for further work.

Option 2 for including hapū

Do not include hapū question in 2018 Census, but work with iwi and/or hapū to collect own data. Further investigation required.

Positive impacts of Option 2:
- enables concerns about data access, respondent burden, cost, and quality to be addressed

- allows more informed decision-making

- builds a better working relationship between Statistics NZ and Māori.

Negative impacts of Option 2:
- no data from 2018 Census

- timeframe unknown

- resourcing required for further work.

Option 3 for including hapū

Do not include hapū question in 2018 Census due to concerns with quality, feasibility, and respondent burden. No further work required.

Positive impact of Option 3:
- maintains time series.

Negative impacts of Option 3:
- not responsive to user needs

- no data from 2018 Census.

Option 4 for including hapū

Include hapū question in 2018 Census to improve coding of iwi and possible release of data (at hapū level). To be the starting point for a continuous collection.

Positive impacts of Option 4:
- responsive to users' future needs

- a starting point for future hapū collection

- potential to improve coding and quality of other variables (eg iwi)

- enables granular data about Māori to be collected (and potentially released)

- describes Māori identity better.

Negative impacts of Option 4:

- creates the expectation that data will be released
- time-series impact and feasibility unknown
- could adversely affect iwi information received in the census
- respondents have varying knowledge of hapū
- quality of hapū information unknown, may not be releasable

Including marae

Key findings for including marae:

- There is support to include marae (in addition to iwi). Marae connections are important for Māori people and provide a wider understanding of whakapapa.
- Users would like data at marae level.
- Including a question on marae may, but not necessarily, improve coding and hence the quality of iwi information.
- The ability to code marae is constrained by current survey processing systems.
- There is concern about data quality and whether the data will be released as output.
- Limited cognitive testing to date indicates that respondents are able to name their marae more frequently than their hapū. Including a question on marae in the census increases respondent burden.

Option 1 for including marae

Do not include marae question in 2018 Census and continue to develop. Aim to include marae in another survey in the future (such as Māori well-being survey, or a household sample survey). Further investigation is required, including investigating the option of geospatially enabling marae.

Positive impacts of Option 1:

- allows opportunity for further work to address concerns about data access, respondent burden, cost, and quality
- allows more informed decision-making before inclusion.

Negative impacts of Option 1:

- no data from 2018 Census
- no granular information.

Option 2 for including marae

Do not include marae question in 2018 Census, but work with iwi/Māori to collect their own data. Further investigation is required.

Positive impacts of Option 2:

- allows opportunity for further work to address concerns about data access, respondent burden, cost, and quality
- allows more informed decision-making
- contributes to building a better working relationship between Statistics NZ and Māori.

Negative impacts of Option 2:
- no data from 2018 Census
- timeframe and funding unknown.

Option 3 for including marae

Do not include marae question in 2018 Census due to concerns with quality, feasibility, and respondent burden. No further work required.

Positive impact of Option 3:
- maintains time series.

Negative impacts of Option 3:
- not responsive to user needs
- no data from 2018 Census.

Option 4 for including marae

Include marae question in 2018 Census to improve coding of iwi and possible release of data (at marae level). To be the starting point for a continuous collection.

Positive impacts of Option 4:
- responsive to users' future needs
- a starting point for marae collection
- potential to improve coding and quality of other variables (eg iwi)
- more granular data about Māori collected (and potentially released)
- describes Māori identity better.

Negative impacts of Option 4:
- creates the expectation that data will be released
- time series impact/feasibility unknown
- could adversely affect iwi information we receive in the census
- difficulty in using marae to improve iwi coding due to technical constraints
- increases respondent burden in the census.

Including non-kinship groups

Key findings for including non-kinship groups:
- Non-kinship groups play an important part of urban Māori life and offer a sense of belonging, identity, and security.
- Information is required on non-kinship groups to capture contemporary, urban Māori groups.
- There is concern about the fluid nature of non-kinship groups.
- There is strong opposition to mixing kinship and non-kinship concepts.
- Limited cognitive testing to date indicates that work is required to clarify what information we require.

Option 1 for including non-kinship groups

Do not include non-kinship groups question in 2018 Census. Aim at including a non-kinship question in a future survey (such as Māori well-being survey, or a household survey). Further investigation is required.

Positive impacts of Option 1:

- allows further work to address concerns about data access, respondent burden, cost, and quality
- allows for informed decision-making before inclusion in a census
- workable option for a new concept.

Negative impacts of Option 1:

- no data from 2018 Census
- no granular population information
- lack of data on non-kinship groups limits ability to gain a full understanding of Māori society
- continues traditional approach to data and does not reflect real world.

Option 2 for including non-kinship groups

Do not include non-kinship groups question in 2018 Census, but work with Māori groups to collect own data. Further investigation is required.

Positive impacts of Option 2:

- allows further work to address concerns about data access, respondent burden, cost, and quality
- allows for more informed decision-making
- contributes to building a better working relationship between Statistics NZ and Māori.

Negative impacts of Option 2:

- no data from 2018 Census
- timeframe and funding unknown.

Option 3 for including non-kinship groups

Do not include non-kinship groups question in 2018 Census due to concerns with quality, feasibility, and respondent burden. No further work required.

Positive impact of Option 3:

- maintains time series.

Negative impacts of Option 3:

- not responsive to user needs
- no data from 2018 Census.

Option 4 for including non-kinship groups

Include non-kinship groups question in 2018 Census to enable collection of information on non-kinship Māori groups.

Positive impacts of Option 4:

- responsive to users' future needs

- reflective of contemporary New Zealand society

- a starting point for non-kinship collection

- more granular data about Māori collected (and potentially released)

- describes Māori identity better.

Negative impacts of Option 4:

- creates the expectation that data will be released

- time-series impact/feasibility unknown

- could adversely affect iwi information we receive in the census.

Including rohe/location

Key findings for including rohe/location:

- Rohe information currently collected to aid with iwi coding.

- Some respondents have limited understanding of the term 'rohe'. Cognitive testing to investigate alternative options for rohe is underway.

- The rohe used within the classification are not true rohe boundaries. Rohe are similar to regional council boundaries.

- Rohe is currently not a geospatially enabled boundary. Therefore, rohe is not directly comparable with data based on geospatial boundaries.

- If rohe is changed to a geospatially enabled location measure (ie statistical area 1, statistical area 2, territorial authority, or regional council), it might not accurately measure the location of an iwi, hapū, or marae in a meaningful way for Māori.

- Statistics NZ geospatial team is currently investigating a project to map iwi boundaries, but timeframe for completion is unknown.

Option 1 for including rohe/location

Maintain the collection of rohe to support iwi coding. Continue collection of rohe to maintain time series.

Positive impacts of Option 1:

- enables iwi that share the same name across regions to be coded

- maintains time series

- a geographic/location indicator allows iwi to access data not only about themselves but also about others in their area

- maintains a geographical indicator relevant to Māori.

Negative impacts of Option 1:

- the term rohe is not well understood by respondents

- the current rohe classification does not reflect true iwi rohe

- rohe is not directly comparable to other geospatially enabled boundaries or Te Puni Kōkiri boundaries, limiting comparability across regions and agencies.

Option 2 for including rohe/location

Change rohe to an alternative location measure and include in 2018 Census.

Positive impacts of Option 2:

- users require iwi information and statistics at regional or low geographic levels

- a geographic/location indicator allows iwi to access data not only about themselves but also about others in their area.

Negative impacts of Option 2:

- the term rohe is not well understood by respondents

- cognitive testing for 'location' is ongoing, and the respondents to date have varying responses to the question

- new location indicator still may not be relevant to Māori.

Option 3 for including rohe/location

Maintain rohe in 2018 Census iwi question, but continue to investigate options for change. Keep informed of Statistics NZ geospatial iwi boundary mapping project.

Positive impacts of Option 3:

- enables iwi that share the same name across regions to be coded

- maintains time series

- a geographic or regional-type indicator allows iwi to access data not only about themselves but also about others in their area

- a geographic/location indicator allows iwi to access data not only about themselves but also about others in their area.

Negative impacts of Option 3:

- The term rohe is not well understood by respondents. Rohe is not directly comparable to other geospatially enabled boundaries or Te Puni Kōkiri boundaries, limiting comparability across regions and agencies.

- The timeframe for completion of the project investigating mapping/alignment of geospatial boundaries with iwi boundaries is unknown.

Option 4 for including rohe/location

Delete rohe/location geospatial question from the census iwi question.

Positive impact of Option 4:

- decreases respondent burden.

Negative impacts of Option 4:

- iwi that share the same name across regions cannot be coded without rohe

- utility of rohe data is limited

- time series is discontinued

- iwi are not able to access data about themselves and others at regional level.

Data access and capability

Key findings for data access and capability:

- Users require lower level data. Access to lower-level data is limited by confidentiality thresholds.

- Some users have limited data access and analytical capabilities (due to awareness, skills, and cost).

- Concern over ownership of iwi and Māori data.

- The Statistics Act 1975 is currently being reviewed. Changes might be required with regard to the treatment of iwi and Māori information.

Option 1 for data access and capability

Work with Māori to increase analytical capabilities, to enable Māori groups to collect and analyse their own data.

Positive impacts of Option 1:

- will increase the ability and number of Māori users able to access data

- data will be of greater value to new users

Negative impact of Option 1:

- Educational resources will need to be developed and workshops delivered. The resources (time and costs) required will be based on demand.

Option 2 for data access and capability

Educate to increase awareness.

Positive impacts of Option 2:

- will increase the ability and number of Māori users able to access data.

Negative impact of Option 2:

- Educational resources will need to be developed. The resources (time and costs) required will be based on demand.

Option 3 for data access and capability

Review legislative constraints imposed within the Statistics Act 1975 around confidentiality.

Positive impact of Option 3:

- may result in change of current practice – would require a full review of privacy and legal implications.

Negative impact of Option 3:

- no identifiable negative impact.

Option 4 for data access and capability

No change to ownership and confidentiality. Data is treated the same as any other data collected by Statistics NZ.

Positive impact of Option 4:

- no costs incurred.

Negative impacts of Option 4:

- lack of capability and awareness of data available will continue

- Statistics NZ is not responsive to user needs.

Consistency

Key finding for consistency:

- Limited consistency across government collections. Limits data integration and comparability.

Option 1 for consistency

Promote and encourage adoption of statistical standards and classifications across government.

Positive impact of Option 1:

- The Statistics Act 1975 already allows for the promotion of the standard. Improved standardisation across the data ecosystem.

Negative impact of Option 1:

- Inconsistency can result in lack of data comparability.

Option 2 for consistency

Leave as is and let the Statistics Act 1975 guide.

Positive impact of Option 2:

- More consistent collection will result in better data comparability

Negative impact of Option 2:

- Not being responsive to users' needs.

Census processing

Key findings for census processing:

- Link between Māori descent and iwi question. Currently if respondents answer 'no', 'don't know', or do not answer the Māori descent question, the respondent is routed away from the iwi question.

- Analysis shows a small number of respondents record an iwi after answering no, don't know, or leaving the Māori descent question blank. This data is not included in iwi output.

- Implications with regard to census mode. The respondent can see all the questions on paper forms. Online forms will automate the routing (respondents will not see all the questions – just the questions relevant to them).

- Changing the processing and output treatment of the data may have implications on time series (in that previous undercoverage is being included in the output), and could increase quality.

- Note: All responses are captured (as raw data). Statistics NZ do have the ability to identify this group in past censuses.

Option 1 for census processing

Change the routing rules (for both modes), so that Māori descent 'yes' and 'don't know' are routed to iwi question. Also, on the paper form, a non-response in the Māori descent question and an iwi stated is included in iwi output data.

Positive impact of Option 1:

- more accurate measurement through inclusion of respondents currently left out due to the processing system.

Negative impact of Option 1:

- change will result in higher counts and may affect time series.

Option 2 for census processing

Maintain current mode of collection, processing, and question routing, applying the rules to both modes (paper and online).

Positive impact of Option 2:

- maintains time series.

Negative impact of Option 2:

- continued exclusion of responses that could be valid.

Review cycle

Key finding for review cycle:

- The statistical standard for iwi was developed in 1994 and has not been reviewed until now. The standard is dated.

Option 1 for review cycle

Review as need arises.

Positive impacts of Option 1:

- gives users more confidence in the relevance of the standard
- enables Statistics NZ to be responsive to change.

Negative impact of Option 1:

- harder to budget and timetable.

Option 2 for review cycle

Review at a time that is more appropriate and regular to enable adoption within the census and by users across the data ecosystem.

Positive impacts of Option 2:

- allows for budget allocation and timetabling
- improves real-world relevance
- more dynamic user contribution to change

Negative impacts of Option 2:

- slow response to changes
- time-series disruptions potentially more frequent.

6 Glossary

hapū
A sub-tribe; most iwi comprise two or more hapū, although a number of smaller iwi have marae but no hapū (source: Te Kāhui Māngai).

iwi
A Māori tribe descended from a common named ancestor or ancestors, and is usually composed of a number of hapū (source: Te Kāhui Māngai). The Iwi today is the focal economic and political unit of the traditional Māori descent and kinship-based hierarchy of waka, iwi, hapū, and whānau (source: Statistical standard for iwi).

marae
A traditional meeting place for whānau, hapū, and iwi members, usually characterised by a named wharenui (meeting house) (abridged; source: Te Kāhui Māngai).

kaumātua
Adult, elder, elderly man, elderly woman, old man – a person of status within the whānau (source: Māori dictionary).

rohe
A boundary, district, region, territory, area, border (of land) (source: Māori dictionary).

tangata whenua
Local people, hosts, indigenous people – people born of the whenua, ie of the placenta and of the land where the people's ancestors have lived and where their placenta are buried (source: Māori dictionary).

taonga

Treasure, anything prized - applied to anything considered to be of value including socially or culturally valuable objects, resources, phenomenon, ideas, and techniques (source: Māori dictionary).

urban marae
Non-traditional marae, not specifically associated with any particular hapū. They often serve as meeting places for the wider community and are also commonly called Community; Ngā Hau e Whā; Ngā Mātā Waka; or Pan-tribal marae (abridged; source: Te Kāhui Māngai).

whakapapa
Genealogy, genealogical table, lineage, descent – reciting whakapapa is an important skill and reflects the importance of genealogies in Māori society in terms of leadership, land and fishing rights, kinship, and status. It is central to all Māori institutions (abridged; source: Māori dictionary).

whānau
A family or extended family (source: Te Kāhui Māngai).

7   References

Constitutional Advisory Panel (2012). New Zealand's constitution: The conversation so far. Retrieved September 2016 from www.ourconstitution.org.nz.

Department of Statistics (1988). *Report of the Review Committee on Ethnic Statistics*, Wellington: Statistics NZ.

Statistics NZ (2014a). Guide to using He Arotahi Tatauranga. Retrieved July 2016 from www.stats.govt.nz.

Statistics NZ (2014b). Te Kupenga 2013. Retrieved August 2016 from www.stats.govt.nz.

Statistics NZ (2015). Crown-Maori engagement and statistical information needs. Retrieved July 2016 from www.stats.govt.nz.

Statistics NZ (2016a). Review of the statistical standard for iwi: Summary of key points. Retrieved July 2016 from www.stats.govt.nz.

Statistics NZ. (2016b). New Zealand literature review of Maori groupings. Retrieved July 2016 from www.stats.govt.nz.

Statistics NZ (2016c). The review of the statistical standard for iwi: Submission report (internal paper). Wellington: Statistics NZ.

Statistics NZ (nd,a). What are classifications and standards? Retrieved July 2016 from www.stats.govt.nz.

Statistics NZ (nd,b). Statistical standard for iwi. Retrieved July 2016 from www.stats.govt.nz.

Statistics NZ (nd,c). Classifications and standards review process. Retrieved July 2016 from www.stats.govt.nz.

Te Puni Kōkiri (nd). New Zealand: Rohe introduction and map. Retrieved July 2016 from www.tpk.govt.nz.

Appendix 1: Iwi classification changes over time

Appendix 1, table 1

Iwi classification changes over time		
Classification version	**Start date**	**Summary of changes**
Iwi version 6.0	3/7/2009	• Two name changes (corrections) • One iwi added – o 1008 Ngāti Kauwhata
Iwi version 5.0	29/6/2005	• Eight name changes (corrections)
Iwi version 4.0	1/12/2004	• Fifteen name changes (corrections) • Three iwi added – o 0710 Ngāti Pahauwera o 0711 Ngāti Rakaipaaka o 1007 Ngāti Tama ki Te Upoko o Te Ika (Te Whanganui-a-Tara/Wellington).
Iwi version 3.0	6/3/2001	• Ninety name changes (corrections) • Twelve descriptors recoded (given new classification codes) • Twenty-eight iwi/residuals added – o 0412 Ngāti Tahu (Te Arawa) o 0510 Ngāti Whare o 0707 Ngāti Kahungunu ki Whanganui a Orotu o 0708 Ngāti Kahungunu ki Tamatea o 0709 Ngāti Kahungunu ki Tamakinui a Rua o 0904 Ngāti Hauiti o 1006 Te Atiawa ki Whakarongotai o 2001 Tainui o 2002 Te Arawa o 2003 Takitimu o 2004 Aotea o 2005 Mātaatua o 2006 Mahuru o 2007 Māmari o 2008 Ngātokimatawhaorua o 2009 Nukutere o 2010 Tokomaru o 2011 Kurahaupo o 2012 Muriwhenua o 2013 Hauraki/Pare Hauraki o 2014 Turanganui a Kiwa o 2015 Te Tauihu o Te Waka a Maui o 2016 Tauranga Moana o 2017 Horouta o 2110 Ngāti Apa area unspecified o 4444 Don't know o 5555 Refused to answer o 7777 Response unidentifiable.
Iwi version 2.0	1/7/2000	Codefile changes
Iwi version 1.0	1/12/1994	

Appendix 2: Options for revising/updating the statistical standard and classification for iwi

The themes that emerged from the review of the statistical standard and classification for iwi informed a range of options for revising and updating the statistical standard and classification (see Appendix Table 1). Working group members representing Statistics NZ, cross-government agencies, and Māori provided feedback on the options presented below. This feedback, together with the research and consultation findings, informed the final recommendations.

Explanatory note: The options presented below refer to the Census of Population and Dwellings. However, to reflect use of the standard beyond the census (eg in administrative collections), references to census were removed from *Recommendations from the 2016 review of the statistical standard for iwi*.

Appendix 2, table 1.

Summary of options for revising/updating the statistical standard and classification for iwi				
Key findings	**Response to the findings**	**Options**	**Positive impacts**	**Negative impacts**
1. Purpose and rationale for the statistical standard for iwi	• The current iwi standard was developed to reflect how the Crown was engaging with Māori in Treaty of Waitangi and Fisheries claims. This approach does not reflect the post-Treaty settlement environment. • Removal of references to Treaty of Waitangi settlements and Waitangi Tribunal decisions (land ownership, fishing rights etc) will enable a more responsive approach for measuring statistics for and about Māori.	• Change rationale to emphasise a statistical focus. Remove reference to Treaty settlements, Waitangi Tribunal, and resource allocation, as these are no longer relevant in a post-Treaty settlement environment.	• Changes the focus on the purpose for collecting the data. • Enables a more responsive approach for measuring iwi and reflecting a post-Treaty settlement environment.	• No identifiable impact.
		• Change rationale to emphasise a more statistical focus. Remove reference to Treaty settlements, Waitangi Tribunal, and resource allocation. Replace with rationale that reflects and	• Enables a change in focus of the standard.	• Potential confusion that Treaty/resource is still in rationale.

Summary of options for revising/updating the statistical standard and classification for iwi				
Key findings	**Response to the findings**	**Options**	**Positive impacts**	**Negative impacts**
	• Update the purpose and rationale of the statistical standard to address changing data needs.	acknowledges commitments as a Treaty partner.		
		• Maintain current rationale.	• Maintains consistency in time series.	• Not able to reflect contemporary New Zealand society.
2. Structure of Māori groupings classifications and standards.	• Current standard and classification needs to better reflect a personal sense of belonging for Māori identity groupings. Ensuring the concepts remain relevant is important. • Look to expand the underlying concepts to include hapū, marae, and/or non-kinship to broaden the structure and content of the classification. • Introduce a suite of standards and classifications under a wider framework. • Investigate viability of incorporating the Māori statistical framework. • Investigate the need to review the Māori descent standard to improve linkage with the iwi standard.	• Introduce new concepts and/or create separate standards and classifications for each identity collection via a staged approach with iwi first.	• Will lead to better quality data – more granular and detailed. No confusion over which aspect of Māori group identity is being considered.	• This will require the continued work of Statistics NZ. The standard for Māori descent will need review, and development of further standards will be required. Implementation and resourcing (time and cost) also a factor.
		• Create all classifications under an umbrella standard.	• Will lead to data that is more granular. Extends the scope of the current standard. • Education strategy required to mitigate concerns that Statistics NZ is defining Māori identity.	• Further classifications will need to be developed and implemented. • There is a high risk that Statistics NZ is seen as defining Māori identity.
		• Continue with existing concepts and definitions but re-apply these to reconfigure the classification or retain status quo.	• Least amount of work required from Statistics NZ in the immediate future. Least change therefore least impact to	• Least responsive option for addressing more recognition for Māori group identity.

Summary of options for revising/updating the statistical standard and classification for iwi				
Key findings	**Response to the findings**	**Options**	**Positive impacts**	**Negative impacts**
			• users and survey areas in Statistics NZ.	
		• Create an umbrella standard for kinship-based classifications and a separate standard for non-kinship (which could be developed at a later date).	• Will lead to data that is more granular. Extends the scope of the current standard.	• Further classifications will need to be developed and implemented (for hapū, marae, and non-kinship). Additional statistical standards will need to be developed.
3. Iwi classification criteria	• The current criteria are too rigid and do not enable evolving Māori groups to be included. • Investigate whether custodianship of the standard and classification may be better placed with a more appropriate agency. • A change in criteria could affect time series, particularly for the Census of Population and Dwellings. • Classification is not an exhaustive list of statistically feasible (yet to be defined) iwi (iwi missing due to criteria constraint). • Need to increase coverage and quality of iwi information (to enable release of lower-level information). Measures that may improve quality are: o maintain a geographical reference to iwi (to help code	• Replace classification criteria to better reflect a post-Treaty settlement environment and a contemporary New Zealand society.	• Allows smaller/emerging iwi to be recognised. • Meets data needs currently unavailable. • Easier to apply changes to the classification and data. • Classification is more reflective of the real world.	• Change in time series because of criteria change (ie measure of what is included). • Potential alienation of major iwi by reversing commitments by a previous Government Statistician.
		• Remove only the criterion stating, "In addition, Statistics NZ will consult with the larger Iwi to obtain its view on the group's position in relation to the five criteria".	• Allows smaller/emerging iwi to be recognised. • Meets data needs currently unavailable. • Easier to get changes applied to the classification and data.	• Potential alienation of major iwi by reversing commitments by a previous Government Statistician.. • Potential for legal challenges.
		• Create a more collaborative and inclusive partnership with Māori to facilitate updating and maintenance of the classification.	• Improved relationship with users and Māori.	• Dependent on funding.

Summary of options for revising/updating the statistical standard and classification for iwi				
Key findings	**Response to the findings**	**Options**	**Positive impacts**	**Negative impacts**
	iwi that are located in a number of locations) ○ ask additional information to improve the accuracy of the iwi coding (hapū and marae). • Revision of inclusion criteria of iwi standard may result in change in population of interest (iwi).	• Maintain current criteria (including the clause stating need to consult with larger iwi).	• Maintains time series.	• Least responsive option for addressing more recognition for Māori group identity.
		• Statistics NZ relinquishes custodianship of the standard and classification.	• Resides with appropriate subject matter experts/agencies.	• No one agency with the authority or expertise to take responsibility for cross-data ecosystem governance.
4. Include hapū	• Support to include hapū as an identity marker (in addition to iwi). Hapū connections are important for Māori people and provide a wider understanding of whakapapa. • Users would like data at hapū level. • Including a question on hapū may improve coding and quality of iwi data. • The ability to code hapū is constrained by current survey processing systems. • Concern that quality of hapū information is unknown. Release of information dependent on quality. • Limited cognitive testing to date indicates respondents have a varying ability to report hapū. Including a question on hapū in the census increases respondent	• Further investigation required. Do not include in 2018 Census and continue to develop. Aim to include hapū in another survey in the future (such as Māori well-being survey, or a household survey).	• Enables concerns about data access, respondent burden, cost, and quality to be addressed. • Allows more informed decision-making.	• No data from 2018 Census. • No granular information. • Potential difficulty in using hapū to improve iwi coding due to technical constraints. • Potentially increases respondent burden in future data collections. • Resourcing required for further work.
		• Further investigation required. Do not include in 2018 Census, but work with iwi and/or hapū to collect own data.	• Enables concerns about data access, respondent burden, cost, and quality to be addressed. • Allows more informed decision-making. • Working towards building a better working relationship between Statistics NZ and Māori.	• No data from 2018 Census. • Timeframe unknown. • Resourcing required for further work.

Summary of options for revising/updating the statistical standard and classification for iwi

Key findings	Response to the findings	Options	Positive impacts	Negative impacts
	burden and takes up valuable space on the form.	• Do not include in 2018 Census due to concerns with quality, feasibility, and respondent burden. No further work required.	• Maintains time series.	• Not responsive to user needs. • No data from 2018 Census.
		• Include in 2018 Census to improve coding of iwi and possible release of data (at hapū level). To be the starting point for a continuous collection.	• Responsive to users' future needs. • A starting point for future hapū collection. • Potential to improve coding and quality of other variables (eg iwi). • Enables granular data about Māori to be collected (and potentially released). • Describes Māori identity better.	• Creates the expectation that data will be released. • Time-series impact and feasibility unknown. • Could adversely change iwi information received in the census. • Respondents have varying knowledge of hapū. • Quality of hapū information unknown, may not be releasable.
5. Include marae	• Support to include marae (in addition to iwi). Marae connections are important for Māori people and provide a wider understanding of whakapapa. • Users would like data at marae level. • Including a question on marae may, but not necessarily, improve	• Further investigation required, including investigating the option of geospatially enabling marae. Do not include in 2018 Census and continue to develop. Aim to include marae in another survey in the future (such as Māori well-being survey, or a household sample survey).	• Allows opportunity for further work to address concerns about data access, respondent burden, cost, and quality. • Allows more informed decision-making before inclusion.	• No data from 2018 Census. • No granular information.

Summary of options for revising/updating the statistical standard and classification for iwi				
Key findings	**Response to the findings**	**Options**	**Positive impacts**	**Negative impacts**
	coding and hence the quality of iwi information. • The ability to code marae is constrained by current survey processing systems. • Concern about data quality and whether it will be released as output. • Limited cognitive testing to date indicates that respondents are able to answer their marae more frequently than hapū. Including a question on marae in the census increases respondent burden.	• Further investigation required. Do not include in 2018 Census, but work with iwi/Māori to collect own data.	• Allows opportunity for further work to address concerns about data access, respondent burden, cost, and quality. • Allows more informed decision-making. • Working towards building a better working relationship between Statistics NZ and Māori.	• No data from 2018 Census. • Timeframe and funding unknown.
		• Do not include in 2018 Census due to concerns with quality, feasibility, and respondent burden. No further work required.	• Maintains time series.	• Not responsive to user needs. • No data from 2018 Census.
		• Include in 2018 Census to improve coding of iwi and possible release of data (at marae level). To be the starting point for a continuous collection.	• Responsive to users' future needs. • A starting point for marae collection. • Potential to improve coding and quality of other variables (eg iwi). • More granular data about Māori collected (and potentially released). • Describes Māori identity better.	• Creates the expectation that data will be released. • Time series impact/feasibility unknown. • Could adversely affect iwi information we receive in the census. • Difficulty in using marae to improve iwi coding due to technical constraints. • Increased respondent burden in the census.

Summary of options for revising/updating the statistical standard and classification for iwi				
Key findings	**Response to the findings**	**Options**	**Positive impacts**	**Negative impacts**
6. Include non-kinship groups	• Non-kinship groups play an important part of urban Māori life and offer a sense of belonging, identity, and security. • Information required on non-kinship groups to capture contemporary, urban Māori groups. • Concern about the fluid nature of non-kinship groups. • Strong opposition to mixing kinship and non-kinship concepts. • Limited cognitive testing to date indicates that work is required to clarify what information we require.	• Further investigation required. Do not include in 2018 Census. Aim at including a non-kinship question in a future survey (such as Māori well-being survey, or a household survey).	• Allows further work to address concerns about data access, respondent burden, cost, and quality. • Allows for informed decision-making before inclusion in a census. • Workable option for a new concept.	• No data from 2018 Census. • No granular population information. • Lack of data on non-kinship groups limits ability to gain a full understanding of Māori society. • Continues traditional approach to data and does not reflect real world.
		• Further investigation required. Do not include in 2018 Census, but work with Māori groups to collect own data.	• Allows further work to address concerns about data access, respondent burden, cost, and quality. • Allows for more informed decision-making. • Working towards building a better working relationship between Statistics NZ and Māori.	• No data from 2018 Census. • Timeframe and funding unknown.
		• Do not include in 2018 Census due to concerns with quality, feasibility, and respondent burden. No further work required.	• Maintains time series.	• Not responsive to user needs. • No data from 2018 Census.
		• Include in 2018 Census to enable collection of information on non-kinship Māori groups.	• Responsive to users' future needs. • Reflective of a contemporary New Zealand society.	• Creates the expectation that data will be released.

Summary of options for revising/updating the statistical standard and classification for iwi				
Key findings	**Response to the findings**	**Options**	**Positive impacts**	**Negative impacts**
			• A starting point for non-kinship collection. • More granular data about Māori collected (and potentially released). • Describes Māori identity better.	• Time-series impact/feasibility unknown. • Could adversely change iwi information we receive in the census.
7. Rohe/location.	• Rohe information currently collected to aid with iwi coding. • Some respondents have limited understanding of the term 'rohe'. Cognitive testing to investigate alternative options for rohe is underway. • The rohe used within the classification are not true rohe boundaries. Rohe are similar to regional council boundaries. • Rohe is currently not a geospatially enabled boundary. Therefore, rohe is not directly comparable with data based on geospatial boundaries. • If rohe is changed to a geospatially enabled location measure (ie statistical area 1, statistical area 2, territorial authority, or regional council), it might not accurately measure the location of an iwi, hapū, or marae in a meaningful way for Māori.	• Maintain the collection of rohe to support iwi coding. Continue collection of rohe to maintain time series.	• Enables iwi that share the same name across regions to be coded. • Maintains time series. • A geographic/location indicator allows iwi to access data not only about themselves but also about others in their area. • Maintains a geographical indicator relevant to Māori.	• The term rohe is not well understood by respondents. • The current classification rohe does not reflect true iwi rohe. • Rohe is not directly comparable to other geospatially enabled boundaries or Te Puni Kōkiri boundaries, limiting comparability across regions and agencies.
		• Change rohe to an alternative location measure and include in 2018 Census.	• Users require iwi information and statistics at regional or low geographic levels. • A geographic/location indicator allows iwi to access data not only about themselves but also about others in their area.	• The term rohe is not well understood by respondents. • Cognitive testing for 'location' is ongoing, and the respondents to date have varying responses to the question.

Summary of options for revising/updating the statistical standard and classification for iwi				
Key findings	**Response to the findings**	**Options**	**Positive impacts**	**Negative impacts**
	• Statistics NZ geospatial team is currently investigating a project to map iwi boundaries, but timeframe for completion is unknown.			• New location indicator still may not be relevant to Māori.
		• Maintain rohe in 2018 Census iwi question, but continue to investigate options for change. Keep informed of Statistics NZ geospatial iwi boundary mapping project.	• Enables iwi that share the same name across regions to be coded. • Maintains time series. • A geographic or regional-type indicator allows iwi to access data not only about themselves but also about others in their area. • A geographic/location indicator allows iwi to access data not only about themselves but also about others in their area.	• The term rohe is not well understood by respondents. Rohe is not directly comparable to other geospatially enabled boundaries or Te Puni Kōkiri boundaries, limiting comparability across regions and agencies. • Timeframe for completion of the project investigating mapping/alignment of geospatial boundaries with iwi boundaries is unknown.
		• Delete rohe/location geospatial question from the census iwi question.	• Decreases respondent burden.	• Iwi that share the same name across regions cannot be coded without rohe. • Utility of rohe data is limited. • Time series is discontinued.

Summary of options for revising/updating the statistical standard and classification for iwi				
Key findings	**Response to the findings**	**Options**	**Positive impacts**	**Negative impacts**
				• Iwi are not able to access data about themselves and others at regional level.
8. Data access and capability	• Users require lower level data. Access to lower-level data is limited by confidentiality thresholds. • Some users have limited data access and analytical capabilities (due to awareness, skills, and cost). • Concern over ownership of iwi and Māori data. • Statistics Act 1975 is currently being reviewed. Changes might be required with regard to the treatment of iwi and Māori information.	• Work with Māori to increase analytical capabilities, to enable Māori groups to collect and analyse their own data.	• Will increase the ability and number of Māori users able to access data. • Data will be of greater value to new users.	• Educational resources will need to be developed and workshops delivered. The resources (time and costs) required will be based on demand.
		• Educate to increase awareness.	• Will increase the ability and number of Māori users able to access data.	• Educational resources will need to be developed. The resources (time and costs) required will be based on demand.
		• Review legislative constraints imposed within the Statistics Act 1975 around confidentiality.	• May result in change of current practice. Would require a full review of privacy and legal implications.	• No identifiable impact.
		• No change to ownership and confidentiality. Treated the same as any other data collected by Statistics NZ.	• No costs incurred.	• Lack of capability and awareness of data available will continue. • Statistics NZ is not responsive to user needs.
9. Consistency	• Limited consistency across government collections. Limits data integration and comparability.	• Promote and encourage adoption of statistical standards and classifications across government.	• The Act already allows for the promotion of the standard. Improved standardisation across the data ecosystem.	• Inconsistency can result in lack of data comparability.

Summary of options for revising/updating the statistical standard and classification for iwi				
Key findings	**Response to the findings**	**Options**	**Positive impacts**	**Negative impacts**
		• Leave as is and let the Statistics Act 1975 guide.	• More consistent collection will result in better data comparability.	• Not being responsive to users' needs.
10. Census processing	• Link between Māori descent and iwi question. Currently if respondents answer 'no', 'don't know', or do not answer the Māori descent question, the respondent is routed away from the iwi question. • Analysis shows a small number of respondents record an iwi after answering no, don't know, or leaving the Māori descent question blank. This data is not included in iwi output. • Implications with regard to census mode. The respondent can see all the questions on paper forms. Online forms will automate the routing (respondents will not see all the questions – just the questions relevant to them). • Changing the processing and output treatment of the data may have implications on time series (in that previous undercoverage is being included in the output), and could increase quality. • Note: All responses are captured (as raw data). Statistics NZ do have the ability to identify this group in past censuses.	• Change the routing rules (for both modes), so that Māori descent 'yes' and 'don't know' are routed to iwi question. Also, on paper form, a non-response in the Māori descent question and an iwi stated is included in iwi output data.	• More accurate measurement through inclusion of respondents currently left out due to the processing system.	• Change will result in higher counts and may affect time series.
		• Maintain current mode of collection, processing, and question routing, applying the rules to both modes (paper and online).	• Maintains time series.	• Continued exclusion of responses that could be valid.

Summary of options for revising/updating the statistical standard and classification for iwi				
Key findings	**Response to the findings**	**Options**	**Positive impacts**	**Negative impacts**
11. Review cycle	• The statistical standard for iwi was developed in 1994 and has not been reviewed until now. The standard is dated.	• Review as need arises.	• Gives users more confidence in the relevance of the standard. • Enables Statistics NZ to be responsive to change.	• Harder to budget and timetable.
		• Review at a time that is more appropriate and regular to enable adoption within the census and by users across the data ecosystem.	• Allows for budget allocation and timetabling. • Improves real-world relevance. • More dynamic user contribution to change.	• Slow response to changes. • Time-series disruptions potentially more frequent.