Iwi Data Needs

Purpose

The purpose of this brief paper is to articulate a clear view of the respective needs for and uses of iwi data. This paper is one of the outputs from the Mana Ōrite Work Programme and has been written to provide guidance to StatsNZ and other government officials.

Background

It has been our experience that government officials have struggled to understand the value and uses of iwi data, and therefore the role the Public Sector has in enabling the development, collection and dissemination of iwi data. In our view, it is not the responsibility of the Public Sector and the Government Chief Data Steward (GCDS) to lead or govern this space, but the Public Sector does play a critical part as major producers of official statistics, which includes data *for* or by Māori; data *about* Māori; and any data that Māori have a connection to. Within a Te Tiriti o Waitangi perspective, the GCDS should ensure that government agencies have the capability and right skills to understand the value, need for and uses of iwi data. This means creating the conditions for the development, collection, and dissemination of relevant, appropriate, and timely iwi data by the Public Sector – statistics for iwi uses and needs, not just about iwi.

Since the 1980s, Statistics New Zealand (StatsNZ) had advanced projects to better articulate and provide for Māori data needs. In that time, StatsNZ has collected two key Māori population measures: Māori ethnicity and Māori descent. Māori ethnicity is self-perceived affiliation of a person to an ethnic group or groups that they identify with or feel they belong to. It is a measure of cultural affiliation. This measure is highly useful for national, regional, government and policy purposes.

In 1991, StatsNZ began collecting Māori descent data to meet legal requirements for determining electoral representation. Māori descent is based on a genealogical concept that a person is Māori or descend from a Māori person. It is a measure of ancestry biology. This concept closely aligns with Māori views of whakapapa and that a person must descent from a Māori person, and also applies to iwi affiliation (Kukutai, 2004).

In 1991, StatsNZ also began collecting iwi data at the request of iwi. This was firstly to inform implementation of the Runanga Iwi Act 1990 (repealed in 1991). It was then used for other purposes – to inform firstly the Fisheries Settlement (and eventually its distribution model) and then other Treaty settlements to help determine quantum or the level of financial redress. StatsNZ then developed iwi profiles as a Census output for iwi. At first this was for distribution to iwi authorities, but later were disseminated to the wider public. StatsNZ has historically relied on these iwi profiles as a key output to meet iwi data needs – however, iwi data needs have been increasingly more sophisticated beyond simple population profiles. These mechanisms acknowledged the need and demand for iwi data, either within iwi geographies, which often did not match administrative boundaries, or for iwi populations and their diaspora.

In addition to Census outputs and iwi profiles, StatsNZ occasionally partnered with iwi authorities to undertake capability building programmes. This included provision of customised data requests based on specific needs of those iwi. However, commitment to this workstream had fluctuated over time.

In the last decade, Te Kupenga was welcomed as a more relevant data collection for Māori. However, in earlier stages iwi outputs were not intended from Te Kupenga. After some lobbying by iwi representatives StatsNZ were able to provide outputs for some iwi.

In the past decade there has been increasing discussion about Māori data sovereignty with the establishment of Te Mana Raraunga and with greater awareness of iwi data sovereignty with the establishment of the Data Iwi Leaders Group (Data ILG). These two movements have provided clear direction for discussions and advocacy about Māori and iwi data needs. Iwi continue to request data that meets their respective needs and uses to exercise their rights and interests as Te Tiriti partners in Aotearoa. These needs and uses are more specific than the usual Māori data needs.

Today, iwi and their representative authorities have a *diverse capacities and capabilities* for data design, collection and analysis. Some have advanced technical capabilities and data infrastructure while others still require assistance to collect and use data.

In addition to this, technologies have advanced and become more accessible so that iwi data can be collected and disseminated more readily by data collectors, such as government; and iwi can collect and store their own data. This creates multiple opportunities for government agencies to both collect data and to help build iwi capability and capacity to meet their data needs.

Framework and Approach

Māori are and have been data designers, collectors and disseminators for countless generations. The form that we have collected it in differs from our modern understanding of data, and the forms that we collected and transmitted the data in are closely interconnected with our mātauranga and our ways of being. Data was and continues to be how we have continued our consciousness as Māori across time and distance. For us, **data is a tāonga**. This forms a fundamental pou for how we consider data needs in this paper.

The frame in which we discuss iwi data needs in this paper is based in and guided by *Te Tiriti o Waitangi* as a foundation to the relationship between iwi/hapū and the Crown. Our contemporary discussions about data needs and data governance are shaped by colonisation and therefore by the main instrument cited for the relationship between iwi Māori and the Crown. While we often talk of the Māori Crown relationship, the frame of this paper acknowledges both (a) that hapū signed the Te Tiriti, establishing the relationship with the Crown; and (b) that iwi are often used as the vehicle to advance relationships with the Crown. We acknowledge that the Crown is a significant collector of data for and about Māori, and that iwi data is collected by government agencies. There are further opportunities emerging for agencies to collect further iwi datasets, which is encouraging for the Māori Crown relationship.

We also acknowledge colonisation as a process that disenfranchised Māori from our ways of life. From a data perspective this includes the rewriting and disconnection from our histories, our stories and our data; and more perversely the reframing of our identities and intergenerational consciousness – so that we were defined by the narratives of colonisation, deficit and dependency on the colonising State (Rodriguez-Lonebear, 2016; Rainie et al, 2017; Kukutai & Taylor, 2016; Walter, 2016; Russo-Carrol et al, 2019). Hence the data ecosystem is inconsistent, inaccurate and irrelevant for our purposes; and that data governance and control was exercised externally, by non-Māori and largely by the Crown. Suppression and co-optation of our knowledge system perpetuated this data divide, emphasising data dependency and lessening Māori data sovereignty (Russo Carrol et al, 2019). Hence, the Te Tiriti o Waitangi perspective emphasises the need to reduce data dependency, and reclaim control over design, collection, storage and access to data.

A second major frame for our thinking is the distinction between governance of data and data for governance. Walter et al (2018, p3) explains that Indigenous (and therefore Māori) data governance is decision-making and the power to "decide how and when Indigenous data are gathered, analysed, accessed and used". This spans Māori and iwi data that is held by iwi, Māori organisations, the Crown and the Private Sector. Data for governance is the need and investment in data that informs nation-building (Russo-Carrol et al, 2019) or tino rangatiratanga. In this respect iwi data needs largely falls within the need to govern iwi data and the need for different types of data for the purpose of governance (or government).

Russo-Carroll et al (2019) highlighted the interrelationship between the governance of data and data for governance, as well as the reduction of data dependency through data governance and decolonising of data. Therefore our thinking in this paper addresses the complementary ideas of data governance and data for governance, in the context of reducing data dependency and decolonising data.

Thirdly, the paper uses the Data ILG strategic framework '*whāia te ITI Kahurangi, ki te tuohu koe me he maunga teitei*':

- <u>Information</u>: access and governance over iwi data;
- <u>Translators</u>: enhance and build our capability to engage, use and design data;
- <u>Infrastructure</u>: future-proof the information infrastructure for iwi data.

Lastly, we also acknowledge that there are various interests in terms of Māori and iwi data sovereignty. It is important to distinguish the difference between Māori and iwi data needs and therefore Māori data sovereignty and iwi data sovereignty. While they share the same fundamental basis and approach, iwi data sovereignty focuses on the specific nuances, aspirations and sovereignty of their own data in the advancement of their own collective wellbeing(s). In this case, the data needs of one iwi may be slightly or significantly different from others. This differs from a more nationalised perspective of Māori data sovereignty.

What is Iwi Data?

Our earlier wānanga about data sovereignty resulted the following definitions for Māori data:

- Data that is for, from or about Māori and the places we have connection with; and
- Data this is about or from iwi in terms of people, language, culture, resources, environments or knowledge systems.

As such, we consider iwi data to be any data of this nature: data that is about Māori; data that is from or by Māori; and any data that is connected to Māori. This includes data about population, place, culture, environment and their respective knowledge systems. In our view, this spectrum can be both quantitative and qualitative data, and therefore include any data or information that comprises iwi knowledge systems, whether implicit and encoded in cultural items such as karakia, haka, waiata tawhito and pakiwaitara; or explicit in terms of statistics and qualitative narratives. It is not just statistics.

We understand that methodologists often want concepts to be practical and have clear and bounded definitions. However, for us data underpins how we use data for governance, for mana motuhake, for tino rangatiratanga. If we limit this definition further, then the data ecosystem will continue to be designed against our data needs, and we will not have the appropriate data for our own governance.

Using the lens of data governance, we assert control over this data according to the principles of relevance and access mentioned later in this paper. Secondly, the breadth of Māori and iwi data should be seen within the context of data for governance. While this definition is expansive, it is easier to understand why it is this broad if readers understand that "data that affects Māori in any way" refers to iwi and Māori desires and aspirations to exercise tino rangatiratanga for our own governance purposes.

Iwi Data Uses

Iwi data uses largely speaks to the notion of data for governance. However, it also speaks to how data is designed and collected. Decolonising data, and ensuring that data is designed for our needs is important. Therefore it is not only about making iwi data readily and freely available (use), but ensuring that iwi are designers of data (design). **Iwi must be designers of data as well as consumers of data**.

Iwi leaders, organisations, groups and as collectives as a whole require data for several common purposes; noting that iwi each have their own focus and aspirations. The most important of these is **governance** – **to lead** and **to develop our people, places and interests** toward their aspirational goals. To be able **to effectively make and monitor decisions** and achieve those aspirations, iwi and iwi leaders need more appropriate, relevant and timely data.[1]

This is conducted in a frame where the aspiration is for iwi to flourish as iwi, hapū and whānau – on their own terms and to live their lives well. As such, identifying how well people are according to our own ideas of wellbeing, is central to that idea. Thus, **assessing the state of wellbeing** (which should be defined in our own terms) helps us to identify the state of our people and of places of importance, and what our priorities are for improving our collective wellbeing (see the Independent Māori Statutory Board Māori Plan as an example of Māori-led and -defined approach to wellbeing). There are many dimensions to this, including:

- population (including geographic dispersion);
- safety and security (including health, education, employment, housing and rental status, and cultural wellbeing);
- participation (including social, digital and cultural connectivity, civics, investment and business data); and
- environments we are part of (including physical, built and digital environments).

Cutting across this is the idea of both **individual and collective wellbeing** – that iwi are interested in how people fare individually as well as the collectives that they comprise (including whānau, household, hapū and community collectives).

Assessing and improving our states of iwi wellbeing, and how iwi can flourish, serves a broader purpose. It is about continuing whakapapa and mātauranga intergenerationally. Importantly, this is an adaptive process and not fixed. Therefore, how an iwi determines what flourishing and what wellbeing means (and by implication the data they need to inform this conversation) shifts across successive generations. How each iwi defines the components of wellbeing, and their relative priority, also **shifts from iwi to iwi**.

However, importantly, assessing the state of wellbeing is only part of the picture as it tends to provide descriptive narratives for iwi needs. There is an active component to enable and empower iwi

---

[1] IDSov publications clearly explain the difference between governance of data and data for governance.

development. Data should also enable iwi **to act directly** where they already have resources to do so, **to inform how iwi seek resourcing**, and **to influence others** where decision-making, infrastructures or communities are involved and able to positively impact iwi wellbeing.

The uses for iwi data is framed as either being able **to further and achieve the aspirations of iwi, hapū and whanau**. However, given power dynamics where iwi and hapū no longer have full control of the resources to govern their people, **holding the Crown and government agencies to account** for their policies, investments and choices in respect of their responsibilities to Māori, iwi and hapū is important. In this respect, data provides us with a basis to advocate for better resourcing, processes and outcomes for iwi. As one of our leader's states, they need data to provide us with *a quiver of arrows*. This was largely because people with resources or influence liked to have numbers – e.g. a discussion with Government needs data because Government Ministers and officials like to use numbers. In other words, to speak *with* government, we must speak *like* government. Data makes advocacy more compelling.

The implication of this complex and shifting picture is a challenging one for a conversation about data needs, especially at a macro level .To synthesise iwi data uses and needs becomes more a conversation about values and how data collectors work with iwi to provide the best and most appropriate processes to design, collect, analyse and disseminate data. It acknowledges that some data will be appropriate for iwi to collect, and that agencies as significant collectors of data, must be actively engaged in conversations about iwi data needs, provide space for codesign of datasets and make that data available for iwi to use.

Iwi Data Needs

It is clear from our interviews with iwi leaders and technicians that iwi need more data. However, there is currently very little data that meets the variety of iwi needs. Presently, iwi rely largely on Census data – which is problematic in light of the issues with the 2018 Census and 2013 Census (and the subsequent erosion of trust), and that the Census is currently conducted every five years. Further, it has been proposed on several occasions to be moved to a ten-year cycle or removed in favour of administrative data collections. If these latter scenarios occur, then iwi reliance on available data is again placed at risk. This suggests that iwi data needs to be futureproofed in the event that the system shifts away from Census. It also suggests that real time tools or tools that allow customised data mining (like the Integrated Data Infrastructure) will provide greater utility for iwi purposes over time.

Despite this, iwi require more **timely** data beyond a five-yearly Census. Therefore, it would greatly benefit iwi data to be gathered through and expanded to other collections. *The collection of iwi affiliation data must be seen and recognised as a 'core' variable for any people centred data collections across the system.* We are encouraged that key agencies have started exploring how they can collect iwi data, and strongly press that these are expedited and that we would like to work with other agencies to start collecting iwi data.

While we are aware of iwi data being collected by a few government agencies; we have learned that other agencies have already started collecting iwi data. This highlights another key need for **accessible** data. There are three parts to this: (1) that iwi be made aware that iwi data is being collected; (2) that the data is made **available** (freely) for iwi to use; and (3) there must be assurance of the quality of that data.

In addition to this, not all data collected about Māori and iwi is fit for iwi data needs, and as a result has limited or lacks **relevance**. Existing datasets often do not fit well and have limited or no utility. For example, Māori ethnicity data is more relevant for government purposes, or national or regional

discourse. Māori descent and iwi data is more specifically relevant to iwi. Māori ethnicity data, in an iwi context, is often used a proxy when iwi data is not available. However, it can be difficult to build a consistent narrative because analyses that use this proxy will switch between base populations – making it both inaccurate and confusing for audiences to understand the narrative or business case.

The relevance of data can also be strongly determined by design. Leaders have explained how much of the data that we do use for both Māori and iwi purposes are designed for a system that is not our own. Therefore, the narrative that it tells can also be skewed by that design. For example, existing government measures often highlight how Māori have poorer outcomes than non-Māori – yet the measurement is not framed to Māori and iwi perceptions of a good life and for wellbeing. As one of our leaders often states, it is like *Cinderella's slipper on Rangi's foot*. It is easy to only build a narrative that Māori or iwi have poor outcomes when that is primarily the focus of collection, measurement and dissemination.

One example cited was the Census smoking question. While to researchers and academics, this can be used as a proxy health question, for iwi leaders and technicians the question (and resulting data) is limited and begs the question of what we want or need to know.

If we were to both define Māori wellbeing according to what matters most to ourselves, then the outlook and narrative would be significantly different. Te Kupenga, while not a perfect tool, provided Māori (and to some extent, iwi) with a more nuanced picture that fit our perception of the world and of our own wellbeing. The Integrated Data Infrastructure (IDI) also provides possible opportunities to generate more timely and relevant datasets – so we hope that future reviews and re-designs of the IDI take iwi data needs into consideration and improve its relevance and responsiveness for Te Tiriti partners.

We also see that there may be opportunity to build a more trusted relational space for iwi Crown data, possibly an infomediary, where government data and iwi data can be integrated to generate even more relevant data. We would welcome any further discussions where StatsNZ could help make this a possibility.

The last point here is the **appropriateness** of data collection. This is the recognition of what is most appropriate for iwi to collect, and where government might collect data on behalf of iwi.

As noted above, iwi data needs fall broadly under two roles – to **achieve the aspirations of iwi** and **to influence the outcomes of Māori, iwi and hapū**. Given the dynamic realities and priorities for iwi, we posit that it is for iwi to frame their sense of wellbeing and relative priorities themselves. Data ILG can hold this space, but it is ultimately for iwi to determine this for themselves. In saying this, we point to the seminal work of Whetu Wereta and her team in developing the Māori Statistics Framework, and its fundamental alignment to the Capability Approach – in particular Amartya Sen's view of agency, that wellbeing is determined by the people – in this case iwi themselves. This leads to the critical work that technicians such as Kirikowhai Mikaere have done in developing iwi information frameworks specific to iwi needs, framed and envisaged with their own voice.

While we are reluctant to take a reductionist or top-down view to synthesise how iwi have prioritised data needs, there are existing frames that identify data needs for Māori (and implicitly iwi, hapū and whānau). These include the Māori Statistics Framework, the Māori Plan for Auckland, Te Kete Tu Atea, the Indigenous Approach to the Living Standards Framework. These can use a *four wellbeings approach* (**social**, **cultural**, **economic** and **environmental**) and a *capitals approach* (variations of **human**, **social**, **political**, **cultural**, **natural**, **built/physical** and **financial** capitals). In similar ways, iwi aspirations outline domains or theories of change in their respective strategies.

For example, the Ruapehu Whānau Transformation project (Ngāti Rangi) uses a broad theory of change about improved **education** leading to improved **employment and enterprise** opportunities, which lead to better **housing** decisions, which leads to improved **health** conditions, which then leads to greater connection and participation in society and in **social** groupings. Staged interventions across these five domains, and monitoring of these outcome areas, demonstrate how wellbeing of the iwi (and all whānau in their role, under the mantle of their role as kaitiaki) improves over time. While much of this appears to be focused on population or physical environments, it is important to note that financial, investment, business and infrastructure (including energy, digital or communications) data are of interest for iwi governance.

We note that some advocates highlight that iwi data needs are used to inform narratives. This enables iwi leaders and technicians to navigate the complex and dynamic environments of their iwi aspirations. Data provides an initial view of current dynamics and priorities, further data is gathered, tested and reconsidered. This approach then creates feedback loops of quantitative and qualitative data to build, test and create a narrative that can be used to negotiate, leverage and influence for positive changes for iwi and iwi members.

Our discussions with iwi leaders and technicians found that many had strategic aspirations, but many found that there these were often difficult to measure because of the availability of relevant and accessible data.

A Framework

Using the discussion above, we have generated a broad framework for iwi data needs and uses (see over the page). This summarises key points from the discussion above about the functions of data for iwi and what it is used for. It highlights some of the rationale for how and why data is used in the way it is.

Key Statements

We assert the following statements:

- There is significant demand and need for iwi data

Governance of Iwi Data

- Iwi and Māori data is a tāonga
- Iwi have always been data designers and collectors
- Iwi must be designers of data as well as consumers of data
- Iwi and Māori want to reduce data dependency in the Crown
- Government has an ongoing role in collecting iwi data as part of the Māori Crown relationship
- Iwi and Māori governance of data held by the Crown requires the sharing of power over design, collection, storage and access to iwi data held by government agencies
- Iwi data must serve iwi needs
- Data needs and priorities are set by each iwi
- Iwi data needs to relevant, timely, appropriate, available and accessible to iwi
- A relational or shared space for data will dramatically improve the relevance and availability of data for Māori
- Mechanisms for co-governance and integration of datasets is central to establishing maintaining the relational space
- Protocols for co-governance must empower tino rangatiratanga

Data for Governance

- There is a clear distinction between data *for* iwi/ Māori, data *about* iwi/ Māori and data *with* iwi/ Māori
- Māori data also includes data about those people, places and situations that Māori have connection with
- Iwi data describes our wellbeing state, directly informs decisions we make, and informs discussions for advocacy, influence and resourcing
- Iwi data enables iwi governance (and government) over iwi affairs
- Data must be designed by iwi, and not just rely on Crown-designed datasets
- Iwi demand greater involvement in data investment conversations
- The Crown must invest in, enable and empower data for governance – that is, empower iwi to lead data design and collection so that iwi can achieve their aspirations and realise their tino rangatiratanga
- Control over iwi affiliation data is better placed with iwi, rather than the Crown administering it on behalf of iwi
- The Crown must resource iwi to be able to design and collect their own data as part of the Treaty relationship and future-proofing Aotearoa data eco-system
- The Crown must invest in iwi infrastructure to enable the relational space and to decolonise data and to improve iwi data capability and capacity
- Iwi data needs are more specific and nuanced than the current set of Māori data needs
- Iwi data must inform and be relevant for iwi and their diverse strategic purposes
- Iwi use data to advance their aspirations and to influence the outcomes of their peoples and places
- Government must invest in a relational space for data (between Kāwanatanga and iwi):
  - This is an opportunity for the Crown to free up resources for iwi and Māori to design, collect, analyse and disseminate data for governance – rather than doing or leading data design, collection and dissemination for or about Māori; and
  - this includes co-governance of data and integrating Kāwanatanga and iwi datasets for the benefit of iwi

Bibliography

Alkire, S. (2005). Subjective quantitative studies of human agency. *Social Indicators Research*, *74*(1), 217-260.

Kukutai, T & Taylor, J. (2016). 'Data Sovereignty for Indigenous Peoples: Current Practice and Future Needs'. In: Kukutai, T & Taylor, J. (Eds.), I*ndigenous data sovereignty: Toward an agenda*. Canberra, Australia: Australian National University Press, pp. 79–97.

Kukutai, T. (2004). 'The Problem of Defining an Ethnic Group for Public Policy: Who is Māori and Why Does it Matter?'. *Social Policy Journal of New Zealand*, 23, pp. 86-108.

Octave. (2020). *Audience Research Report.* Unpublished report prepared for Te Kāhui Raraunga.

Rainie, S.C., Schultz, J.L., Briggs, E., Riggs, P. & Palmanteer-Holder, N.L. (2017). 'Data as strategic resource: Self-determination and the data challenge for United States Indigenous nations'. *International Indigenous Policy Journal*, 8(2).

Russo-Carroll, S., Rodriguez-Lonebear, D. & Martinez, A. (2019). 'Indigenous Data Governance: Strategies from United States Native Nations', *Data Science Journal*, 18(31), pp1-15.

Sen, A. (1985). Well-being, agency and freedom: The Dewey lectures 1984. *The Journal of Philosophy*, 82(4), 169-221.

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

Stats NZ (2016b). *Discussion of findings from the 2016 review of the statistical standard for iwi.* Retrieved from www.stats.govt.nz.

Stats NZ (2016c). *Recommendations from the 2016 review of the statistical standard for iwi.* Retrieved from www.stats.govt.nz.

Stats NZ (2017). *Iwi statistical standard: September 2017.* Retrieved from www.stats.govt.nz.

Walter, M. (2016). 'Data politics and Indigenous representation in Australian statistics'. In: Kukutai, T. & Taylor, J. (Eds.), I*ndigenous data sovereignty: Toward an agenda*. Canberra, Australia: Australian National University Press, pp79–98.

Walter, M. (2018). 'The Voice of Indigenous Data: Beyond the markers of disadvantage First Things First'. *Griffith Review*, 60, pp256–263.

Wereta, W., & Bishop, D. (2006). *Towards a Maori statistics framework.*

GOVERNANCE OF DATA

ORANGA

RANGATIRATANGA   **MANA MOTUHAKE**

Category	Content			
WHAT DATA?	Varies according to priorities set by iwi, hapū and whānau – their dynamics are nuanced according to their own context and dynamics – this is a bottom-up process			
Key PRINCIPLES	**RELEVANT** data according to our needs	Data is more **TIMELY** than Census	Data that is **APPROPRIATE** to **OUR** needs	Data that is freely **AVAILABLE** and **ACCESSIBLE**
What will it be **USED FOR**?	To understand the current state of our wellbeing	To create a narrative to understand the levers of change required to create the conditions for our flourishing in our own terms, and to measure positive shifts and impacts		
FUNCTIONS of the data	**DESCRIPTIVE** data	Data for **DIRECT ACTION**	Data for **RESOURCING**	Data for **INFLUENCE**
For what **PURPOSE**?	To understand the **STATE** of our wellbeing (from our points of view)		To pursue specific **OPPORTUNITIES** or **OUTCOMES** to improve our wellbeing	
HOW do we do this?	We do this through our respective lenses as iwi, hapū and whānau – this is kaupapa Māori according to the dynamics, contexts and nuances of iwi, hapū and whānau			
WHY is data important?	To ensure **WELLBEING** and that our people and environments are flourishing		To advance the **DEVELOPMENT** of our people, communities, places and environments	

FOR GOVERNANCE

REDUCE DATA DEPENDENCY   **DECOLONISE DATA**

Most data collected by others (e.g. agencies and private sector) are developed for purposes other than our own. We may re-purpose some of this data to inform our narratives, or develop and collect our own

Colonisation has diluted our ability to govern our people and places us in so that we (a) can directly act and (b) require strategies to influence or collaborate with others to achieve positive impacts for our people

Data constructs narratives about our state and identifies opportunities and levers to improve our wellbeing

Data inform us about our wellbeing as we define it and informs us how we can flourish on our terms, in our respective contexts

Data serves our need to govern our interests to achieve self-determination and rangatiratanga on our terms