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Government Response to
Report of the Commerce Committee on its
*Inquiry into Finance Company Failures*

Presented to the House of Representatives
in accordance with Standing Order 249
Introduction

The Government notes the Commerce Committee’s report on its Inquiry into Finance Company Failures (the report) and thanks the Committee for its thoughtful consideration of the issues.

The Commerce Committee (the Committee) has made thirteen recommendations to the Government, canvassing a diverse range of matters from financial literacy through to effective enforcement against delinquent directors. The Government responds to the recommendations in the report in accordance with Standing Order 249.

The Government takes note of the report. The Government supports the general nature of the committee’s recommendations, including the importance of financial literacy, effective disclosure to investors, and efficient enforcement action against those market participants who break the rules.

The Government notes that there has been a comprehensive programme of financial sector reform in recent years designed to facilitate the growth of a sounder and more efficient capital market.

In achieving this aim, a key objective of the Government has been to re-establish investor confidence in the financial sector. Measures to achieve this aim include the establishment of the Financial Markets Authority (FMA), the regulation of key financial market participants such as financial advisers, trustees and auditors, the introduction of prudential regulation of finance companies, and the introduction of the Non-bank Deposit Takers Bill. The recent introduction of the Financial Markets Conduct Bill will also comprehensively revise New Zealand’s securities law including the issue of debt securities by finance companies.

While supporting the general nature of the Committee’s recommendations, the Government considers that the majority of the Committee’s recommendations have been, or will be, adequately addressed as part of the Government’s ongoing work programme of financial sector reform.

There are only two recommendations that fall outside this category and which the Government does not support. The first is to change the name of moratoria to “creditor compromise situation”. The Government does not consider that this change of name will make the potential impacts of the situation clearer for investors. The second is to expand or clarify the scope of the Protected Disclosure Act to make it easier for an employee to report serious wrongdoing directly to the appropriate authority, rather than to the head of the organisation to which the wrongdoing relates in the first instance. The Government considers that there are exceptions in the Act which would already permit this in appropriate circumstances, and that the changed proposed would be inconsistent with the focus of the Act on internal procedures and the responsibilities of the head of the organisation in dealing with whistleblowing.
Recommendations and Government Response

The Commerce Committee makes the following recommendations to the government.

Recommendation 1:
That financial literacy efforts include efforts to publicise the distinction between “independent advisers” and those who receive remuneration from the providers of investment products, to encourage the public to opt for independent advice.

Response
The Government agrees that there is an important benefit to the public investing in financial products with more risk being informed and understanding the difference between financial advisers that receive remuneration from the providers of the investment products recommended and those who do not.

The Government notes that the Financial Advisors (Disclosure) Regulations 2010 sets out the information disclosures that ‘authorised financial advisers’ (AFAs - generally those who advise on more risky products with an investment focus – such as the majority of finance company products) are required to provide to clients that includes details of how the authorised financial adviser is paid and details of arrangements the AFA has made to manage any conflict of interest.

At the same time, AFAs are required to comply with the Code of Professional Conduct for AFAs. Specifically, AFAs are not to state or imply that the AFA is independent, or that any financial advisor services provided are independent if they are not. In addition, the AFA must ensure each retail client has sufficient information to enable the client to make an informed decision including fees, benefits and conflicts of interest.

The Government believes sufficient controls have been put in place to ensure that adequate disclosure of remuneration and its implications will be provided to investors. However, these issues will be covered in the broader review of the financial advisers regime set to take place in 2016.

Recommendation 2:
That the Government investigate the possibility of banning conflicted remuneration structures in the provision of financial advice, including consultation with Australian authorities on the model proposed in that country.

Response
The Australian government has now committed to a ban on conflicted remuneration structures from 1 July 2012, including commissions and volume payments, in relation to the distribution of and advice on retail investment products including managed investments, superannuation and margin loans and a ban on most soft-dollar benefits of $300 or more. In addition, the Financial Services Authority in the United Kingdom has recently banned financial advisers from receiving commissions for selling investment policies.

The Government recognises the potential negative impacts of commission based remuneration on the incentives. Officials will be monitoring the effects of the
Australian and United Kingdom bans while liaising with relevant industry bodies and consumer organisations to better understand the role of advice in different sectors, the nature and extent of problems and the likely impacts of any ban.

The Government notes that it is a legislative requirement that the Financial Advisors Act 2008 and the Financial Service Providers (Registration and Dispute Resolution) Act 2008 are reviewed by mid-2016. This timeline will provide an opportunity to bed in the regime. A baseline evaluation of financial advisor behaviour has already been carried out. The initial indications are that the new requirements contained in the regime established by these Acts have reduced reliance on commissions. Officials will better be able to determine toward the end of 2012 whether more should be done prior to the review.

Recommendation 3:
That the Financial Markets Authority be asked to investigate means of standardising the way information is publically presented so that the general public can readily understand financial information such as profitability.

Response
The Government notes that the Financial Markets Conduct Bill currently before the House will establish a new disclosure regime for offers of financial products. This regime will replace the existing prospectus and investment statement with a new Product Disclosure Statement (PDS) supplemented by additional disclosures on an electronic Register of Financial Product Offers.

Unlike the current situation with the prospectus, the Government expects that certain aspects of the presentation of the PDS (such as length and format) will be prescribed in regulations in at least some cases. The Government expects that this will help to ensure that the PDS is clear and accessible to investors. It should also help to ensure that important information cannot be hidden in the document.

In addition, the FMA is currently preparing guidance on the use of alternative performance measures in public communications by issuers, with the expectation of consulting on this guidance this year. The FMA has also recently consulted on guidance on disclosure.

The Government notes that the committee has suggested that the FMA prepare frameworks or methodologies regarding the reporting of a company’s profitability. At present the Government is satisfied that the likely level of prescription in the new disclosure regime combined with the FMA’s guidance on disclosure and alternative performance measures will be sufficient to deal with this issue. However, the Government will keep this issue under observation.

Recommendation 4:
That the Government give priority to a co-ordinated effort to improve New Zealanders’ understanding of financial matters, focused particularly at those at or nearing retirement age, on young people to build financial capability, and on those most at risk from scams and irresponsible lending practices.
Response

The Government agrees that financial literacy is an important component of personal financial well-being and that financial education can assist in encouraging beneficial behaviours. This, combined with protection of the most vulnerable consumers against unscrupulous lenders, can lead to improved financial outcomes.

There are a large number of financial literacy initiatives delivered by a large number of organisations in New Zealand. As in most countries within the OECD, there has been little evaluation of the initiatives that have been completed report mixed or inconclusive results on what the results of any particular initiative are or what the best initiative is. In addition, there is currently only limited information on the state of the financial literacy of New Zealanders.

The Minister of Commerce now has responsibility for financial literacy and also for two agencies with a key interest in financial literacy, the Commission for Financial Literacy and Retirement Income (previously the Retirement Commission) and the FMA.

The Commission for Financial Literacy and Retirement Income (the Commission) will re-launch the “Sorted” website in March 2012 with new advertising focused on the benefits of ‘thinking and planning for the expected and unexpected’. The programme of activity covers an 18 month period initially and will include separate campaigns aimed at ‘shrinking debt’ and ‘growing saving’. “Sorted” activity is aimed at the 18 – 55 year old age group.

The Commission is also working with the FMA on a separate investor literacy programme.

Retirement Planning and Income

The Commission is developing a co-ordinated strategy to ensure that older Kiwis and their families have greater access to free, independent and impartial information and resources to help them manage their money. This strategy is due in July 2012 (older Kiwis are defined as 55+ years of age for the purposes of the strategy).

Young people

Initial areas to focus on will be secondary school education including participation in the OECD Programme for International Student Assessment (PISA) in 2012 which will include assessment of the financial literacy among 15-year old students. This will provide a benchmark to underpin future efforts targeted to this age group.

The Ministry of Education is currently developing additional financial literacy teaching and learning units which are scheduled to be available for use in February 2012. The units cover financial literacy related concepts including needs and wants, consumers and producers. The Ministry is working with the Tindall Foundation, the Commission and others to partner fund the development of these resources.

In addition, the Commission continues to work closely with the Ministry of Education and other agencies to promote the Financial Literacy Competency Framework which will help teach students money skills for life and also continues to work with tertiary education providers and industry training organisations to include financial education as a core part of many tertiary qualifications and pre-employment training.
Irresponsible Lenders
In October 2011 Cabinet agreed to a number of amendments to the Credit Contracts and Consumer Finance Act 2003 (CCCFA) and the Credit (Repossession) Act 1997 to provide for responsible lending. Proposed changes include introducing new responsible lending requirements, amendments to the oppressive credit contracts and hardship provisions, and restrictions on financial providers who do not belong to an approved dispute resolution scheme to charge fees and interest on loans.

The responsible lending initiative is based around a responsible lending purpose and principles along the lines that exercising the care, diligence and skill of a responsible lender includes:

- Credit offered must be reasonably expected to meet the needs or purposes of the borrower (similar language to Consumer Guarantees Act services guarantee),
- The borrower must be reasonably expected to repay the loan without substantial hardship, and
- The lender must be honest and transparent in dealing with the borrower.

The changes to the CCCFA will require lending to be in accordance with a Code of Responsible Lending.

Recommendation 5:
That the Government review the adequacy of current funding of the Retirement Commissioner and schools for financial education and increase it as necessary.

Response
Responsibility for the Retirement Commissioner moved from the Minister of Social Development and Employment, to the Minister of Commerce on 1 July 2011. Since then the Retirement Commission was renamed the Commission for Financial Literacy and Retirement Income. In May 2011 the FMA was established. One of its functions is investor education.

These changes reflect the importance of financial literacy to the financial well-being of New Zealanders and the overall performance of the financial markets in New Zealand.

As demonstrated by the National Strategy for Financial Literacy, developed by the Commission, there is currently a large number of financial literacy initiatives delivered in New Zealand supported by a wide range of organisations. The Commission for Financial Literacy and Retirement Income currently receives approximately $5,700,000 per year in Crown funding, and spent over $2,700,000 on marketing and education in the 2010/11 financial year. In addition, it works with private sector organisations to leverage its efforts through funding from other entities.

At present it is not envisaged that further Crown funding for the Commission is necessary.
Recommendation 6:
That moratorium situations be referred to as “creditor compromise situations”, as a small but important indication of the unlikelihood of a satisfactory outcome for investors.

Response
The Government notes that the Securities (Moratorium) Regulations 2009 define “moratorium proposal” as:

“an offer of any debt security that is, in substance, a variation of the terms or conditions of an existing debt security that extends the time for payment of the principal amount or any other returns, or reduces or cancels the principal amount or any other returns, that are due, or to become due, under that existing debt security”

The Government considers that this is an accurate definition of what constitutes a moratorium. In substance, this is effectively an arrangement that effects a creditor compromise in respect of money owing to creditors who are security holders.

On balance, the Government is not confident that the term “creditor compromise situation” will be appreciably clearer to investors than the current term of “moratorium”. It could also lead to confusion for investors about the distinction between moratoria and creditor compromises under the Companies Act 1993.

The Government notes that the Securities (Moratorium) Regulations 2009 require tailored disclosure to investors when a moratorium is proposed, and that a proposal to delay or reduce the total payment due to security holders is likely to indicate that the company is in financial difficulties.

Recommendation 7:
That the duties imposed on directors be stated clearly and forcefully in legislation, according to the principles set out in the February 2011 Cabinet paper which set out the policy intent of the draft Financial Markets Conduct Bill.

Response
The Government notes that the committee’s report notes that the February 2011 Cabinet paper setting out the policy intent behind the Financial Markets Conduct Bill proposed that an offence be established for intentional contraventions of the following duties:

- To act in good faith and what the directors believe to be in the best interests of the company;
- To avoid carrying on the business of the company in a manner likely to create a substantial risk of serious loss to the company’s stakeholders; and
- To not incur an obligation unless the director believes at the time on reasonable grounds that the company will be able to perform the obligation when it is required to do so.

These are existing directors’ duties from the Companies Act 1993 and are clearly set out in that legislation. These duties are owed to the company rather than the shareholders of the company or holders of debt securities issued by the company.
The February 2011 Cabinet paper on the Review of Securities Law proposed that serious breaches of these duties be criminalised. Since that time the exact scope of these proposed criminal offences has been refined. Cabinet has subsequently agreed to not to criminalise the third of the duties noted above (i.e. the duty to not incur an obligation unless the director believes that the company will be able to perform the obligation) on the basis that this conduct is effectively captured by other criminal offences.

While the Financial Markets Conduct Bill also provides for a set of prescribed duties owed to investors by managers of managed investment schemes (MIS), these prescribed duties do not extend to directors of debt issuers (including finance companies). This is partly because company directors already owe statutory duties to the company (and in limited circumstances, the shareholders), and providing additional duties owed to holders of debt securities is likely to create potential conflicts between these duties and the duties owed to the company.

However, the directors’ duties under the prudential regulatory regime for finance companies goes further than the Companies Act directors’ duties by prohibiting finance companies that are subsidiaries from including in its constitution a provision that allows the directors to act other than in the best interests of the finance company. The Non-bank Deposit Takers Bill goes even further and will not allow directors of finance companies to act other than in the best interests of the finance company despite the provisions of the Companies Act.

As the committee notes, the FMA has the power to take proceedings on behalf of another person. This also goes a certain way towards addressing the issue of effective enforcement of those duties that are owed directly to the company but which benefit investors.

The Government is satisfied that, where necessary, the duties owed to investors in different types of financial products will be adequately set out in legislation once the Non-Bank Deposit Takers Bill and the Financial Markets Conduct Bill have come into force.

**Recommendation 8:**
That the term “supervisor” be used instead of the term “trustee” to describe those trustees who supervise peoples’ investments.

**Response**
The Government agrees that the term “supervisor” more accurately describes the role of trustees in cases where they supervise peoples’ investments (particularly in the context of issues of debt securities, where the trustee does not actually hold the funds of investors). The Financial Markets Conduct Bill replaces the term “trustee” with the term “supervisor” in these circumstances.
Recommendation 9:
That the Government ensure that the Financial Markets Authority, as regulator of New Zealand’s securities markets, be adequately resourced to fulfil its statutory functions.

Response
The Government notes that the funding for the FMA has been set up to 2014/15 and out years and, except in the establishing year, is to remain the same as it was for Securities Commission with additional funding proposed to be sourced from third party revenue streams. This funding comprises three operating appropriations, a litigation fund appropriation, and an initial capital investment have been provided to adequately fund the FMA to meet its expanded regulatory mandate, and to make provision for its transition to a medium-sized entity of 128 FTEs and a second office in Auckland. The specific funding provided to the FMA is set out in the table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vote Commerce Non-Departmental</th>
<th>2011/12</th>
<th>2012/13</th>
<th>2013/14</th>
<th>2014/15 &amp; Outyears</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Output Expense: Licensing and Supervision of Market Participants</strong></td>
<td>11.688</td>
<td>12.256</td>
<td>12.556</td>
<td>12.556</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Output Expense: Performance of Investigation and Enforcement Functions</strong></td>
<td>5.749</td>
<td>6.968</td>
<td>7.973</td>
<td>7.973</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Operating Total:</strong></td>
<td>24.274</td>
<td>25.461</td>
<td>27.770</td>
<td>26.184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other Expense: Financial Markets Authority Litigation Fund</strong></td>
<td>2.500</td>
<td>2.000</td>
<td>2.000</td>
<td>2.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Capital Expenditure: Investment in the Financial Markets Authority</strong></td>
<td>5.000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A detailed analysis of the resourcing that the FMA would require was carried out prior to the funding levels being set. The FMA Establishment Board commissioned a consultant to undertake a cost analysis of the functions and operations of the new entity based on its proposed organisation structure. Following consideration Cabinet subsequently approved the funding noted above.

The Government is confident, given the analysis that led to Cabinet’s approval of this level of funding, that FMA is adequately resourced to carry out its statutory functions.

Recommendation 10:
That the wording of the Protected Disclosures Act 2000 be broadened to cover wrongdoing by board members and other senior officers besides the “head” of the company.

Response
The Government notes that the Protected Disclosures Act 2000 (the Act) provides for substantive protections for whistle-blowers in both public and private sector organisations.
In the absence of the organisation having internal procedures for receiving and dealing with reports of serious wrongdoing, disclosure by a whistle-blower must be made to the head of the organisation. The exception to this is where the person making the disclosure believes on reasonable grounds any of the following:

- That the head of the organisation is or may be involved in the serious wrongdoing alleged in the disclosure; or
- That immediate reference to an appropriate authority is justified by reason of the urgency of the matter to which the disclosure relates, or some other exceptional circumstances; or
- That there has been no action or recommended action on the matter to which the disclosure relates within 20 working days after the date on which the disclosure was made.

In these circumstances, under section 9 of the Act, the person making the disclosure may make that disclosure directly to the appropriate authority (which in this case would presumably be either the FMA, Police, or Serious Fraud Office).

The Committee’s recommendation is to expand section 9(1)(a) to cover circumstances where the person making the disclosure believes on reasonable grounds that a board member or senior officer of the organisation is or may be involved in the serious wrongdoing alleged in the disclosure (rather than just the head of the organisation).

The Government considers that expanding the scope of section 9(1)(a) of the Act in the way proposed by the Committee may contradict other sections of the Act including the promotion and application of internal procedures for dealing with disclosures. Under the Act, reporting directly to the appropriate authority is intended to be the exception rather than the rule. Furthermore, as there is potential for a significant number of protected disclosures to relate to board members or senior officers, amending the Act in the way proposed by the Committee will significantly increase the number of protected disclosures made directly to the appropriate authority.

The Government notes that in a financial sector context a whistle-blower may be reluctant to report to the head of an organisation serious wrongdoing by that organisation’s board members or senior officers, due to a fear that the head of the organisation may be disinclined to take action or report the wrongdoing to the appropriate authority. However, the Government considers that the Act already provides exceptions that would adequately deal with situations of this kind.

Firstly, the person making the disclosure can report directly to the appropriate authority where they believe on reasonable grounds the head of the organisation may be involved in the wrongdoing. This could be a reasonable belief that although the head of the organisation did not commit the wrongdoing, their knowledge of and/or failure to address that wrongdoing implicates them as a party to the wrongdoing.

Alternatively, if no action has been taken within 20 working days following a disclosure to the head of the organisation, the person can make a disclosure directly to the appropriate authority. In addition, if there is a reasonable belief that the matter
is urgent and it would be improper to wait for the 20 working days a disclosure can be made directly to the appropriate authority. There is also the ability to make a disclosure directly to an appropriate authority in “exceptional circumstances” (which could cover a situation perhaps where someone believes on reasonable grounds that the majority of directors are involved in the wrongdoing and it may be inappropriate for the head of the organisation to investigate).

The Government also notes that under the Act an employee can seek guidance from the Ombudsmen on any matter concerning protected disclosures. So if an employee was concerned that the head of an organisation may not take action in relation to their disclosure the employee can seek guidance from the Ombudsmen prior to making such a disclosure.

Recommendation 11:
That priority be given to progressing legislation on class actions during the term of the 50th Parliament.

Response
The Rules Committee, a statutory body established under the Judicature Act 1908, undertook public consultation on a Class Actions regime for New Zealand and developed a draft Class Actions Bill which it provided to Government for its consideration.

The purpose of the Class Actions Bill is to enhance the procedures of the High Court to secure the just, speedy and inexpensive determination of class actions. The Bill will allow multiple litigants to institute a single proceeding against one or more defendant(s) on the basis that all the claims arise out of the same, similar or related circumstances, and give rise to at least one substantial common issue of law or fact.

Further policy work is required before a Bill can be introduced to the House. This is expected to occur in 2012.

Recommendation 12:
That such legislation (relating to class actions) include guidelines for the operation of commercial third-party funders of litigation.

Response
Government has not made decisions on this aspect of class actions. As noted in the response to recommendation 11, policy work (including this aspect) is expected to occur in 2012. There is a range of possible ways by which guidance can be provided to third-party funders of litigation, and these will be considered through the policy process.
Recommendation 13:
That the Government consider accelerating work on legislation to provide means for investors to gain redress from funds in trusts, including an examination of sham trusts and a means of penetrating trusts to recover assets for creditors.

Response
The previous Government referred the law of trusts to the Law Commission for review in 2009. Because of the breadth of issues being reviewed, the Law Commission is undertaking the review in stages. The first stage which covers the Trustee Act 1956 addresses the issues identified by the select committee.

The Law Commission is examining:
- Whether the law relating to sham trusts (where parties intend that certain acts or documents are not to create the legal rights or obligations that they give the appearance of creating) is satisfactory
- Whether the courts should have the statutory power to set aside a trust if having regard to a range of factors, the court was of the opinion that no trust had been established or that the trust should not be permitted to continue to exist
- Whether the existing legislative mechanisms that address the impact of trusts when trusts interact with other areas of law, such as under the insolvency and property legislation discussed below, are adequate.

The Insolvency Act 2006 provides for the ability to void transactions entered into by a bankrupt up to two years before they became bankrupt if they were effectively insolvent at the time the transaction was entered into. If a debtor transfers property or establishes a trust to defeat a creditor’s interests, the court may, under the Property Law Act 2007, set aside the transfer or settlement.

Whether reforms in these areas could assist investors who have lost money to finance companies would depend on the circumstances of each situation in which individuals established their trusts.

Ministers cannot direct an independent Crown entity, such as the Law Commission, on how to prioritise its work. However, the Law Commission will work with officials to refine the scope and timing of its projects. A final report for the first stage of the review is expected to be published in late 2012. When the Law Commission’s report is tabled in Parliament the Government will have 120 working days to respond.

Conclusion
The Government reiterates its support for the general nature of the Committee’s recommendations, and is committed to ensuring effective disclosure and enforcement in financial markets, and helping to improve financial literacy. The Government also wishes to thank Committee members for their careful consideration of the issues.

The Government notes that it considers that eleven of the committee’s thirteen recommendations have been, or will be, effectively addressed with through the Government’s existing work programme. These include important recommendations relating to improving the quality of financial advice (recommendations 1 and 2),
ensuring effective disclosure and improving financial literacy (recommendations 3, 4 and 5), and ensuring effective enforcement and redress for investors when wrongdoing occurs (recommendations 7, 11, 12 and 13).

These recommendations align with recent measures undertaken as part of the Government’s reform programme in the financial sector. In particular, the establishment of the FMA with additional powers and a clear mandate, the introduction of prudential regulation of finance companies, the introduction of the Non-bank Deposit Takers Bill and the enhanced regulatory measures in the Financial Markets Conduct Bill, as well as various steps that are being taken to improve financial literacy in New Zealand.

As noted, there are only two recommendations which the Government does not support. These relate to changing the name given to moratoria (recommendation 6) and to amending the scope of the Protected Disclosures Act (recommendation 10).
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Government Response to the
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Inquiry into 21\textsuperscript{st} century learning environments and digital literacy

1. The Government welcomes the Report of the Education and Science Committee (the Committee) on its Inquiry into 21\textsuperscript{st} century learning environments and digital literacy. The Government has carefully considered the report and is responding in accordance with Standing Order 249.

2. The report is the result of considerable work by the Committee over eight months, and represents a major contribution to the development of public policy in the important but challenging area of digital literacy.

3. The Government believes that all the recommendations are helpful and worthy of further consideration. We are committed to looking at them with the support of an expert reference group drawn from the education and technology sectors, as outlined in para 9 below.

4. There are two types of recommendations in the report; those that require consideration of policy, and those that require an initiative or policy to be delivered with effective engagement of key stakeholders.

5. Many of these recommendations are already being actioned as part of the Ministry’s current work programme and may require more intensive work.

6. This Government has made substantial investment in technology. The Government is investing $1.5 billion in ultrafast broadband. The Government target is for 97.7 percent of schools and 99.9 percent of students to have access to ultrafast broadband. The roll out of ultra-fast broadband to schools and communities, the Schools Network Upgrade Project (SNUP) to upgrade internal school network infrastructure, and a network for the delivery of content and services are challenging us to think differently about our education system.

7. This Government is committed to ensuring that all students are purposefully engaged in learning to achieve the Government’s expectations expressed through the Better Public Services targets. To achieve these targets we need to continue to improve access to infrastructure, to content and services, and to knowledge and understanding about the use of the digital technologies to enhance teaching and learning.

8. Comprehensive change management is required to fully integrate technology into teaching and learning in every learning environment in every school and kura. This approach will engage key stakeholders. Used effectively, technologies have the potential to increase students’ motivation, engagement and achievement and foster innovative ways of working collaboratively.

9. The Government is establishing a reference group to further consider the recommendations of the select committee and assist with the development of a digital education strategy. The group will have broad membership and include representatives from the education and technology sectors.

10. The Government thanks the Select Committee for its comprehensive report.
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The Government welcomes the Report of the Education and Science Committee (the Committee) on its Inquiry into Pacific languages in early childhood education. The Government has carefully considered the report and is responding in accordance with Standing Order 249. The report is the result of considerable work by the Committee over the period of May 2012 to November 2013.

The Government believes that the recommendations are helpful and worthy of further consideration. Many of the recommended actions are already part of the current work programmes of the Ministries of Education and Pacific Island Affairs. This is particularly the case with the Pasifika Education Plan 2013-2017, which sets out the Government’s strategic direction for improving Pasifika educational outcomes.

Recommendations and Government response

Recommendation 1: that the Government encourage Pasifika communities to increase their participation in school boards of trustees.

Response:
The Government accepts recommendations 1 and 2, and notes that they are consistent with the Pasifika Education Plan 2013-2017.

The Government undertook a range of measures in the period leading up to the 2013 school boards of trustees elections with the aim of increasing the number of Pasifika people on school boards. The Ministries of Education and Pacific Island Affairs will continue to use, and expand upon, these measures to increase Pasifika participation in school Boards of Trustees in the 2016 triennial board elections.

Recommendation 2: that the Government support measures to encourage Pasifika parents to stand for school boards of trustees, and address challenges to Pasifika representation on boards of trustees.

Response:
The Government notes the recommendation of the Committee for further consideration. It is possible under existing policy for schools to set up bilingual or immersion units for Pasifika or other languages, and some have done so. The Government will investigate how best to provide information to communities to ensure they are aware of this possibility.

Recommendation 3: that the Government encourage Pasifika communities to encourage their local schools to establish immersion or bilingual units.

Response:
The Government notes the recommendation of the Committee for further consideration. It is possible under existing policy for schools to set up bilingual or immersion units for Pasifika or other languages, and some have done so. The Government will investigate how best to provide information to communities to ensure they are aware of this possibility.
Recommendation 4: that the Government encourage Pasifika communities to cooperate with Government to make successful use of the initiatives and measures available to them.

Response:
The Government accepts the recommendation and notes that it is consistent with the direction of the Pasifika Education Plan 2013-2017 and the Pacific Languages Framework.

Recommendation 5: that the Government consider how equity funding could be used more effectively to support heritage language learning, for example to target an increase in the number of Pasifika language teachers.

Response:
The Government accepts the recommendation and notes that it is consistent with recommendations made by the Education Review Office (ERO) Report on the use of Equity Funding in Pacific Early Childhood Services (October 2013).

The Government is considering ERO’s recommendations to see what further steps should be taken to support Pasifika services.

In 2014, the Ministry of Education is offering 100 scholarships for people who have experience working with Māori or Pasifika communities to study to become early childhood education (ECE) teachers.

Recommendation 6: that the Government consider taking steps to determine the number of early childhood teachers who are fluent in Pasifika and heritage languages.

Response:
The Government accepts the recommendation and will investigate how best to do this.

Recommendation 7: that the Government consider how equity funding could be used more effectively to incentivise growth in numbers of Pasifika early childhood education services teaching in a Pasifika language for over 50 percent of the time.

Recommendation 9: that the Government encourage growth in the number of Pacific Island language immersion early childhood education centres.

Response:
The Government accepts recommendations 7 and 9, and notes that they are consistent with the Pasifika Education Plan 2013-2017.

The Ministry of Education is carrying out a review of ECE funding. This review will explore more effective ways of using Equity Funding to support children from the Government’s priority groups: Māori children; Pasifika children; children from low socio-economic status backgrounds; and children with special education needs.
Recommendation 8: that the Government consider establishing Pasifika early childhood education best practice models, to be developed in consultation with the community.

Response:
The Government accepts this recommendation. The Ministry of Education will investigate ways of incorporating this work in the ECE professional development programme *Strengthening Early Learning Opportunities*. The Ministry of Pacific Island Affairs will be collecting Pasifika ECE best practice models.

Recommendation 10: that the Government continue to work on the provision of online learning resources.

Response:
The Government accepts the recommendation and notes it is consistent with current work programmes.

Recommendation 11: that the Government continue to provide resourcing to improve participation in Pasifika services

Response:
The Government accepts the recommendation and notes it is consistent with the direction of the ECE Participation Programme and the *Strengthening Early Learning Opportunities* professional development programme.

Recommendation 12: that the Government explore opportunities for cooperation between the New Zealand and Pacific Island Governments for sustaining Pasifika heritage languages in early childhood education.

Response:
The Government accepts this recommendation. The Government will explore this topic in its regular policy and development discussions with Pacific Governments.

Recommendation 13: that the Government focus specifically on ensuring that the Strengthening Early Learning Opportunities programme demonstrates more responsiveness to Pasifika communities than the previous programme of professional development.

Response:
The Government accepts the recommendation and notes that it is consistent with measures taken by the Ministry of Education to ensure an increase in the number of Pasifika professional development providers in the pool of preferred suppliers.
Recommendation 14: that the Government require early childhood education partnership activities promoting Pasifika participation in early childhood education to include a specific language focus.

Response:
The Government accepts the recommendation and notes it is consistent with the focus of the ECE Participation Programme to encourage ECE services to be responsive to the needs of their communities and to recognise the importance of identity, language, and culture for children attending services. The Government is aware, however, that not all Pasifika families will choose Pasifika language ECE programmes.

Recommendation 15: that the Government consider undertaking research to develop a better understanding of bilingual delivery in heritage languages.

Recommendation 17: that the Government consider undertaking research into the uptake and quality of Pacific languages in early childhood education.

Response:
The Government notes recommendations 15 and 17 for further consideration. It is important that any research builds on existing evidence and that the complexity of these topics is fully explored in order for this research to achieve meaningful results. The Ministry of Education will explore with researchers how best to proceed.

Recommendation 16: that the Government consider undertaking research into Pasifika children’s educational transitions.

Response:
The Government accepts the recommendation and notes that the Ministry of Education has work just getting underway on ensuring successful transitions to school. The Early Learning Taskforce will work with target communities to develop local initiatives to support strong transitions. The different community approaches will be evaluated to provide an evidence base for future transition initiatives.

Recommendation 18: that the Government take into account the broader evidence on bilingual and immersion language learning when considering measures to improve outcomes of Pasifika early childhood education centres.

Response:
The Government accepts the recommendation and notes that it is consistent with its current focus on improving educational outcomes for Pasifika.

Conclusion
The Government thanks the Education and Science Committee for its thorough report.
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The government has carefully considered the Committee’s report on the Briefing on the International Criminal Court and the Kampala Amendment on the Crime of Aggression. The government welcomes the report on the amendments, which represent an important development in the functions of the International Criminal Court.

The government responds to the report in accordance with Standing Order 249. The government will take a formal decision in the first quarter of 2014 on ratification of the Kampala amendments.

Recommendations and government response

Recommendation

That the Government give priority to New Zealand’s ratification of the Kampala amendments to the Rome Statute, and thus make New Zealand one of the 30 founding states needed to implement the amendments.

Response

The government, noting the motion that was agreed by the House on Wednesday 5 June 2013 regarding the Kampala amendments, will take a formal decision in early 2014 on ratification of the amendments and, as appropriate, the introduction of implementing legislation.
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Government Response to the Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade Committee
report: Inquiry into New Zealand’s relationship with India

Introduction

The Government has carefully considered the Committee’s report on its inquiry into
New Zealand’s relationship with India.

The Government commends the Committee for its well-timed consultations, thorough
analysis and constructive approach. The Government welcomes the report, which
represents a useful contribution to the development of policy on New Zealand’s
relationship with India.

The Government responds to the report in accordance with Standing Order 248.

The release of the Committee’s report immediately preceded the public launch of the
Government’s New Zealand [Incorporated] Inc India strategy, which envisages that
India would become a core trade, economic and political partner of New Zealand by
2015. The India strategy is the first of seven country and regional strategies aimed at
strengthening NZ Inc agency collaboration to grow key bilateral relationships, working
closely with the private sector. It continues to guide NZ Inc work in 2012, with agencies
prioritising a number of action steps to facilitate achievement of the India strategy’s six
key goals:

1. Grow merchandise exports to at least NZ$2 billion by 2015;
2. Grow services trade with India (education, tourism and professional services) by
   an average of 20% per year;
3. Improve the bilateral investment framework and facilitate growth in the
   investment relationship;
4. Attract and retain skilled migrants from India who are able to make an effective
   contribution to New Zealand’s economic base;
5. Engage more deeply with India on regional and global issues that will impact on
   New Zealand’s future prosperity and security;
6. Raise the profile of New Zealand’s value proposition in India through a series of
   conscious steps, from enhanced cricket diplomacy to increased political contact
   with India.

The Government welcomes the Committee’s positive acknowledgement of the NZ Inc
India strategy as a useful starting point for a coordinated Government approach to
interactions with India. The Government has closely examined all of the Committee’s
recommendations, many of which complement the strategy and the priority action steps
already being implemented by NZ Inc agencies. There are also a number of
recommendations that will need further consideration as New Zealand’s relationship with
India develops.
Recommendations

Political and diplomatic relations

1. That New Zealand representation in India be reviewed in the event of the successful conclusion of a free trade agreement, including consideration of the appointment of honorary consuls outside of New Delhi and Mumbai, in addition to the one in Chennai.

New Zealand’s engagement with India is deepening across the spectrum, both in terms of Government and private sector engagement. This trend is welcomed by the Government and is expected to continue under the NZ Inc India strategy, which envisages India as a core trade, economic and political partner for New Zealand by 2015.

In line with the strategy, New Zealand’s representation in India is being kept under close review to ensure that resources are nimble and appropriately sized/located to match opportunities in India and respond to the interests of New Zealand exporters. The successful conclusion of a free trade agreement and the possibility of expanding the number of Honorary Consuls in India are both factors under consideration as part of this ongoing review. The Government is also continuing its efforts to secure the appointment of a Wellington-based defence adviser to India.

The Government highlights the significant increase in New Zealand’s footprint in India achieved with the opening of the New Zealand Consulate in Mumbai in 2011. The Consulate comprises resources from New Zealand Trade and Enterprise, Tourism New Zealand and Immigration New Zealand. Some Government agencies have also based resources for India in Singapore, including Tourism New Zealand’s Regional Manager for South Asia (previously based in Mumbai), and NZTE’s full-time investment manager for India.

In addition to representation in India, the Government continues to facilitate exchanges between New Zealand and India to build links and raise the profile of New Zealand across a number of sectors. A number of high-profile ministerial visits took place in 2011, including the Prime Minister’s visit in June which successfully re-launched the relationship at the highest level and provided strengthened political links to underpin growth of the bilateral relationship. The Government will continue to support ministerial and other high-level visits in 2012 to maintain momentum in the relationship and facilitate the implementation of the NZ Inc India strategy.

The Government also welcomes the broad range of exchanges supported by other institutions in New Zealand, including the journalism and art internships organised by the Asia New Zealand Foundation and the annual bilateral Track II dialogue between India and New Zealand, which is led by the Asia New Zealand Foundation and the Institute of Defence and Strategic Analysis in New Delhi.

Trade and investment

2. That the Government investigate mechanisms, beyond the Beachheads programme, for providing India-specific capability programmes for businesses wanting to do business in India.
3 That the Government work with the private sector to decide upon states or cities in India for a New Zealand focus, and develop strategies to concentrate New Zealand’s efforts on those places.

The Government supports the Committee’s focus on trade issues and its identification of the difficulties New Zealand exporters face in dealing with both high import tariffs and a number of non-tariff barriers for goods entering India. As the Committee notes, the Indian regulatory environment is a complex one and New Zealand exports can face a number of challenges in complying with India’s labelling, sanitary and phytosanitary regimes and border certification requirements.

In this context the successful conclusion of a comprehensive free trade agreement remains a key priority for the Government, particularly as a mechanism to lift exports to India. Government agencies are also working together to address non-tariff barriers to trade and where possible to provide trade facilitation for New Zealand business engaging in the Indian market. For example, NZTE is developing an in-depth programme of business capability training tailored to provide India-specific practical information for New Zealand companies wanting to grow successful business relationships with Indian counterparts. The Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade is also liaising closely with institutions including the Asia New Zealand Foundation on initiatives to promote understanding of Indian business culture.

The Government reiterates that the location of New Zealand’s resources in India is continuously under review as the Government responds to new opportunities and to interest from the private sector. Flexibility in the deployment of resources remains a priority, with existing offices in New Delhi and Mumbai able to cover a range of locations across India to give extra leverage and visibility to New Zealanders doing business in these areas.

It is anticipated that the primary focus of New Zealand interests in India will remain in Delhi and Mumbai given the co-located headquarters of many larger Indian firms, the presence of large international airports and the extensive business networks already developed by New Zealand business and agencies in these cities. But, in line with the priority sectors targeted in the NZ Inc India strategy and the developing interests of New Zealand exporters, government agencies continue to explore opportunities for coverage beyond the main centres. Examples include opportunities for information and communications technology firms in Bangalore, Hyderabad and Pune, and the agritech sector in the regions of Punjab, Haryana and Tamil Nadu.

Export education

4 That the Government instruct Education New Zealand to consider increasing its presence in India through education fairs or similar exercises.

5 Mindful of New Zealand’s need for scientists and engineers, that the Government consider lifting the immigration qualifications applying to the migration market.

6 That the Government instruct Immigration New Zealand to review its decision not to process student visas during the Christmas-New Year period.

India is an important and growing market for New Zealand education services, both in terms of Indian students studying in New Zealand and New Zealand providers offering their services in India. Increasing services trade in education with India comprises a
significant strand of the NZ Inc India strategy, with Education New Zealand leading work on engagement in this area. In addition to its support for private education providers, Education New Zealand also works with the wider education sector to support their activities in India. For example, Education New Zealand organised an insightful and well-attended seminar on Doing Education Business in India for the public and private sectors in February 2012 in Wellington. Further activities planned in 2012 include education fairs in three cities in India as well as other marketing activities such as digital promotions, T-20 Cricket and education cluster events.

The Government is also looking into opportunities to strengthen links between New Zealand and Indian universities focused on agriculture. Such links have the potential to facilitate understanding of innovative technology in New Zealand (for example in food processing) and of the health status of New Zealand’s plants and animals. In the longer term this understanding could support improved bilateral trade and investment in these areas.

Attracting and retaining skilled migrants from India who are able to make an effective contribution to New Zealand’s economic base is another central pillar of the NZ Inc India strategy. The Government recognises India as a significant source market for skilled migrants and as a source of qualified young people who remain in New Zealand after paying for their education here. It welcomes their potential contribution to New Zealand’s labour force and to the lifting of productivity rates, and remains committed to the effective management of related opportunities and challenges. The opening of an Immigration New Zealand office in Mumbai in 2011 with approximately 50 staff reflects this commitment.

The Government has recently announced changes to immigration policy to incentivise higher-level courses of study for prospective skilled migrant applications. These changes will see a higher threshold put in place for international students who wish to access work and residence after they study here, and more distinction made between low-end and high-end qualifications. From April 2012, in order to be eligible for a ‘Study to Work’ work visa (available to students after they graduate), the student will need to have studied in New Zealand for two years (minimum of 16 months full time study); unless their qualification is degree level (level 7) or above, in which case they will be required to have studied in New Zealand for one year (nine months minimum). Previously there had been no minimum required period of study in New Zealand.

A range of targeted attraction measures is also in place, including streamlined pathways for postgraduate scholars (who, for example, can obtain New Zealand residence without requiring a job offer). The Government has decided against further measures at this time.

With regard to applicants for skilled permanent residence who have not studied in New Zealand, the Government is currently comfortable with the points given for qualifications. Ongoing monitoring of residents’ employment outcomes shows that the majority are working in skilled jobs, meeting our skill needs and contributing to the New Zealand economy.

Immigration New Zealand (INZ) will investigate opening its Indian branches over the Christmas-New Year period to cater to the student application demand peak and will consult other affected agencies including the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade.
Tourism

7 That the Government actively grasp opportunities presented by co-hosting the 2015 Cricket World Cup with Australia.

The Government is fully committed to co-hosting a successful 2015 Cricket World Cup (CWC). This event will provide a great opportunity to showcase New Zealand to the world, particularly to countries such as India that share our passion for cricket.

New Zealand agencies are already coordinating to maximise the opportunities presented by co-hosting the CWC with Australia. Through the Major Events Development Fund the Ministry of Economic Development has invested in the preparation of a comprehensive best practice manual for New Zealand Cricket and its Local Organising Committee to assist the world-class delivery of the CWC. This will include the development of a leverage and legacy plan designed to maximise the international, national and community benefits around hosting the event. The leverage and legacy plan will take a cross-agency approach to maximise trade, tourism and investment opportunities with all the countries involved in the CWC.

New Zealand and India are currently negotiating a Sports Cooperation Arrangement which will provide a platform to explore closer ties in the area of sport. The CWC may also provide an opportunity to share experiences between Indian and New Zealand security agencies in terms of managing such large scale events and associated security threats.

The Government is already working with New Zealand Cricket to leverage the opportunities provided by cricket tours, and with prominent ex-international cricketers to heighten the profile of selected business programmes in India. The Government will continue to work with New Zealand Cricket, prominent cricketers and related stakeholders to deliver programmes of value to its customers, focusing on opportunities for New Zealand businesses and the interests of New Zealand exporters.

Beyond the opportunities presented by the CWC and cricket linkages more broadly, the Government is continuing its efforts to promote New Zealand as a tourist destination for Indian travellers in line with the objectives of the NZ Inc India strategy. For example, the Government has been working to develop links between Bollywood and the New Zealand film production industry, including as a mechanism to stimulate tourism from India. The Government is pleased to report that the New Zealand India Film Co-production Agreement was signed during the Prime Minister’s visit to India in June 2011 and was brought into force in October 2011.

Immigration

8 That the Government review visa provisions for Indian nationals with a view to the facilitation of travel to New Zealand, particularly for bona fide business and tourist visa applicants.

The Government has introduced a number of initiatives to help facilitate travel by Indian nationals to New Zealand. These include the opening of a new Immigration New Zealand branch in Mumbai in 2011 to provide much needed extra capacity and enable Immigration New Zealand to improve the service it is able to offer Indian nationals, and the development of a joint Education New Zealand/Immigration New Zealand initiative to
facilitate students through a trusted partner programme. The Government has also recently committed to a total replacement of the foundation immigration IT system. The new Immigration Global Management System, to be introduced from 2013, will facilitate online applications and faster processing.

The Government is also considering introducing a new long-term business visitor visa that would enable bearers to travel to New Zealand over extended periods without the need for re-application. This visa product will be of particular interest to business people engaged in long-term commercial relationships with New Zealand companies.

New Zealand regularly reviews its visa waiver provisions, but there are no plans to extend a visa waiver to India at this time.

**Sectors with potential for further engagement**

9 That the Government assist the New Zealand business community in pursuing opportunities for trade with India in ICT, creative industries, aviation, engineering, science and innovation.

10 That the Government consider the need for more approved medical examiners to be appointed, and if a case exists amend the legislative framework to allow recognition of medical clearances from other equivalent jurisdictions. The objective should be to facilitate the recruitment of more flight training students from India.

The Government places a high priority on the provision of assistance to New Zealand businesses engaging in India. Agencies continue to work with the New Zealand business community to pursue opportunities for trade with India across a range of sectors and, under the auspices of the NZ Inc strategy, are implementing specific action plans in the food and beverage/agritech, high value manufacturing, construction and interiors, high value services, tourism and education sectors. The Government is also providing innovative assistance to New Zealand businesses, for example by leveraging cricket to support the promotion of New Zealand products, services and businesses in India.

Opportunities for the New Zealand business community were enhanced by the high profile visit by the Prime Minister, Minister of Trade and business delegations to India in June 2011. In addition to strengthening political links and raising the profile of New Zealand in India, the visit produced a number of concrete outcomes including the conclusion of a Science and Innovation Cooperation Protocol and a Film Co-production Agreement.

The Science and Innovation Cooperation Protocol reflects the broad range of opportunities to build science and innovation links across a range of areas including primary production and food processing innovation in particular. Other potential areas for cooperation include reducing greenhouse gas emissions and clean energy. Agencies continue to work closely with industry to explore these and other opportunities.

In the aviation sector, agencies and industry are in the early stages of examining a proposal for an Arrangement or Memorandum of Understanding on aviation cooperation between New Zealand and India. Such cooperation would aim to facilitate training and commercial links, drawing on New Zealand’s solid reputation for high quality training and aviation safety. Opportunities are also being explored by the aviation industry for the development of direct air links between New Zealand and India.
Changes to the civil aviation legislative framework to allow the recognition of medical clearances from other equivalent jurisdictions are a matter which the Ministry of Transport and the Civil Aviation Authority are considering. In the meantime, it is open for medical examiners in other countries who meet the required standards to apply to the Director of Civil Aviation to issue New Zealand certificates.
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Introduction

The Government has carefully considered the Report of the Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade Committee (the Committee) on the Agreement between the Government of New Zealand and the Government of the United States on Enhancing Cooperation in Preventing and Combating Crime (the PCC Agreement).

The Report makes one recommendation. The Government has examined this recommendation and responds to it in accordance with Standing Order 249.

Recommendation and Government response

The Committee recommended that once the process is developed, Parliament should be advised on a six-monthly monthly basis about the number of requests and individuals affected, by a report to Parliament from the responsible Minister.

The Government agrees that some form of reporting is desirable, and adopts the Committee’s recommendation with some clarifications and modifications, to ensure reporting is efficient and effective.

In particular it is necessary to clarify who the responsible Minister is, when the reporting obligation will commence and the content of the report. The Government intends to modify the frequency and nature of reporting to align with existing reporting practices.

Responsible Minister
The Government proposes that the Minister of Police will have oversight of the reporting requirements. Other agencies such as Immigration New Zealand and New Zealand Customs may share information under the PCC Agreement.

Commencement of reporting
NZ Police are in a position to begin reporting when the PCC Agreement enters into force.

Content of report
The report will include the number of times information is shared under the PCC Agreement. To clarify, the report will not include particulars about the individuals themselves.

Frequency and nature of reporting
The Committee recommended that the responsible Minister would report on a six monthly basis. NZ Police will include the report within the NZ Police Annual Report which is tabled in the House. Although this means NZ Police will report less frequently than recommended by the Committee it is the most practical option to align the reporting requirement with an existing obligation.
The Committee intended that a separate report would be tabled in the House. Instead, the Government proposes that the information is included in an appropriate section in the Annual Report to ensure that it is easily accessible.

Conclusion

The Government thanks the Committee for its report. It accepts the Committee’s single recommendation with the clarifications and modifications outlined above.
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Introduction

The Government has carefully considered the Committee’s report on Petition 2011/49 of Aaron Cross on behalf of the Greyhound Protection League of New Zealand.

The petition requested that the House ‘note that 1,590 people have signed an online petition requesting an inquiry into the injuries and outcomes for greyhounds in the New Zealand racing industry, that the findings be made public, and that the House support this request’.

The Government responds to the report in accordance with Standing Order 249.

The Government accepts the concerns raised in the Committee’s report, however significant progress is already being made in improving the welfare of greyhounds in racing.

In 2013, the greyhound industry commissioned an independent investigation into the animal welfare of greyhounds in racing. The review found that, on the whole, greyhounds appear to be very well cared for during their racing lives. However, the review made recommendations for the industry to improve in several areas, including having a greater focus on population management, enhanced welfare standards, improved education, and better enforcement of the racing rules.

The New Zealand Greyhound Racing Association has accepted the findings in the review’s report and adopted all of the recommendations. At the Association’s AGM in October 2013, a number of amendments to the racing rules were adopted to strengthen the welfare component of the rules. The Association has also announced the Racing Dog Welfare Programme. The main features of the programme are the appointment of a full time welfare officer, a welfare code covering conditions in which greyhounds are kept and trained, a new breeding licence system, and a database tracking dogs from birth.

Recommendations and government response

Recommendation 1: The Government Administration Committee recommends to the Government that it ask the New Zealand Racing Board to develop a system for monitoring the greyhound racing industry’s Rules of Racing.

Response: The Government does not believe developing such a system is necessary as the New Zealand Racing Board currently review and must approve all proposed amendments to the racing rules. The Racing Board can also submit any rule changes to the Greyhound Association for consideration.

The Racing Integrity Unit is an independent organisation responsible for integrity matters within the racing industry, and also has a role of monitoring compliance with the rules.
**Recommendation 2:** The Government Administration Committee recommends to the Government that it ask the New Zealand Racing Board to review the service agreement between the New Zealand Greyhound Racing Association and the Racing Integrity Unit.

**Response:** The service agreement between the Greyhound Association and the Racing Integrity Unit was recently reviewed by the Racing Board. The review was completed in February 2014.

**Recommendation 3:** The Government Administration Committee recommends to the Government that it ask the New Zealand Racing Board to review the New Zealand Greyhound Racing Association's implementation of the recommendations arising from the welfare review of the greyhound racing industry by August 2014.

**Response:** The Government agrees with this recommendation and has asked the Racing Board to undertake such a review by August 2014.

**Recommendation 4:** The Government Administration Committee recommends to the Government that it ask the Department of Internal Affairs to establish and maintain a database of greyhounds, tracking their identity and their location from registration until death.

**Response:** The Greyhound Association already has an established database that has recently been upgraded. The changes include requiring litters to be registered with the Association, ensuring all greyhounds are registered with the local council, and detailed information to be provided when greyhounds are deregistered from the Association.

The Greyhound Association is confident that the greater priority recently given to this aspect of greyhound population management will provide comprehensive tracking of greyhounds. The Government does not believe it would be necessary or efficient for the Department of Internal Affairs to implement a database that would duplicate the system that the Association has in place.

**Recommendation 5:** The Government Administration Committee recommends to the Government that it ask the National Animal Welfare Advisory Committee to consider developing standards for the use of animals, particularly greyhounds, in racing.

**Response:** The Government agrees with this recommendation and, in July 2013, asked the National Animal Welfare Advisory Committee (NAWAC) to consider this issue. NAWAC has advised the use of animals in greyhound racing will be considered during the development of a proposed new Code of Welfare for animals in public display, exhibition and entertainment.

**Recommendation 6:** The Government Administration Committee recommends to the Government that it ask the National Animal Welfare Advisory Committee to consider developing guidelines on the breeding of greyhounds.
Response: The Government agrees with this recommendation and, in July 2013, asked the National Animal Welfare Advisory Committee (NAWAC) to consider a number of issues around the greyhound industry, including the issue of over breeding. NAWAC has advised that it has included the issue of over breeding as part of its longer-term strategic issues work program.

Recommendation 7: The Government Administration Committee recommends to the Government that it ask the National Animal Welfare Advisory Committee to consider reviewing the Animal Welfare (Dogs) Code of Welfare 2010, with a view to specifying the circumstances in which dogs can be euthanased.

Response: NAWAC has advised that it has included the issue of euthanasia as part of its longer-term strategic issues work program.

Conclusion

The Government appreciates the work of the Committee and has given close consideration to the recommendations. Steps are being taken to address the matters raised by the Committee, with considerable progress already being made in many areas. The industry has taken a proactive approach in addressing concerns about the welfare of greyhounds in racing, and the Government will continue to monitor the industry’s ongoing progress.
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Introduction

The Government has carefully considered the Committee’s report on Petition 2011/97 of Kyle Lockwood.

The petition requested that “the House repeal section 5(1) of the Passports Act 1992, as is currently enacted and substitute it with the original text of the Act as enacted in 1992 (No 92) and repeal without replacement section 8 of the Passports Amendment Act 2005 and by doing so reintroduce ten-year passports for New Zealanders.”

The Government responds to the report in accordance with Standing Order 249.

The Government agrees with the Committee’s view that moving to biometric passports has increased the security of passports. However, it remains the case that attempts to counterfeit or falsify passports, including biometric passports, continue. New Zealand passports contain many more security features than a ‘biometric’ chip. These features are refreshed more frequently in a passport with a five-year validity period. Evidence indicates that the longer that passports with older security features remain in circulation the greater the risk of those passports being counterfeited.

Whilst biometric passports are more difficult to counterfeit, a number of international organisations including Interpol, the International Civil Aviation Organisation and Frontex highlight that incidents of ‘imposter’ crime (the misuse of a genuine passports) will increase. This concern was highlighted by the misuse of genuine passports for travel on Malaysian Airlines flight MH370. One counter-measure to this is the five-year validity period, because the identity details on the passport, such as the photograph of the passport-holder, are checked and updated more frequently. Moving to a ten-year validity period is likely to increase the risk of fraud and/or counterfeiting, and the potential misuse of the New Zealand passport.

The Government is aware that other countries have considered these risks but have reintroduced ten-year passports. For any extension to a ten-year passport in New Zealand, the Government would need assurance that such a change would not materially compromise the security and integrity for which New Zealand passports in particular are currently recognised.

It is also the experience of countries, such as Canada and the Netherlands, that in moving to a ten-year passport, there is need to significantly increase upfront passport fees and/or change their fee and funding structures (i.e. by reducing or removing the subsidy for children’s passports). This is because a smaller number of travel documents are issued and the fees for these documents must support the service over a longer time scale.

In its report the Committee recognises that the fees for passports may increase but suggests that this may be partially offset by the reduced costs for New Zealanders living abroad, who will need less frequently to pay to transfer visas into new passports. However, this benefit will only be experienced by a relatively small number of New Zealanders, whereas increased passport fees will affect all passport applicants.
The Government will therefore review in detail different funding approaches and options to ensure that fees are not unreasonable.

Recommendation of the Government Administration Committee

The Government Administration Committee recommends to the Government that it review the validity period of passports.

Response

The Government appreciates the work of the Committee to examine this issue. The Government agrees to undertake a review of the validity period of passports on the following terms:

i) an independent review of the security settings in the context of current international civil aviation security and border control issues, and the materiality of the differences in security risks between five-year and ten-year validity periods. This review would also take into account Cabinet’s decision to provide for an extension of the five-year validity period of up to nine months, when a person renews their passport; and

ii) a review of the funding approaches for passports and other travel documents, including how to maximise efficiency gains. This would include examining options such as:

- adjusting fees to accommodate different passport validity periods;
- supporting aspects of passport production through Crown funding;
- removing subsidies currently in place for some products or applicants; and
- incentivising or disincentivising the use of some channels through fees.

It is proposed that the Department of Internal Affairs would report to the Minister of Internal Affairs by 1 December 2014 on the conclusions of the review.
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Government Response to Report of the Health Committee on Inquiry into improving child health outcomes and preventing child abuse with a focus from preconception until three years of age

Introduction

The Government welcomes the Health Committee’s (the Committee’s) report titled Inquiry into improving child health outcomes and preventing child abuse with a focus from preconception until three years of age (the Report). The Report is the result of almost two years of work and represents an important contribution to the discussion on these significant issues.

The Government has carefully considered the Report and makes this response in accordance with Standing Order 248.

The Committee has made 130 recommendations to the Government on how to improve outcomes for children and prevent child abuse. Improving outcomes for children and preventing child abuse are priorities for this Government. Substantial progress has been made since the Committee initiated its inquiry in February 2012, as is evident from the results for children under the Better Public Services programme, the White Paper for Vulnerable Children, the Children’s Action Plan and the wide range of initiatives in the health, education and social sectors for children and their parents that are outlined in this Government Response. The Government has a planned programme of activity under way that responds to the issues identified by the Committee, and agencies are working together to improve services and outcomes for children and their families.

Overall, the Government supports the Report and notes that it generally aligns with Government priorities. Budget 2014 may also see the announcement of new initiatives, which will address some of the Report’s recommendations.

The Government notes the three key areas of focus in the Report:

- early intervention and the social and economic determinants of health and wellbeing (Chapters 3 and 5 of the Report)
- coordinated action across the government sector (Chapters 9, 13 and 14 of the Report)
- improving specific services (Chapters 4, 6 to 8 and 10 to 12 of the Report).

Early intervention and the social and economic determinants of health and wellbeing

Investment in the early years has informed the policy development of social sector agencies for some time. The White Paper for Vulnerable Children outlines a number of ways in which the Government has been addressing wider social and economic determinants impacting on outcomes for children, including addressing issues such as inadequate housing and alcohol-related harm.

Note: throughout this document reference to the Report, its chapters and recommendations refer to those in Volume 1 of the Report.
There is work under way to improve our understanding of the effectiveness of very early intervention programmes and this is described in responses to the Committee’s recommendations. In the interim at least, the Government will continue making improvements to services and introducing new initiatives in priority areas. The Government is taking an Investment Approach to prioritising funding in the social sector whereby support is allocated to the areas where the greatest benefits can be achieved.

The Government considers that the recommendations of the Committee on the economics of early intervention with children should be progressed as an integrated body of work, with a clear focus on implementation in the New Zealand context. Overseas evidence is valuable, however, it is not necessarily transferable to the New Zealand context.

**Coordinated action across the government sector**

The Government supports the Committee’s view that coordinated action across the government sector is essential to improving outcomes for children and their family and whānau. Government work that reflects this includes:

- the Better Public Services programme, which sees government agencies work together and with communities to find innovative ways to deliver better public services. The focus is on 10 result areas, which have been grouped into themes, one of which is vulnerable children
- the introduction of the Vulnerable Children Bill, which is before Parliament, will see the Prime Minister designate a Minister responsible for setting Government priorities for improving the wellbeing of vulnerable children. Chief Executives of prescribed agencies will be responsible for working together to develop, review and report on a vulnerable children’s plan, which would set out the steps they will take to work together to achieve those priorities
- the White Paper for Vulnerable Children and the Children’s Action Plan, which demonstrate the Government’s commitment to providing strong leadership to support positive outcomes for children
- the Social Sector Forum, which supports a coordinated approach to the development and delivery of services across social sector agencies.

There is scope to integrate the work arising from the Committee’s recommendations and to implement it within the framework provided by the Children’s Action Plan and the Vulnerable Children Bill.

**Improving specific services**

Most of the Committee’s recommendations about improving specific services are being addressed through government agencies’ work programmes. There is a clear focus on ensuring that services for the very young, their parents, family and whānau are accessible, affordable and of high quality.

The Government has a substantial amount of work under way to ensure that systems are linked, so that contact with the health services, for example, triggers other appropriate connections. Better information systems and better-connected services should support easier transitions and result in children and their parents getting access to the supports and services they need.
As is evidenced in the responses to specific recommendations in the following section, the Government is making a substantial additional investment in services for the very young and for their parents, families and whānau, through health, education and social services.

**Key recommendations**

Responses to the Committee's recommendations are presented in the following sections. Responses to the Committee's key recommendations (presented in Chapter 1 of the Report) are included in the relevant chapters.
Recommendations and Government Response

Chapter 1: Introduction

We strongly recommend that the Ministry of Health work with all relevant parties and other key ministries to establish a programme with timelines for implementing our recommendations, especially our key recommendations. We understand that the recommendations involving more investment in the very early lives of children may take time, but we wish to see the Government commit itself to optimal and equitable investment in this area in the medium to long term.

Response: Accept

There is already a considerable amount of cross-agency work focusing on services and actions to improve outcomes for children. This includes the Better Public Services targets related to vulnerable children, the Children’s Action Plan, and a wide range of activity that is the core function of health, education and social services agencies.

The Government will coordinate any work arising from the Report through the framework provided by the Children’s Action Plan and the Vulnerable Children Bill. The Children’s Action Plan is overseen by a Ministerial Oversight Group and is led by the Vulnerable Children’s Board, which comprises chief executives from several government departments.

The governance structure under the Children’s Action Plan will be supported by legislation, when the Vulnerable Children Bill becomes law. This is expected to be sometime in 2014. The Vulnerable Children Bill aims to make government agencies jointly accountable to a responsible Minister for producing, reviewing and reporting on a vulnerable children’s plan. That plan must set out how agencies will work together towards collectively achieving the Government’s priorities for vulnerable children.

This framework will ensure that all of the related activity is coordinated for greatest impact and that it is overseen by chief executives who have a collective responsibility for key results and improved outcomes for children.

In addition, the creation of new a monitoring, evaluation and research function for the Families Commission will play a key role in achieving Government’s research and evaluation priorities in the social sector and contribute to addressing some of the Committee’s recommendations. The Commission’s new focus will promote the use of evidence to inform and improve initiatives, programmes and services for families and society.

---

2 The Ministerial Oversight Group is chaired by the Minister for Social Development and includes the Ministers of Finance, Justice, Health, Education, Police and Whānau Ora.
3 The Vulnerable Children’s Board is the governance body for implementation of the Children’s Action Plan. It comprises the chief executives of the Ministry of Social Development (Chair), Ministry of Health, Ministry of Education, Ministry of Justice, New Zealand Police and Ministry of Business, Innovation, and Employment (Deputy Chief Executive Housing) and Te Puni Kōkiri.
Chapter 3: The economics of early intervention with children

Recommendation 1

We recommend to the Government that it establish a New Zealand and international evidence base for the economic value and cost-effectiveness of very early intervention programmes (pre-conception to three years). The initial economic analysis should be completed within 12 months of this report being published, and once strong evidence is established, the Government should move quickly to reprioritise investment towards achieving:

- best-practice reproductive health services and education
- optimal prenatal, natal, postnatal, and whole-of-life nutrition action plans
- best-practice maternity and postnatal care and monitoring
- best-practice health, early childhood education, and social service intervention
- programmes for the first three years of life (with particular focus on the vulnerable, disadvantaged, and Māori and Pasifika children).

This should be completed within 12 months of this report being published.

Response: Accept in part
The Government considers that the Committee recommendations should be seen as part of an integrated body of work already underway. A clear focus on implementation in the New Zealand context is important.

The Government makes investment decisions about social services on the basis of evidence, where it is available, as well as economic value and cost-effectiveness. The Government’s Investment Approach to welfare, for example, uses a variety of instruments to assess the cost/benefit of intervening early to achieve longer-term outcomes and invests in support where it will make the biggest difference.

Work already under way to build an evidence-base includes the evaluation of the Children’s Action Plan and the Prime Minister’s Youth Mental Health Project. Additionally, the Central Analytics Insight Function is being developed to link up data sets that are already held by government agencies, in order to get a better picture of what is working and make better use of data to improve outcomes.

Over time, specific economic evaluation of recommended areas will be undertaken.

Please see the response to the Chapter 1 Recommendation for more information on the Government’s research and evaluation efforts.

Recommendation 2

We recommend to the Government that it compile a New Zealand evidence base for the economic and equity justification of investment of public funds at various ages during the life span. This should be completed within 12 months of this report being published.
Response: Accept in part
The Government supports the development of strong evidence bases.

Government-funded services use a variety of tools to support decision-making about access to services, with a view to meeting the needs of all New Zealanders. Routine prioritisation processes often take into account economic and equity criteria (amongst others), across a range of characteristics including age, gender and other markers of need or effectiveness. Capacity to benefit, where benefit is defined as life-years saved is a criterion used in priority-setting for health services.

Cost-utility analysis is another tool used to inform decisions, for example Pharmaceutical Management Agency (PHARMAC) uses it to inform decisions on which medicines to fund. The results of cost-utility analysis demonstrate how many quality-adjusted life years are gained for every dollar spent.

Recommendation 3

We recommend to the Government that it explore the cost-effectiveness of methods for funding programmes to achieve better outcomes for children; this might include measures such as social bonds.

Response: Accept
The Government is considering outcome-based contracting and testing new financing instruments. In particular, it is interested in the potential for social bonds to drive better social outcomes and value for money.

In 2013, the Ministry of Health began exploring the potential for social bonds in New Zealand and Cabinet agreed in September 2013 that work begin to develop a social bonds pilot. The pilot will test whether and how social bonds work in the New Zealand market. It could also offer lessons on the use of social bonds and other outcome-based contracting. A registration of interest was released in December 2013 to identify suitable outcome areas and capable service providers for the pilot.

Recommendation 4

We recommend to the Government that it conduct a review of the international literature pertaining to very early intervention, as a basis for on-going economic research in New Zealand. The review should include Early intervention: the next steps by Graham Allen, and be carried out within 12 months of this report being published.

Response: Accept in part
The Government recognises the utility of reviewing the literature on very early intervention. The focus, however, should be on whether early intervention programmes can deliver realisable gains in the New Zealand context. This will be considered as part of ongoing work to support vulnerable children.
Recommendation 5

We recommend to the Government that it continue to progress policies to address disadvantage and promote opportunity for all children. This should include poverty, discrimination, healthy housing, optimal nutrition, access to health and education services, and safe home environments. The Government should publish an action plan setting out how it will address each area on a yearly basis, and employ a transparent monitoring system, with published results to demonstrate progress.

Response: Accept in part

The Government is committed to addressing disadvantage and promoting opportunity for all children. Universal services play an important role in meeting this commitment.

The whole-of-government frameworks set out in the Better Public Services programme and in the Vulnerable Children Bill could be used to address the social and economic influences on children’s wellbeing.

The following three core components of the Government’s approach will take forward the aspects of the Committee's recommendations that call for a whole-of-government approach and addressing disadvantage:

- the Social Sector Forum (a cross-agency vehicle that focuses on improving outcomes for individuals, family, whānau and communities with multiple and complex problems) and the Vulnerable Children’s Board, provide a governance structure for taking a whole-of-government approach to addressing the health and wellbeing of vulnerable children
- by implementing the Children’s Action Plan and introducing Children’s Teams, the Vulnerable Children’s Board is developing an integrated approach to service delivery for children at risk of abuse
- the Vulnerable Children Bill will require certain chief executives to work together to:
  - develop a vulnerable children’s plan that will set out the steps that will be taken by those chief executives to work together to achieve the Government’s priorities for improving the wellbeing of vulnerable children
  - report annually on progress against the plan
  - review the plan within three years and recommend amendments or a new plan to the responsible Minister.
Chapter 4: Pre-conception care and sexual and reproductive health

Recommendation 6

We recommend to the Government that it develop a co-ordinated cross-sectoral action plan with the objective of giving New Zealand world-leading, evidence-based sexuality and reproductive health education, contraception, sterilisation, termination and sexual health services, distributed to cover the whole country. The plan should be developed within 12 months of this report being published and be matched with appropriate, sustainable resourcing. The plan should also be monitored by tracking trends in teenage pregnancy, sexually transmitted diseases, unplanned pregnancy, and terminations.

Response: Accept in part

The Government is committed to improving the sexual and reproductive health of New Zealanders. Sexual and reproductive health is a core part of the education curriculum. The effectiveness of this in individual schools is regularly reviewed through the Education Review Office (ERO) process.

The Ministry of Education will review the sexuality education guidelines in 2014 to better support boards of trustees and principals to deliver sexuality education programmes in line with the New Zealand Curriculum. Government agencies including the Ministries of Health, Education and Social Development will continue to work together to deliver the best sexuality and reproductive health outcomes for young people.

The Government provides funding of around $56 million each year to nationwide health promotion and primary care services. Additional funding has also been provided. Budget 2011, for example, included $7.3 million over four years to enable better support for high priority groups such as young Māori and Pasifika people.

Latest New Zealand figures show that abortion rates recently hit a 17 year low. There has also been a decrease in the annual known new cases of HIV notifications from 227 in 2008 to 170 in 2012, and a drop in AIDS notifications from 48 to 20 over the same period. This suggests that Government-funded programmes such as the public health promotion programme ‘Get It On’, which is delivered by the New Zealand AIDS Foundation, are proving successful in target areas such as men who have sex with men.

The Government acknowledges, however, that there is still room for improvement. New Zealand still has high rates of sexually transmitted infections, including having one of the highest rates of chlamydia in the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (also known as the OECD). New Zealand’s teenage pregnancy rate is also high compared with other developed countries. The Ministry of Health will work with district health boards (DHBs) and service providers to improve regional planning and service coordination, and to improve data gathering and monitoring.
Recommendation 7

We recommend to the Government that the Ministry of Health ensure that the patient co-payments being charged by Primary Health Organisations and the Community Services Card eligibility criteria for lower general practitioner fees present minimal or no obstacles for women seeking contraception advice and services. This should be achieved within two years of this report being published.

Response: Noted
Government makes a substantial investment in primary care to ensure services are accessible for all New Zealanders. General practice fees and fee increases are set annually and monitored through the Fees Framework in the primary health organisation services agreement. This takes into account that general practices are private businesses and set their own fees (ie, co-payments) in discussion with their Primary Health Organisation.

The Government also provides a range of additional subsidies to facilitate access to primary health care services, including Very Low Cost Access funding, capitation funding for enrolled patients and a fee-for-service subsidy (the General Medical Services subsidy) for non-enrolled patients. Patients on low incomes may qualify for a Community Services Card and, if they have high health needs, may be eligible for a High Use Health Card or Care Plus services.

Access to a comprehensive range of subsidised medications, including contraception, is provided through the pharmaceutical schedule. Women with prescriptions for contraceptives may qualify for the Pharmaceutical Subsidy Card if they or their families have collected twenty or more prescriptions in one year. The Card means that families will pay a maximum of $100 on prescription charges in any one year.

Recommendation 8

We recommend to the Government that it ensure that people have ready access to primary care reproductive and sexual health services, and that inexpensive or taxpayer-funded services be made available to those who cannot afford to pay. This should be achieved within three years of this report being published.

Response: Noted
Please see the response to Recommendation 7. In addition, there are services such as those delivered by Family Planning and Youth One Stop Shops, which provide some free or low cost reproductive and sexual health services for those for whom cost may otherwise be a barrier to access.

Recommendation 9

We recommend to the Government that it amend the National Education Guidelines to require all schools to deliver sexuality and reproductive health programmes that meet the criteria for success set out in the 2008 Ministry of Health review. This should be achieved within two years of this report being published.
Response: Accept in part
The New Zealand Curriculum already requires schools to provide sexuality and reproductive health programmes as stated in the Education Act 1989. Consideration will be given to meet the criteria for success set out in the in the Ministry of Health review in conjunction with the education sector.

Recommendation 10

We recommend to the Government that it require the Education Review Office to actively monitor and report on all schools’ application of the best-practice criteria for sexuality and reproductive health education programmes, reporting specifically on their efficacy for students of different cultures, ethnicities, genders, and sexual orientations. This should be achieved within three years of this report being published.

Response: Accept in part
ERO monitors and reports on schools’ Health Curriculum. The Health Curriculum includes the teaching of sexuality education under headings such as relationships, safety management, personal identity, positive attitudes, interpersonal skills, societal attitudes and values, and identity sensitivity and respect. In every school review, ERO requires the board chairperson and principal to complete a Board Assurance Statement Self Audit Checklist. This includes attesting to the school’s compliance with the requirement to develop and implement teaching programmes to provide all year 1 to 10 students with opportunities to achieve for success in health and physical education.

ERO is undertaking a Wellbeing Review in 2014, which will investigate how the Health Curriculum contributes to the wellbeing of students.

Recommendation 11

We recommend to the Government that the Ministry of Health coordinate the development of a whole-of-Government action plan to minimise teenage parenthood and to provide maximum support for teenage parents and their children. This should require district health boards to provide access to a teen parent unit where practicable. This plan should be completed within one year of this report being published.

Response: Accept in part
The Government provides a range of services and supports to minimise teenage parenthood and provide support for teenage parents and their children, including:

- the Youth Service, introduced in August 2012 at an investment of more than $148 million, which provides comprehensive wraparound support to help young people on benefit, and those at risk of going on benefit, to develop skills to enable independence and improve their educational outcomes
- the Young Parent Payment for teen parents requiring financial assistance. Those receiving the Young Parent Payment are required to engage with a Youth Service
provider who supports them to complete a range of obligations that are focused on improving their education engagement and achievement, and budgeting and parenting skills

- intensive case workers, supported housing for vulnerable teen parents, and parenting support for teen fathers – initiatives that were introduced in 2010 at a cost of $14.9 million
- teen parent units attached to state secondary schools provide health services and education for teenage students who are pregnant or already parents. There are currently 22 teen parent units in full operation across New Zealand. ERO reviews these units every three years and publishes a national report about the overall quality of education for teen parents. These units are the responsibility of the Ministry of Education, not DHBs.

Recommendation 12

We recommend to the Government that the Ministry of Health, through DHBs, be required to ensure that a choice of youth health services (including sexual and reproductive health) is available in urban centres wherever practicable. Services might include specific one-stop-shop youth health services, family planning, school-based services, and integrated general practice. A key performance indicator should be set requiring DHBs to make a choice of acceptable services available in their areas. This should be achieved within three years of this report being published.

Response: Accept in part
The Ministry of Health is using existing accountability mechanisms to encourage DHBs to provide a greater choice of youth health services.

Please also see the more extensive response to Recommendations 6 and 8.

Recommendation 13

We recommend to the Government that it ensure individual school-based and primary-care-based identification of and interventions for at-risk youth are available, along with treatment for sexual abuse, drug and alcohol use, and family distress. This requirement should be reflected in a DHB’s KPIs. School-based facilities should have the competency and capability to provide up-to-date advice on contraception and reproductive health; they should encourage students but not require them to share this information with their general practitioner and their parents. This should be achieved within three years of this report being published.

Response: Accept in part
Public health nurses provide health services, including sexual health services, to all schools. School-based health services are available to all year 9 students in 135 decile 1 and 2 secondary schools. School-based health services are being offered to all 47 decile 3 secondary schools as part of the Prime Minister’s Youth Mental Health Project. The vast majority of these schools are expected to be implementing the services by the end of 2014.
School-based health services include promotional health campaigns and a Wellness Check in year 9 for every student. The Wellness Check includes an assessment of the student’s physical and mental wellbeing. This covers areas such as home life, eating, activities, drugs, sexuality, suicide and depression. When issues are identified, a referral may be made to the appropriate specialist primary or secondary service.

The focus for health services in schools is on identifying where needs exist and referring appropriately. DHBs provide a range of primary care-based services that at-risk young people can access.

**Recommendation 14**

We recommend to the Government that it provide funding for free or low-cost access to a wider range of long-acting reversible contraceptives, including the Mirena device or its equivalent, for all women of childbearing age, and ensure that health workforce planning provides for delivery. Criteria for access should be related to ability to pay. This should be achieved within two years of this report being published.

**Response: Accept in part**

PHARMAC endeavours to always make available a range of contraceptive options for women through the Pharmaceutical Schedule. It currently funds two forms of long-acting reversible contraception through the Combined Pharmaceutical Budget. These include a copper intrauterine device and a sub-dermal implant. This means all eligible women of childbearing age have funded access to long-acting reversible contraceptives.

While doctors can access supplies of the copper intrauterine device for their practice at no cost, the sub-dermal implant is available on prescription and would incur a $5 co-payment at the time of dispensing. Service costs associated with the insertion of these products are met through other parts of the health system. The broader social system also provides funding support for women to access such services, including a Special Needs Grant to help with the additional costs of accessing subsidised long-acting reversible contraception.

**Recommendation 15**

We recommend to the Government that it ensure all DHBs provide ready access to male and female sterilisation, and that waiting times are kept under three months at all times. This should be achieved within two years of this report being published.

**Response: Accept in part**

Sterilisation services are included in the national minimum range of services DHBs are required to fund for their populations as part of their Crown Funding Agreement with the Minister of Health. Specific monitoring of waiting times will be considered.

**Recommendation 16**

We recommend to the Government that it allow more specially trained primary care nurses the ability to prescribe contraception and fit intrauterine devices, and that the
Nursing Council should appoint such nurses and provide training. This should be achieved within two years of this report being published.

**Response: Accept in part**
The Nursing Council is working with the Ministry of Health on proposals to extend registered nurse prescribing, including the prescribing of contraception. Substantial progress in this area is expected within the next two years. The Nursing Council is a registration body, it does not appoint or train nurses.

Nurse practitioners practising in primary care, youth health, sexual health and family planning can already prescribe medication, including contraception and can insert intrauterine devices. Registered nurses who have received training (eg, nurses working for Family Planning) can insert intrauterine devices and long-acting reversible contraceptives. Registered nurses practising in sexual and reproductive health may also apply to the Nursing Council for authorisation to supply the emergency contraceptive pill.

**Recommendation 17**

We recommend to the Government that it ensure that all women are given the opportunity postnatally to access contraception or sterilisation before they go home or at the six-week check. This should be achieved within two years of this report being published.

**Response: Accept**
Lead Maternity Carers are responsible for discussing contraception with women before or at the time of discharge from maternity services and they may prescribe contraceptives. Women can also consult their general practitioner following discharge from maternity services if they wish to access contraception.
Chapter 5: Social and economic determinants of health and wellbeing

Recommendation 18

We recommend to the Government that it continue to actively consider the recommendations in *Solutions to Child Poverty in New Zealand: evidence for action*, and at least establish an overall action plan for reducing child poverty or a Better Public Service target for child poverty. The overall action plan or Better Public Service target should be established within two years of this report being published.

*Response: Accept in part*

The Government recognises the need to address child poverty and continues to actively consider the recommendations of the Expert Advisory Group on Solutions to Child Poverty. The Government has also undertaken a wide range of actions that seek to address the causes and consequences of poverty. Examples of the Government’s recent investments in preventing and alleviating child poverty were set out in its response to the final report of the Expert Advisory Group.

The Government has also established a Ministerial Committee on Poverty to focus on:

- the effectiveness of current approaches and responses, against a backdrop of Better Public Services and getting value for money for taxpayers
- raising educational achievement, providing employment opportunities and providing safe, secure homes for families and whānau.

The purpose of the Better Public Services targets (discussed in Chapter 1 of the Government Response to the Expert Advisory Group’s report) is to encourage agencies to take actions that will improve public services – that is, to focus on getting results that will contribute to higher-level outcomes (such as reducing poverty).

Recommendation 19

We recommend to the Government that it construct a set of policy objectives focused on children, similar to those of the Marmot Review: to give every child the best possible start in life; to enable all children, young people, and adults to maximise their abilities and have control over their lives; to create a healthy standard of living for all; to create and develop healthy and sustainable homes and communities; and to strengthen the role and impact of ill-health prevention.

*Response: Accept in part*

The Government has set clear policy objectives and targets to improve children’s health and wellbeing through the Better Public Services programme and the Children’s Action Plan, particularly for vulnerable children. For example, the Supporting Vulnerable Children Result Action Plan, announced in August 2012 under the Better Public Services programme, comprises specific actions and targets to secure better outcomes for vulnerable children.

---

Recommendation 20

We recommend to the Government that it champion children’s health and wellbeing, developing an effective whole-of-government approach to children, establishing an integrated approach to service delivery for children, and monitoring children’s health and wellbeing using agreed indicators. A specific action plan to improve children’s health outcomes from pre-conception till three years of age should be established within 18 months of this report being published.

Response: Accept in part
An integrated, whole-of-government approach is being taken to services for vulnerable children and their families through the implementation of the Children’s Action Plan and through the Vulnerable Children Bill. The Children’s Action Plan has oversight from a joint ministerial group, and chief executives of the government agencies responsible for implementing the Children’s Action Plan.

In addition, there is a wide range of activity that focuses on integrating health services, social services and schools, and on delivering seamless services for young children and their families. The Ministry of Health, for example, is already implementing an integrated approach to monitoring and delivering services for pregnant women and young children (from preconception to five years of age) through the Maternity Quality and Safety Programme and the Well Child/Tamariki Ora Quality Improvement Framework. Another example is the Whānau Ora programme, a whole of whānau approach, which recognises whānau as the core unit of Māori culture and society and as the change agent through which inter-generational gains can be achieved.

Education policy focuses on improving education outcomes for Māori learners, Pasifika learners, those from low socioeconomic backgrounds and those with special education needs. This includes supporting young children with disabilities and their families and whānau. A recent evaluation showed that Incredible Years Parent, a programme delivered as part of Positive Behaviour for Learning, has effectively enhanced parenting skills and reduced disruptive behaviours in children.

The Ministry of Health has begun publishing a report on child health and wellbeing, based on Health Survey data. The report also includes data on access to child health services.

Recommendation 21

We recommend to the Government that it progress its work on rebuilding, strengthening, and growing the economy, supporting people into employment, and improving the delivery of public services that are responsive to the needs of New Zealanders, specifically where positive outcomes are demonstrated by evidence.

Response: Accept
The matters raised in the Recommendation continue to be a key priority for the Government, as reflected in budget policy statements.
Recommendation 22

We recommend to the Government that it continue to develop and apply its policies, services, and programmes with a view to effective delivery for Māori children and their whānau, wherever possible considering Māori-for-Māori services and partnerships between Māori and mainstream providers for implementing access.

Response: Accept

This Recommendation is consistent with the Government’s commitment to Whānau Ora and current approaches to improving outcomes for and with Māori. The Government also acknowledges that successfully improving effectiveness for Māori requires agencies to have a consistent and long-term commitment to improving outcomes for Māori.

Recommendation 23

We recommend to the Government that it ensure that all policies are reviewed regularly and monitored to provide an evidence base for their efficacy.

Response: Accept in part

As stated in the response to the unnumbered Recommendation in Chapter 1, the creation of a new monitoring, evaluation and research function for the Families Commission will play a key role in achieving Government’s research and evaluation priorities in the social sector. The Commission’s new focus will promote the use of evidence to inform and improve initiatives, programmes and services for families and society.

Under its new mandate, the Commission’s new functions include commissioning and managing social sector research contracts on behalf of government, as well as identifying research to help determine policy priorities. The Families Commission will work with the Social Sector Forum to ensure that current and long term policy and research priorities are aligned.

Recommendation 24

We recommend to the Government that it continue its programme of upgrading public housing, ensuring it has adequate insulation and heat sources that meet the standards recommended by the World Health Organisation.

Response: Accept

This recommendation supports Housing New Zealand Corporation’s existing Energy Efficiency Retrofit programme, as well as the Government’s new Warrant of Fitness trial on Housing New Zealand Corporation properties.

Housing New Zealand Corporation has achieved its Statement of Intent target of insulating 99 percent of its properties, where practicable, by the end of the 2012/13 financial year under its Energy Efficiency Retrofit Programme. Through this nationwide programme more than 47,000 state houses have been insulated.
The programme includes all properties owned by Housing New Zealand Corporation that were built before 2000 and includes installing ceiling and under-floor insulation in accordance with the building code, hot water cylinder wraps, pipe laggings, and stays for windows to ensure homes can be properly ventilated. For properties that cannot, for practical reasons, have ceiling and underfloor insulation installed, heating options are provided.

**Recommendation 25**

We recommend to the Government that it develop a legislative framework for private-sector landlords, to implement minimum quality standards, and introduce a “Warrant of Fitness” for all rental housing, with injury prevention among its objectives. This should be established within two years of this report being published.

**Response: Noted**

The Government is currently trialling a Warrant of Fitness system on Housing New Zealand Corporation housing properties. No decisions have been made about the application of the standards beyond Housing New Zealand Corporation housing properties. Next steps will be considered after officials report to Ministers on the trial in July 2014.

The design of any legislative framework to implement a Warrant of Fitness for the private rental market would need to consider the full range of costs and benefits, and potential unintended consequences such as increased rent for low income tenants.

**Recommendation 26**

We recommend to the Government that it ensure, through the building code and related legislation, that any new housing stock meets minimum quality standards regarding insulation and injury prevention.

**Response: Accept**

The Building Code is already designed to ensure that any new housing stock meets minimum quality standards for insulation and safety. All new housing stock must comply with the standards set in the Code. This is enforced by Building Consent Authorities (usually local councils).

**Recommendation 27**

We recommend to the Government that it progress its programme to prevent diseases often associated with poverty, such as rheumatic fever, and develop coordinated national public health preventive programmes to reduce the incidence of diseases such as cellulitis and skin and lung infections in children.

**Response: Accept**

The prevention of such diseases is a priority for the Government. The Supporting Vulnerable Children Result Action Plan includes specific actions and targets around increasing immunisation rates and reducing the incidence of rheumatic fever.
Increased immunisation is a priority for the Government. Immunisation is one of the most effective interventions to prevent against infectious diseases. In July 2012 a new immunisation health target to improve the timeliness of immunisations for young infants was introduced. The target aims to have 95 percent of all eight-month-olds fully immunised by December 2014.

Good progress is being made. As at December 2013, 91 per cent of eight-month-olds were fully immunised. Over the past five years New Zealand has gone from having one of the lowest immunisation rates in the developed world to one of the highest. There has also been an unprecedented increase in the Māori immunisation rates over the past four years. Immunisation rates for Māori children are now equal to or better than the New Zealand European rate in more than half of the country’s DHBs. The Ministry of Health is continuing to work with DHBs and primary health organisations to make further improvements.

The Government is also focused on reducing rheumatic fever, an illness that disproportionately affects Māori and Pacific children in New Zealand. As part of the Better Public Services focus, the Government has a target to reduce the incidence of rheumatic fever by two thirds to 1.4 cases per 100,000 people by June 2017. The Government has invested $45 million in a range of initiatives aimed at addressing the high incidence of rheumatic fever including:

- a school-based throat swabbing programme, which will cover over 50,000 at-risk children in more than 200 schools by February 2014
- the Pacific Engagement Strategy – community workers from Pacific service providers engage with communities and families to help them understand the risks related to rheumatic fever and how to prevent it
- Rapid Response Clinics – free nurse-led drop-in clinics in accessible locations in Auckland and Porirua that treat sore throats in high risk populations of young people to prevent rheumatic fever
- the Auckland-wide Healthy Homes Initiative, which provides a housing hub for referring families with children with, or at risk of, rheumatic fever. A community worker helps families plan and access a range of services to improve their housing quality and living conditions to reduce their risk of getting rheumatic fever and other infectious diseases.

The Government has also changed the criteria for state housing so that families with children at risk of rheumatic fever are fast-tracked to the top of the waiting list to reduce their risk of contracting the disease. This change started in Auckland on 1 October 2013 and, subject to a successful evaluation, will be rolled out to other centres in 2014.

**Recommendation 28**

We recommend to the Government that it consider the possibility of providing more support for vulnerable women in the postnatal period to allow more opportunity for mothers to bond with their babies.
Response: Accept in part
The Government’s extended length of stay policy aims to ‘ensure that mothers have the choice to stay in birthing facilities longer so they can establish breastfeeding and the confidence to return home.’

Postnatal support is universally available. It is funded by the Ministry of Health and delivered by Lead Maternity Carers under the Primary Maternity Services Notice 2007 pursuant to section 88 of the New Zealand Public Health and Disability Act 2000 (hereafter referred to as the Primary Maternity Services Notice). Lead Maternity Carers must make between five and 10 postnatal home visits and can make more if clinically indicated. In 2012, 89 percent of all women giving birth were registered with a Lead Maternity Carer and received this support.

DHB-funded primary maternity services provide postnatal care for women who do not have a Lead Maternity Carer. The service specification covering this service has the same service coverage expectations as the Primary Maternity Services Notice. The proportion of women receiving care from Lead Maternity Carers has risen over the past five years. DHB-employed maternity staff also provide postnatal care while a woman is an inpatient in a DHB facility.

Local DHB initiatives for vulnerable pregnant women assist them to get greater social support during pregnancy and after birth.

Recommendation 29

We recommend to the Government that it continue to progress policies to address disadvantage and promote opportunity for all children. They should cover poverty, discrimination, healthy housing, optimal nutrition, access to health and education services, and safe home environments. The Government should publish an action plan setting out how it will address each area on a yearly basis, and employ a transparent monitoring system, with published results to demonstrate progress.

Response: Accept in part
Please see the response to Recommendation 5.
Chapter 6: Improving nutrition and reducing obesity and related non-communicable diseases

Recommendation 30

We recommend to the Government that it develop a comprehensive, coordinated action plan, based on the best evidence available, and involving government departments, non-governmental organisations, and the private sector (food and lifestyle industries), with a whole-of-life approach to improving nutrition and reducing obesity and non-communicable diseases, and a special emphasis on working with Māori and Pasifika communities. The plan should be in place within 12 to 18 months of this report being published and modifications made when new evidence becomes available.

The plan will need:

- A health promotion approach directed through communities.
- A primary disease prevention approach (optimal nutrition, education and later exercise) starting before birth and carrying on through a child’s early life.
- A secondary prevention approach dealing with those who have developed or are developing obesity-related non-communicable diseases, through education, optimal exercise, nutrition, smoking cessation, and best-practice treatment services.
- Monitoring and evaluation, and final policy based on scientific international evidence are an essential part.
- At the high level the plan should be about improving systems within which specific programmes, policies, or activities can be embedded, such as schools or antenatal services where systems need to be oriented to improve nutrition, and exercise etc.
- An equity focus and relevance to Māori and Pasifika.

This plan should include a requirement for cross-sectoral collaboration between relevant government agencies, such as the Ministries of Health, Education, Social Development, Consumer Affairs, Treasury, and Business, Innovation and Employment, and key performance indicators requiring chief executives to ensure their departments contribute to reducing obesity.

Response: Accept in part

The Government agrees that a whole-of-life approach to improving nutrition and reducing obesity and non-communicable diseases is useful. It recognises that obesity is a complex issue requiring a multifaceted, whole-of-life approach.

A new community-level health promotion and disease prevention initiative, Healthy Families NZ was announced in January 2014 and is set to be launched later in 2014. The focus of this initiative is on the prevention of non-communicable diseases (such as diabetes and heart disease) and the reduction of risk factors, such as obesity. This work draws on a growing body of evidence suggesting that concentrated, community-led programmes,
Tailored to the specific needs of that community, can be successful in reducing non-communicable disease and improving lifestyles.
Other work that is under way in the area to improve nutrition and reduce obesity and non-communicable disease includes:

- A requirement that primary maternity services following birth provide assistance and advice about breastfeeding and the nutritional needs of the woman and the baby. This contributes to a primary prevention approach.
- The primary prevention approach through Well Child/Tamariki Ora services, starting before birth and carrying on through a child’s early life, which focuses on optimal nutrition, education and physical activity.
- Investments in a ‘whole of family’ nutrition and parenting project to help families give their children a healthy start. To date, total funding of $4.7 million has been announced for South Auckland, Waikato, Taranaki, Hawkes Bay and Greater Wellington and will be used for various regional programmes that focus on promoting healthy eating and physical activity during pregnancy and the postnatal period and for infants and toddlers. The project is initially funded for two years and will be evaluated for potential further roll out.
- The Healthier Lives component of the National Science Challenge being led by the Ministry of Business, Innovation and Employment includes a focus on research to address obesity. The intent of the challenge is to implement a 10-year work plan to reduce the relevant challenge issue(s), in this case, obesity. This will likely include an assessment of the existing evidence for interventions.
- The guidance for healthy weight gain in pregnancy, being developed by the Ministry of Health and due in June 2014.
- Continued investment of around $60 million per year for a range of nutrition and physical activity initiatives, including KiwiSport (an initiative to promote sport for school-aged children) and Green Prescriptions (a health practitioner’s written advice to a patient to be physically active, supported by a provider that encourages the patient and provides them with relevant information).
- The B4 School Check, which aims to identify and address any health, behavioural, social or developmental concerns that could affect a child’s ability to get the most benefit from school. In 2013, the Government announced extra investment of $7 million into the B4 School Check programme to lift coverage.

**Recommendation 31**

We recommend to the Government that it continue to support existing interventions and programmes where evaluation shows them to be effective. Coverage of effective programmes should be increased and ineffective programmes discontinued, which will require a review of all existing programmes.

**Response: Accept**

The Government recognises the need for evaluation and effective programmes. The Families Commission, through the Social Policy and Evaluation Research Unit (SuPERU),

---

5 ‘Primary maternity services’ refers to all services provided under the Primary Maternity Services Notice.
6 Additional information about the National Science Challenges can be found in the response to Recommendation 130.
will play a key role in achieving Government’s research and evaluation priorities in the social sector. As noted in the response to the unnumbered recommendation in Chapter One, the Commission’s new focus will promote the use of evidence to inform and improve initiatives, programmes and services.

Two key projects for SuPERU are its involvement in the research and evaluation aspects of the Children’s Action Plan and the Prime Minister’s Youth Mental Health Project. The exact nature of SuPERU’s involvement in the evaluation of the Children’s Action Plan is being confirmed with the Vulnerable Children’s Board.

Other work that may provide evaluation of interventions and/or programmes is the Healthier Lives component of the National Science Challenge mentioned in the response to Recommendation 30.

**Recommendation 32**

We recommend to the Government that, given the urgency of problems associated with obesity-related non-communicable diseases, it should trial interventions that may not have been proven effective yet but have good prospects on the available evidence, provided that the trials are subject to proper evaluation and the interventions are only rolled out further if proven effective.

*Response: Noted*

Please see the response to Recommendation 30.

**Recommendation 33**

We recommend to the Government:

- that it support the development of a strong research evidence base for the most effective methods to sustain the continuation and increase the duration of breastfeeding in New Zealand.
- that a coordinated public health action plan be developed to improve rates and duration of breastfeeding.
- that best-practice alternatives be recommended for those who cannot or do not wish to breastfeed.

This should be achieved within 12 months of this report being published.

*Response: Accept in part*

The Government recognises the importance of breastfeeding and the need to promote, support and protect breastfeeding, and the use of breast milk substitutes, where they are necessary. It intends continuing its current work in this area, which includes:

- the *Food and Nutrition Guidelines for Healthy Infants and Toddlers (Aged 0–2): A background paper,* 7 which provides the evidence base for the importance of breastfeeding

---

guidelines for health practitioners and resources for the public that provide best practice advice on breastfeeding, breast milk substitutes (where they are necessary) and introducing complementary foods

- a social media campaign to promote and support breastfeeding
- the A Better Start component of the National Science Challenge, being led by the Ministry of Business, Innovation and Employment, which will likely include a focus on research that could inform initiatives that encourage breastfeeding. This may include an assessment of the existing evidence for interventions
- individual infant feeding support through both Lead Maternity Carers and Well Child/Tamariki Ora services.

Recommendation 34

We recommend to the Government that New Zealand remain clear on the message that “breast is best—provided you can” and that it continues to ensure manufacturing and marketing of infant formula is to the highest international standards.

Response: Noted

The Government will continue with its current policy, which includes promoting the ‘Breast is best if you can’ message.

The Government will continue to ensure manufacturing and marketing of infant formula is to the highest international standards, including through:

- implementing and enforcing the Australia New Zealand Food Standards Code in New Zealand. The Food Standards Code is the responsibility of the Ministry for Primary Industries and it requires infant formula products to be labelled with the statement: ‘Breast milk is best for babies. Before you decide to use this product, consult your doctor or health worker for advice.’ This requirement gives effect to part of New Zealand’s obligations under the WHO International Code of Marketing of Breast-milk Substitutes
- the self-regulatory system in New Zealand for the WHO International Code of Marketing of Breast-milk Substitutes to ensure optimal nutrition for infants, which includes protecting, promoting and supporting breastfeeding. The self-regulatory system includes Codes of Practice for industry and health workers and the Ministry of Health manages a complaints process, with a Code Compliance Panel and independent adjudicator
- the Ministry for Primary Industries’ regulatory oversight for the manufacture of infant formula in New Zealand.

Recommendation 35

We recommend to the Government that it revisit the issue of whether to add folic acid to bread on a mandatory basis, and take a scientific, evidence-based approach to implementing the option that would be most likely to reduce the incidence of neural

---

More information about the National Science Challenges can be found in the response to Recommendation 130.
tube defects. This should be achieved within 18 months of this report being published.

Response: Not accepted

The issue of whether to add folic acid to bread was most recently considered by Government in 2012. It was decided at that time to make the addition of folic acid to bread voluntary. The Ministry for Primary Industries has undertaken to work with the New Zealand Association of Bakers to implement the voluntary addition of folic acid to bread in line with a mutually agreed Code of Practice. The Code of Practice has committed to a minimum of 25 percent by volume of packaged breads to be fortified by the end of 2014 and an aspirational goal of working towards 50 percent by volume of packaged breads being fortified (no goal date specified). The industry has commissioned independent audits to verify the level of folic acid and the proportion of breads fortified and it reports these results to the Ministry for Primary Industries.

The Ministry for Primary Industries will continue to keep abreast of scientific developments relevant to folic acid and to monitor folic acid in the food supply as part of its current work programme.

Recommendation 36

We recommend to the Government that it ensure the framework for the manufacturing, distribution, marketing, and supply of infant formula is of the highest standard possible, and aligned with international and New Zealand codes of compliance. We consider that a well-monitored, self-regulated approach (with conditions) should continue at present, but if the voluntary system is not working effectively within the next 18 to 24 months regulation should be implemented.

Response: Accept in part

The Government will continue with the current system around infant formula, as noted in the response to Recommendation 34. The current self-regulatory system in New Zealand for implementing the WHO International Code of Marketing of Breast-milk Substitutes has recently been evaluated and some changes are being implemented to reflect the findings.

The Ministry for Primary Industries has regulatory oversight for the manufacture, processing, composition and labelling of infant formula in New Zealand. The Ministry’s role includes regulation of the claims that can be made on labels or in advertisements of infant formula products. In June 2013, the Minister for Food Safety announced an infant formula market assurance work programme, which includes identifying any areas for improvement in the regulatory framework for the manufacture and export of infant formula and developing measures to address these. The Ministry for Primary Industries is giving priority to engagement in the review of the joint Australia-New Zealand standard for infant formula composition and labelling. This work is being undertaken by Food Standards Australia New Zealand.
Recommendation 37

We recommend to the Government that it develop, evaluate, and implement nutrition and physical activity programmes for Māori, Pasifika, and low socio-demographic children and their families. Traditional Polynesian hospitality practices must be taken into account. This should be achieved within 18 months of this report being published.

Response: Accept

As well as the programmes mentioned in the response to Recommendation 30, the Government has a number of nutrition and physical activity programmes focusing on Māori and Pasifika, and children and families from low sociodemographic communities. These include:

- supporting nutrition promotion activities and physical activity at grass roots level, particularly in Māori settings such as Kohanga and in Pacific settings such as churches
- supporting a rangatahi physical activity programme that aims to increase the physical activity levels of Māori youth through traditional activities such as Ki o Rahi and Waka Ama
- delivering maternal and infant services that encourage families and whānau in low socio-economic communities to eat healthy food and increase their levels of physical activity
- the Fruit in Schools programme, which delivers a piece of fruit daily to over 96,000 students attending 473 decile 1 and 2 primary and intermediate schools and encourages the schools to develop policies and practices to support healthy eating
- the Kickstart Breakfast programme – the Government is contributing $9.5 million over five years, matched by Fonterra and Sanitarium, to provide a healthy breakfast to children five mornings a week in all decile 1 to 4 schools, with a view to gradually rolling the programme out to all schools wanting and needing the programme
- Green Prescriptions – in May 2013 over 250,000 Green Prescriptions had been issued since the introduction of the initiative in 1998. The Government committed $7.2 million in Budget 2013 to double the number of Green Prescriptions issued.

Recommendation 38

We recommend to the Government that it urgently build a national community-based action plan for preventing childhood obesity, based on the best evidence from New Zealand and overseas. This should be developed within 18 months of this report being published.

Response: Accept in part

Please see response to Recommendation 30 for information about the Government’s planned approach to improving nutrition and reducing obesity (including childhood obesity).
Recommendation 39

We recommend to the Government that it develop best-practice guidelines for the delivery of nutrition and physical activity programmes in schools. The guidelines should specifically cover school canteens, vending machines, fundraising events, classroom rewards, and any other aspect of the school environment where food and beverages are supplied. The Ministers of Health and Education should provide a guidance pamphlet for parents and school board trustees regarding options for nutritious school lunches. This should be achieved within 18 months of this report being published.

Response: Accept in part

The Government recognises the importance of nutrition and physical activity programmes in schools. A range of initiatives are already in place to address the delivery of nutrition and physical activity programmes in schools, including:

- a requirement that School Boards of Trustees (under National Administration Guideline 5(b)) ‘promote healthy food and nutrition for all students’
- Food and Nutrition for Healthy, Confident Kids – Guidelines to support healthy eating environments in NZ early childhood education services and schools9
- Food and Nutrition Guidelines for Healthy Children and Young People (aged 2 – 18 years): A background paper10, which documents an evidence-based nutrition policy for school-aged children and young people and is available to health and technology teachers and staff of Health Promoting Schools. There are also accompanying health education resources for children, young people, and their families and whānau
- Fuelled 4 Life – a collaborative initiative that involves the education, health and food industry sectors to work together to support schools to provide healthier food
- the Food for Thought and Heart Start programmes for schools, the Healthy Heart Awards for Early Childhood Education (ECE) programme and a curriculum-based teacher training programme, funded by the Ministry of Health and delivered by the Heart Foundation
- work by the Office of the Children’s Commissioner to develop guidelines for food in schools.

When ERO reviews schools, the board chairperson and principal are required to complete a Board Assurance Statement Self Audit Checklist. This includes attesting that the school is meeting the requirements of National Administration Guideline 5(b).

Recommendation 40

We recommend to the Government that it continue to support and monitor the Waikato DHB’s Project Energize, and that provided it can demonstrate a clear

---

evidence base of efficacy, it be expanded to younger age groups and piloted in other DHBs.

Response: Accept
The Government will continue to support Project Energize, where possible. Monitoring of the efficacy of Project Energize will be facilitated by the Ministry of Health repeating its earlier review of the New Zealand Health Survey data for Waikato DHB children using data from the 2012/13 Health Survey. An external evaluation, led by the Auckland University of Technology, will also be undertaken.

The Ministry of Health has invested $1.5 million in extending Project Energize to preschoolers in parts of the Waikato. The ‘Under 5 Energize’ project will support good nutrition and the development of fundamental movement skills for around 5,000 under five year olds.

Recommendation 41

We recommend to the Government that it ensure existing programmes like Health Promoting Schools and Project Energize are subject to mandatory evaluation and that national implementation is adjusted to reflect what is proven effective.

Response: Accept in part
The Government recognises the importance of evaluation. The Ministry of Health has funded an earlier evaluation of Project Energize and it will continue to monitor the effectiveness of the programme. See the response to Recommendation 40.

The Ministry of Health has also recently undertaken a review of the delivery of the Health Promoting Schools programme. This programme involves the whole school community working together to address the health and wellbeing of students, staff and their community. Schools include health and wellbeing in their planning and review processes, teaching strategies, curriculum and assessment activities.

The review of the delivery of the Health Promoting Schools programme assessed the staff capability and capacity needed to deliver it in the most effective and efficient way. With champions and good leadership some Health Promoting Schools initiatives, such as school gardens and involving children and parents in cooking nutritious meals, have been shown to be effective. Approximately 30 percent of schools participate in the Health Promoting Schools programme.

Recommendation 42

We recommend to the Government that it train school nurses to help implement best-practice guidelines on nutrition and physical activity, and to diagnose children who are overweight, or suffer from poor nutrition, and ensure they and their families receive appropriate follow-up care.
Response: Accept in part

Government recognises that school nurses have a key role to play in delivering interventions to improve nutrition and physical activity and reduce obesity.

Existing work includes:

- school nurses undertaking or assisting with health and social assessments where a global view of the child’s context and health issues is developed and interventions planned, including physical activity and nutrition advice
- planned changes to the food and nutrition guidelines series, which include making the information more accessible and useful to a range of health practitioners, including those without specialist training in nutrition and physical activity. Proposals include a core document based on key messages, an educator’s guide to using the new Eating and Activity Guidelines and an updated food model.

Recommendation 43

We recommend to the Government that it closely monitor options for using fiscal means to improve nutrition; if a policy is shown to be practical and effective in reducing obesity and improving nutrition, it should be implemented.

Response: Not accepted

The Government does not support fiscal means to improve nutrition, such as ‘fat taxes’ or ‘fizzy taxes’. The Ministry of Health monitors international practice and evidence. To date, few countries have implemented broad fiscal and regulatory policies specifically aimed at altering people’s food choices, although some have introduced targeted taxes (mainly on sugar sweetened beverages) and/or regulatory measures such as front-of-pack labelling and restrictions on advertising.

The use of taxes and regulatory instruments to address obesity – for example through regulating or taxing the amount of sugar in beverages – would also raise a number of logistical and implementation issues. There is some evidence that well-designed measures can improve health outcomes by influencing consumer behaviour. Such policies can, however, also raise significant implementation issues, impose costs on business, have regressive distributional effects for individuals, and may conflict with other policy objectives such as maintaining a broad-based, low-rate and relatively straightforward tax system. The Ministry of Health will continue to monitor how such policies work in practice, bearing in mind that policies aimed at reducing obesity take time to have noticeable effects.

Recommendation 44

We recommend to the Government that it carry out research on the possibility of regulating the amount of sugar in beverages, or imposing a tax on beverages that contain unhealthy amounts of sugar. The options should be made public within 18 months of this report being published.

Response: Not accepted

Please see the response to Recommendation 43.
Recommendation 45

We recommend to the Government that it investigate regulatory and fiscal measures to improve healthy eating and activity that are supported by a sound evidence base. A report outlining the options should be published within 18 months of this report being published.

Response: Not accepted
Please see the response to Recommendation 43.

Recommendation 46

We recommend to the Government, regarding the Australian star system of food labelling, that it move to

- monitor progress and development with the Australian system
- trial and evaluate the system in New Zealand on a voluntary basis within two years (provided the Australian system is proven to be effective)
- mandate the system on a voluntary basis if it shows strong evidence of success
- if there is not wide compliance, move to a compulsory system (provided there is sufficient evidence) within three years of this report being published. It is important for New Zealand to remain flexible at this stage due to new knowledge and an incomplete evidence base.

Response: Accept
The Government is considering joining the Health Star Rating System and should be able to advise its decision in the coming months. An Oversight Committee, on which New Zealand would have active membership if it joins the Health Star Rating System, will be established to monitor and evaluate the effectiveness of the Health Star Rating System.

The uptake of the Health Star Rating system would be voluntary in New Zealand (and would therefore not involve legislation).

If Australia moves to adopt a mandatory Health Star Rating system in the future, New Zealand would make a decision based on local experience. New Zealand has the option of opting out of the standards set by Food Standards Australia New Zealand on prescribed grounds.

Recommendation 47

We recommend to the Government that screening mechanisms including cardiovascular and diabetes checks are extended to ensure that people at high risk are identified and enrolled in prevention and management programmes.

Response: Accept
Government is extending checks for diabetes and heart disease. As announced in Budget 2013, $35.5 million is being committed to extending checks, including:
• $15.9 million to make further progress in the ‘more heart and diabetes checks’ national preventative health target
• $12.4 million to improve and accelerate the provision of local diabetes care programmes, for example, enhanced diabetes nursing or more podiatry services
• $7.2 million to double the number of general practitioner and nurse Green Prescriptions for healthier lifestyles, particularly for people with pre-diabetes.

Funding of $12.8 million was also committed to increase the number of patients with access to Care Plus, a general practice programme for patients with long-term conditions such as diabetes and asthma.

**Recommendation 48**

We recommend to the Government that a substantial evidence-based social marketing programme be developed, evaluated, and implemented to support parents, caregivers, and families in the promotion of healthy diets and physical activity. This should be implemented within 18 months of this report being published.

**Response: Accept in part**

The Health Promotion Agency is responsible for leading and supporting activities to promote health, wellbeing and healthy lifestyles. One of the Health Promotion Agency’s work areas is nutrition and physical activity, with a particular emphasis on improving maternal and infant nutrition.

The Health Promotion Agency delivers a targeted social marketing campaign ‘Breakfast eaters have it better’ that aims to increase the proportion of Māori and Pacific children who have breakfast every day. This programme provides information and resources to families, health practitioners, community organisations and health promoters working with families. The Health Promotion Agency is developing a range of tools to help health practitioners to target specific nutrition behaviours. It also funds 20 community organisations to deliver physical activity programmes that focus on getting families active.

**Recommendation 49**

We recommend to the Government that clear, measureable, timely targets be established in consultation with stakeholders for the labelling, manufacturing, and advertising of healthy food and drinks. This should be particularly directed at children and specifically the zero-to-five age group.

**Response: Accept in part**

The Government is considering some work in the area of labelling and manufacturing. For instance, it is considering the Healthy Star Rating System, as discussed in the response to Recommendation 46.

The Government notes that in 2011 the three major free-to-air broadcasters doubled the weekly hours of advertising-free zones and the hours when food advertising targeted at children is restricted.
Recommendation 50

We recommend to the Government that it seriously consider developing the necessary legislative framework and regulations to effectively protect children from all forms of marketing of unhealthy foods and beverages.

Response: Not accepted

The Government does not support this recommendation. See Recommendation 49. The very broad scope of the recommendation raises significant questions about the way ‘all forms of advertising’ would be defined and how compliance could be monitored, assessed and enforced through legislation. The Government considers that non-legislative measures and an educative approach are likely to be more effective. It notes the valuable contribution of non-legislative measures in other areas, such as those for smokefree areas being taken by local authorities, iwi and others and described in the response to Recommendation 63.
Chapter 7: Alcohol, tobacco and drug harm

Recommendation 51

We recommend to the Government that the Ministry of Health formulate evidence based guidelines for low-risk alcohol consumption, to be promoted widely, with particular emphasis on alcohol cessation during pregnancy and pre-conception. We recommend that they be formulated within 18 months of this report being published. This could be done by contracting experts in the disciplines of addiction and maternal healthcare.

Response: Accept

Providing guidance and advice for low-risk alcohol consumption and guidance around alcohol cessation during pregnancy and pre-conception is part of the Government’s work programme. Current and existing work includes:

- the Health Promotion Agency’s evidence-based low-risk alcohol drinking advice\(^ {11}\)
- promotion of alcohol cessation during preconception and pregnancy through the Ministry of Health’s website\(^ {12}\)
- *Alcohol and Pregnancy: A practical guide for health professionals*,\(^ {13}\) which provides guidance for health practitioners around alcohol and pregnancy.

The Health Promotion Agency is also planning a multi-faceted three year work programme from 2014/15 to address drinking in pregnancy. This will include wider promotion of the message to not drink alcohol while pregnant or when planning a pregnancy and the reasons for this.

Recommendation 52

We recommend to the Government that the Ministry of Health progressively increase screening for alcohol misuse, and follow-up intervention, ensuring that

- it is carried out in all emergency departments
- it is a key performance indicator for all initial antenatal assessments
- best-practice guidelines are issued for primary care/general practice with emphasis for women of child-bearing age
- primary care/general practice auditing requires alcohol screening and follow-up.

This should be achieved within two years of this report being published.

Response: Accept in part

The Government supports increased screening for alcohol misuse and increased follow-up intervention. Rather than on-site emergency department follow-up, the preferred approach is screening and follow-up through primary health care services and addiction treatment services.

\(^{11}\) This advice can be found at: www.alcohol.org.nz/alcohol-you/your-drinking-okay/low-risk-alcohol-drinking-advice. It is also published in many of the Health Promotion Agency’s alcohol publications.

\(^{12}\) The Ministry of Health’s website is www.health.govt.nz.

Current work in this area includes:

- investment of $1 million per year in screening for alcohol problems and brief interventions through the Addressing the Drivers of Crime initiative, a cross-agency approach to reducing offending and victimisation
- antenatal assessments by maternity service providers that include screening for alcohol and other drug use
- resources to support and train primary care and general practice in alcohol screening and brief interventions.

**Recommendation 53**

We recommend to the Government that it require DHBs to follow up all alcohol related emergency department presentations with an alcohol assessment by an alcoholism treatment professional. This should be achieved within three years of this report being published.

*Response: Accept in part*

The Government supports the intent of this recommendation but it considers that not all alcohol-related presentations need to be followed up by alcohol treatment professionals. Primary health care services are able to carry out follow-up assessments and refer to specialist services when required.

**Recommendation 54**

We recommend to the Government that it analyse the findings of the Alcohol Advertising Forum on alcohol marketing and sponsorship when they become available, and implement any recommendations with a strong base of evidence.

*Response: Accept in part*

The Ministries of Health and Justice are to convene the Ministerial Forum on Alcohol Advertising and Sponsorship, with assistance from the Health Promotion Agency. The Forum will consider the effectiveness of further restrictions on alcohol advertising and sponsorship to reduce alcohol-related harm. The Forum is expected to report on its findings by the end of 2014.

**Recommendation 55**

We recommend unequivocal health warnings that include, at minimum, “alcohol causes brain damage to the unborn child”. This should be achieved within two years of this report being published.

*Response: Noted*

The Government supports consideration of mandatory pregnancy warnings on alcohol labels. This is part of the Ministry for Primary Industries’ current work programme. The issue
comes under the scope of the Food Treaty\textsuperscript{14} and was considered by the Australia New Zealand Forum on Food Regulation at their December 2013 meeting.

The Forum on Food Regulation agreed in 2011 to voluntary, industry-led, warning labels to alert women that they should not drink while pregnant. This voluntary arrangement was for a two-year trial period, after which mandatory labelling may be considered.

An evaluation is to commence shortly on action taken by the alcohol industry in Australia to put pregnancy warnings on alcohol products. The evaluation will include an extensive consultation process and consideration of economic impacts. Interim and final reports will be provided to Forum on Food Regulation Ministers in March 2014 and June 2014, respectively.

New Zealand will also be undertaking a quantitative evaluation of the New Zealand industry’s voluntary labelling initiatives. This will be undertaken once the Australian evaluation framework has been circulated to the Forum on Food Regulation.

The Government will await the outcome of the trans-Tasman Food Regulation process that will consider the evaluations planned for 2014.

**Recommendation 56**

We recommend to the Government that it develop an action plan to combat the harm caused by foetal alcohol spectrum disorder in New Zealand. The plan could be similar to that produced by the Australian Commonwealth Government in 2013, and should include the WHO international prevalence study to establish reliable data for New Zealand. It should be a whole-of-government plan, and include the whole population but target those at risk, recognise that the disorder is preventable, provide access to services for those affected, and support prevention measures by the health and broader workforce. This should be achieved within 18 months of this report being published.

**Response: Accept**

The Ministry of Health has a range of initiatives that support reducing alcohol consumption during pregnancy and improving responses for people affected by exposure to alcohol during pregnancy.

The Government is concerned about the impact of fetal alcohol spectrum disorder on the development of young people. It is developing a fetal alcohol spectrum disorder plan of action and will look to complete this work within 18 months of the Report being published.

\textsuperscript{14} The 1995 Agreement Between the Government of Australia and the Government of New Zealand Concerning a joint Food Standards System – known as the ‘Food Treaty’. 
Recommendation 57

We recommend to the Government that it carry out a comprehensive analysis of alcohol sales and pricing data, particularly in relation to teenage binge drinking. If the evidence is clear that it would be effective, the Government should consider introducing a minimum price regime, focusing on the cheapest products available.

Response: Accept

The Government has directed the Ministry of Justice to assess the effectiveness and impact of a minimum pricing regime for alcohol.

Recommendation 58

We recommend to the Government that it consider further raising the alcohol excise tax, in a strategic manner to minimise harm.

Response: Noted

The Government considers that any decision about raising the alcohol excise tax should be informed by policy work on a minimum price option.

Recommendation 59

We recommend to the Government that it continue to pursue the aspirational aim of New Zealand becoming smoke-free by 2025.

Response: Accept

The Government welcomes this recommendation and reaffirms its commitment to the ‘Smokefree New Zealand 2025’ goal of reducing smoking prevalence and tobacco availability to minimal levels, thereby making New Zealand essentially a smokefree nation by 2025. The goal is ambitious, but good progress has been made, through annual tobacco excise increases, systematic screening and cessation support, the end of retail displays, and the planned introduction of plain packaging.

Recommendation 60

We recommend to the Government that it ensure that the maternity indicator of the health target requiring that 90 percent of pregnant women who identify themselves as smokers receive advice and support to quit is achieved and eventually increased to 95 percent.

Response: Accept in part

The Government is fully committed to the maternity indicator of the ‘Better help for smokers to quit’ health target, aiming for 90 percent of pregnant women being given smoking cessation advice and support as early in pregnancy as possible. Sector performance will be reviewed regularly to ensure this target is achieved. All health targets are reviewed annually,
at which time increases are considered, if processes are in place to support higher levels of performance. It is too early to consider raising the target, at this stage.

**Recommendation 61**

We recommend to the Government that it require DHBs to prioritise the prevention of sudden unexpected death in infancy by utilising the Health Quality and Safety Commission’s guidelines, and consider using this as a KPI for DHBs.

**Response: Accept in part**

The Ministry of Health is reviewing its prevention activities for sudden unexpected death in infancy (SUDI) and the effectiveness of its work with DHBs to further reduce SUDI rates in the population groups most affected. Data shows that SUDI decreased from 55 deaths in 2008 to 36 deaths in 2012.15

The Ministry’s work on SUDI prevention is based on the key messages set out in the ‘Safe Sleep’ brochure based on the 2012 report of the Child and Youth Mortality Review Committee. These two documents are among those listed in the Health Quality and Safety Commission’s guidelines.

It may not be meaningful to set national key performance indicators for all DHBs because rates of SUDI vary significantly between DHBs.

**Recommendation 62**

We recommend to the Government that it continue with the planned progressive increase in tobacco excise tax, and consider increasing its rate.

**Response: Accept**

The Government considers that raising the price of tobacco through tobacco excise increases is an effective measure in reducing tobacco consumption and smoking prevalence. The Government raised the tobacco excise in April 2010 (by 10 percent for manufactured cigarettes and by 25 percent for loose tobacco) and has, since then, legislated for 10 percent increases for all tobacco products each year from 1 January 2011 to 1 January 2016.

The Government may consider further tobacco excise increases, taking account of evaluations of the effect of the increases and progress towards the goal of a smokefree New Zealand by 2025.

---

Recommendation 63

We recommend to the Government that it consider introducing legislation to introduce additional smokefree areas.

Response: Not accepted
The Government’s current focus is on non-legislative options for extending smokefree restrictions to include areas such as vehicles, parks, playgrounds and beaches where children are particularly at risk from second-hand smoke and the negative behavioural role model of adult smokers. Many local authorities have already made parks, playgrounds and sports fields smokefree in their areas, and some are looking at further extending their smokefree areas. The Health Promotion Agency also plays a vital role in denormalising smoking behaviour through its campaigns (e.g., smokefree cars and homes). The Government is also seeking to introduce for plain packaging of tobacco products.

As the Māori Affairs Committee notes in its report titled Inquiry into the tobacco industry in Aotearoa and the consequences of tobacco use for Māori, there are numerous examples where voluntary and community-led initiatives have successfully extended smokefree environments beyond what is required by the law, including iwi such as Ngāti Kahungunu developing effective auahi kore and tupeka kore strategies.

Recommendation 64

We recommend to the Government that it reduce or remove the current personal duty free tax concession(s) for tobacco products, provided that the trade agreement implications can be accommodated.

Response: Noted
The Government is investigating possible mechanisms for reducing duty-free allowances, taking into account international agreements and the implications for New Zealand. Ministry of Health officials are working with the New Zealand Customs Service and The Treasury to review New Zealand’s tobacco concessions with a view to reducing or removing them.

The Government recognises that current allowances undermine other tobacco control measures and, in particular, remove the price signal from tobacco excise for those smokers who regularly travel overseas or are able to source tobacco products from the duty-free allowances of other travellers. The policy rationale for allowing duty-free purchases in transit between countries which both heavily tax tobacco is questionable, except for the existence of international agreements that provide for personal duty-free allowances.
Chapter 8: Maternity care and post-birth monitoring

Recommendation 65

We recommend to the Government that the key recommendations of the External Review of Maternity Care in the Counties Manukau District be funded and adopted in the Counties Manukau District Health Board and relevant places elsewhere in New Zealand. Particular attention should be given to the following areas: early pregnancy assessment and planning (medical and social), ultrasound scanning, prioritisation of vulnerable and high-needs women, family planning, Māori and Pasifika women, addressing gestational diabetes and obesity, outreach services, and integration of information services. The recommendations of the Counties Manukau review should be fully implemented within three to five years of this report being published, both in Counties Manukau DHB and elsewhere in New Zealand, where relevant. We recognise this may require reprioritisation of funding.

Response: Accept in part

The Ministry of Health is considering whether any of the External Review of Maternity Care in the Counties Manukau District recommendations have national relevance as part of its current work programme. Counties Manukau DHB is not representative of all DHBs and has some unique issues influencing its maternity outcomes. The Ministry of Health proposes that other DHBs adopt recommendations from the Counties Manukau External Review where they are relevant to them.

The Ministry of Health also continues to support and monitor the implementation of the recommendations of the External Review of Maternity Care in the Counties Manukau District as part of the Maternity Quality and Safety Programme. This programme, involves all DHBs and requires a focus on the quality and safety of maternity services. On advice from the Ministry of Health, Counties Manukau DHB has aligned the governance of its Maternity Review Action Plan and its Maternity Quality and Safety Programme to ensure activity is coordinated and geared towards continuous quality improvement. Learnings from Counties Manukau’s activities are being shared across DHBs as part of Maternity Quality and Safety Programme information-sharing.

Recommendation 66

We recommend to the Government that it ensure that the maternity system provides mothers and fathers with support in a sensitive, positive, and practical way, as much as possible, in the antenatal and postnatal periods and beyond.

Response: Accept

This recommendation is being implemented through existing work programmes. The Ministry of Health has undertaken a review of DHB-funded Pregnancy and Parenting Information and Education, and will introduce a new service specification in 2014 to ensure that DHB-funded services best meet the needs of families – including fathers, partners and whānau – as well as providing practical support for healthy pregnancies, healthy families and positive parenting. The new service specification for Pregnancy and Parenting Information and
Education will set a clear expectation that education for pregnancy and parenting will extend beyond the traditional scope of childbirth education.

**Recommendation 67**

We recommend to the Government that the Ministry of Health require DHBs to set a key performance indicator for the majority of women to be booked in for antenatal assessment by 10 weeks gestation. Best-practice clinical, social, and laboratory assessment should take place, and an ongoing plan for the pregnancy formulated. This should be introduced as a national health target within 12 months of this report being published. The target could start at 60 percent and over time be increased to 90 percent of all pregnancies.

**Response: Accept in part**

The Government agrees that there should be early antenatal assessment and considers this should be conducted by a Lead Maternity Carer or other suitably qualified maternity practitioner. The Ministry of Health supports early registration with a Lead Maternity Carer as the best form of early engagement and antenatal assessment and holds all DHBs accountable for increasing the proportion of women registering with a Lead Maternity Carer in the first trimester.

Since 2012, the Ministry of Health has been monitoring Lead Maternity Carer registration rates in the first trimester. The Ministry shares this monitoring with DHBs through the Maternity Quality and Safety Programme. A national target has not been set but a number of DHBs have set their own targets in response to low overall registration rates, or low rates for certain population groups. Provisional data for births occurring in 2012 indicates that 64 percent of women who received services from an LMC funded under the Primary Maternity Services Notice registered in the first trimester of their pregnancy. This has increased from 58 percent in 2010.

On the advice of the National Maternity Monitoring Group, the Ministry will include timely registration as a new clinical indicator and will publish Lead Maternity Carer registration rates in the first trimester in the next New Zealand Maternity Clinical Indicators report. This report will be published in 2014. The Ministry will seek advice from the National Maternity Monitoring Group on the measure and the time period to be used for the clinical indicator.

Consideration will be given to the Committee’s suggestion that antenatal assessment by 10 weeks gestation be introduced as a national health target.

**Recommendation 68**

We recommend to the Government that it develop an ongoing media campaign via the Ministries of Health and Education, urging prospective parents to plan and get healthy before conception, and focus on the welfare of their future babies. This should be achieved within 18 months of this report being published. See Chapters on nutrition, reproductive health, and research regarding pregnancy preparation.
Response: Accept in part
Implementing this recommendation would require further work to test whether an ongoing media campaign urging prospective parents to plan and get healthy before conception and focus on the welfare of their future babies is an effective intervention, given that 40 to 60 percent of pregnancies are unplanned.

The Government already has programmes supporting people to get healthy, including some with a focus on preconception and pregnancy, such as smoking cessation programmes.

Recommendation 69

We recommend to the Government that the current service specification for pregnancy and parenting education be completed, and that it be evidence-based and culturally appropriate, and put into practice within one year of this report being published.

Response: Accept
This is part of the Ministry of Health’s current work programme. The service specification for Pregnancy and Parenting Information and Education will be completed in 2014. The Ministry anticipates that DHBs will start aligning their services with the new service specification during the 2014/15 financial year.

The Ministry of Health and DHBs stipulate through the Provider Quality Specifications in their contracts for health services how providers are expected to engage with and deliver services to Māori communities.

Recommendation 70

We recommend to the Government that it create a comprehensive integrated maternity information system (a maternity shared care record), with a means of communicating effectively with self-employed Lead Maternity Carers. This should be set up and functioning within three years of this report being published.

Response: Accept
This is part of the current work programme. A national system for integrated maternity clinical information is being implemented in five DHBs in 2014, with other DHBs to follow. This will deliver a comprehensive, integrated information system that can be used by DHB clinicians and Lead Maternity Carers, and will provide summary information for other healthcare providers. It will also provide consumers with access to their own information. It is expected that the integrated maternity information system will be implemented in all DHBs within the timeframe recommended by the Committee.

Recommendation 71

We recommend to the Government that a system of “quadruple enrolment” of all newborns be developed into an integrated national online information system recording

- registration with primary care (general practice)
- registration on the National Immunisation Register
- registration with an oral health provider
- registration with Well Child Tamariki Ora.

This should be completed within three to four years of this report being published.

**Response: Accept in part**

The Ministry of Health is working with DHBs to support the development and implementation of multiple enrolment notification systems. More than half of the DHBs are already implementing or working towards implementing these systems.

Work to develop a national child health information platform is under way. This platform will be a comprehensive, integrated tool to record and monitor universal child health service delivery and outcomes including newborn multiple enrolment. It will link with Patient Management Systems to provide real-time patient information. The national child health information platform is being piloted in the Waikato DHB and is scheduled to be fully tested and available to other DHBs by the beginning of 2015.

**Recommendation 72**

We recommend to the Government that it ensure that when children are identified antenatally as vulnerable or at risk, appropriate expert wrap-around services are provided, as proposed in the Children’s Action Plan, with co-ordination of all service providers postnatally and rigorous ongoing follow-up. Most of this work, including the refining of the referral guidelines, should be completed within two years of this report being published.

**Response: Accept**

This recommendation corresponds with the Government’s intention to improve support to vulnerable children, as outlined in the Children’s Action Plan. The intention is that children who meet the threshold of acceptance into a Children’s Team will be provided with the coordinated wrap-around services identified in this recommendation. In the interim, many DHBs have multidisciplinary groups who help connect vulnerable pregnant women to the appropriate support agencies. Cross-agency reviews are already in place in some regions, such as Hawke’s Bay.

The development of the service design aspects of the Children’s Team programme, including referral guidelines, is part of the Children’s Action Plan work programme and will be completed within the timeframe proposed by the Committee. It is unlikely, however, that all children in New Zealand will have access to a Children’s Team within the next two years.

**Recommendation 73**

We recommend to the Government that it establish best-practice auditing for children who have received treatment for physical problems or social vulnerability to ensure that treatment is completed or ongoing. This should be in place within four years of this report being published.
Response: Noted
Please see the response to Recommendation 72.

Recommendation 74

We recommend to the Government that the Maternity Quality and Safety Initiative be progressed, monitored, and improved by

- continued refining of the national quality and safety programme
- regularly updating maternity referral guidelines to evidence-based gold standard
- developing nationally-standardised maternity records to allow the electronic transfer of information between health practitioners
- improving the collection of maternal and newborn information so the quality and safety of maternity services can be monitored more effectively.

Response: Accept

Work on these activities is part of current Ministry of Health work programmes. Progress is being made under all four of the deliverables noted in the recommendation. The Ministry of Health provides regular progress reports to the Minister of Health on these deliverables.

The National Maternity Monitoring Group acts as an advisor to the Ministry of Health on areas for improvement in the maternity sector. This includes monitoring the progress of the Maternity Quality and Safety Programme and recommending areas of focus.

Recommendation 75

We recommend to the Government that it update section 88 of the Primary Maternity Services Notice 2007 to include a requirement for the formal electronic transfer of relevant information from the LMC to the general practitioner or primary care provider before the six-week postnatal handover. We also recommend that the general practitioner be required to confirm receipt of the information and take on accountability for further professional and clinical care of the mother and child. This should be achieved within 18 months of this report being published and 100 percent of newborns should be accounted for.

Response: Accept

An update of the Primary Maternity Services Notice is being considered as part of the current work programme. The Primary Maternity Services Notice already requires the Lead Maternity Carer to provide a written record to the relevant general practitioner(s) before discharging the mother and baby from their care and to refer each woman to her chosen Well Child/Tamariki Ora provider – usually between four and six weeks after the birth of the baby.

The Primary Maternity Services Notice also requires any non-Lead Maternity Carer antenatal service provider (often a general practitioner) to refer women to a Lead Maternity Carer on confirmation of pregnancy and to provide a written summary of care provided.
The national system for integrated maternity clinical information (see response to Recommendation 70) will support electronic information sharing between primary maternity providers (Lead Maternity Carers), primary care (general practitioners) and DHBs. It will, however, not be operational in all DHBs within the 18 months proposed by the Committee.

**Recommendation 76**

We recommend to the Government that it set key performance indicators for DHBs to record the coverage of WCTO checks and B4 School Checks, and that a completion target of 95 percent be established, with special emphasis on vulnerable and hard-to-reach children. Physical problems or social vulnerability must be audited and treated where possible. A tracking arrangement should be established so that all referrals, particularly for serious conditions, are followed up and accepted to confirm that remedial action has been completed. A B4 School Check is needed at school for children who have not already been checked. This check should initially be targeted at decile 1 to 3 schools. This should be in place within three years of this report being published.

**Response: Accept in part**

The Well Child/Tamariki Ora Quality Improvement Framework and B4 School Check programme set national and local targets for B4 School Check coverage and currently fund up to 90 percent coverage, with a particular focus on achieving targets for high deprivation groups.

The recently released Well Child/Tamariki Ora Quality Improvement Framework sets national and local targets for Well Child/Tamariki Ora core contacts in the first year of life, with an expectation of 95 percent coverage for all regions and ethnic and deprivation groups by June 2016.

Good progress is being made towards achieving the new B4 School Check target of 90 percent coverage (increased in the 2013/14 financial year from 80 percent).

**Recommendation 77**

We recommend to the Government that it complete and put into action the WCTO quality framework, with the support of an expert advisory committee. This should be in place within three years of this report being published.

**Response: Accept**

This work is progressing as part of the Ministry of Health’s current work programmes. The Ministry has published the Well Child/Tamariki Ora Quality Improvement Framework, as well as the first Well Child/Tamariki Ora Quality Indicators report. In 2013, it established an expert advisory group and conducted regional workshops to launch the Well Child/Tamariki Ora Quality Improvement Framework. The Ministry of Health and the expert advisory group are supporting DHBs to develop and implement a plan for quality improvement in 2014, and are monitoring progress.
Recommendation 78

We recommend to the Government that it combine WCTO and B4 School Check reporting with the national information technology record. This should be in place within three years of this report being published.

Response: Accept

As mentioned in the response to Recommendation 71, work to develop a national child health information platform is under way. The platform will be a comprehensive and integrated tool to record and monitor universal child health service delivery and outcomes including newborn multiple enrolment.

The B4 School Check database is a real-time system and can be linked with any other National Health Index (NHI)-centric system, including the national child health information platform. Not all Well Child/Tamariki Ora client and service information is held in a real-time electronic system and therefore cannot be linked to other systems. The Ministry is considering ways to address this.

Recommendation 79

We recommend to the Government that it put progressively more resourcing into WCTO visits to high-needs, hard-to-reach mothers and babies, and that multi-sector services be made available to plan and action remedies. This should be in place within three years of this report being published.

Response: Accept in part

Government currently puts additional resources into Well Child/Tamariki Ora for high-needs, hard-to-reach mothers and babies. For example, the Budget 2011 included $21 million over the following four years, to provide a new pool of Well Child/Tamariki Ora additional visits for higher-needs mothers and babies assessed as needing them, with emphasis on support for first-time mothers.

Additional Well Child/Tamariki Ora visits to high-need, hard-to-reach mothers and babies currently account for approximately 50 percent of the total funding under the national Plunket agreement. There is also a significant investment in a range of additional services, such as the $30 million being spent on Family Start.

Reviewing the balance between core and additional contacts in order to refocus more funding towards additional visits for some parents is not part of the current work programme.

Recommendation 80

We recommend to the Government that key providers, midwives, obstetricians, paediatricians, general practitioners, anaesthetists, and consumers continue to develop a collaborative integrated model of maternity care for New Zealand according to guidelines based on research, evidence, and best practice. This should be completed within three to five years of this report being published, and include
consideration of primary and Lead Maternity Carers working with Primary Health Organisations.

Response: Accept
The foundations of an integrated model of maternity care are already in place and are set out in the New Zealand Maternity Standards and the Guidelines for Consultation with Obstetric and Related Medical Services.

A number of Ministry of Health programmes are supporting integration of maternity care, including:

- the Maternity Quality and Safety Programme
- the Well Child/Tamariki Ora Quality Improvement Programme
- the Integrated Performance and Incentive Framework, a framework being developed that will incorporate the use of Better Public Services goals across the health sector, promote improved service integration, and will align core health and disability sector reporting and monitoring frameworks such as the DHB accountability measures
- three Maternity and Child Health Integration Pilots, which are focused on improving the coordination and integration between maternity and child health services.

These programmes are expected to be in place and be making an impact on the integration of the maternity and child health system within one to five years.
Chapter 9: Leadership, whole-of-government approach and vulnerable children

Recommendation 81

We recommend to the Government that it ensure that all new programmes for child abuse treatment and prevention are thoroughly evaluated for efficacy and cost effectiveness before being widely disseminated.

Response: Accept

The research and evaluation programme of the Children’s Action Plan is a key area of focus for SuPERU. The exact nature of SuPERU’s role will be confirmed by the Vulnerable Children Board later this year.

SuPERU is currently finalising a review of the effectiveness of parenting programmes for parents of children aged zero to six years. It is also providing evaluative support during the implementation of the two pilot sites for the Children’s Teams.

Recommendation 82

We recommend to the Government that the Ministry of Health require all WCTO providers to report comprehensive enrolment and service delivery data every 12 months to ensure that contracting for services is adequate.

Response: Accept

The Ministry currently collects quarterly aggregated data from all Well Child/Tamariki Ora providers on the numbers of children enrolled in the service and the numbers of service contacts with each child.

The Ministry of Health is working towards collecting accurate NHI-level information from all Well Child/Tamariki Ora service providers to better assess current performance and unmet need in each DHB. The Ministry expects to complete this work by the 2015/16 financial year.

Recommendation 83

We recommend to the Government that when resources are available, it institute comprehensive health checks on all children before they leave primary school and again before they leave secondary school.

Response: Noted

As mentioned in the response to Recommendation 13, school-based health services are available to all students in consenting decile 1 and 2 secondary schools, with expansion to decile 3 secondary schools. The service provides an overall wellness check including areas such as physical health, home life, eating, activities, drugs, sexuality, suicide and depression. There are funding implications for expansion of such services recommended.
Recommendation 84

We recommend to the Government that the Prime Minister accept the formal role for developing and implementing a whole-of-government, inter-agency action plan for improving outcomes for all children, including a specific early intervention action plan covering pre-conception to three years of age. The Prime Minister’s responsibilities should include defining the economic and general evidence base behind the action plan, monitoring outcomes, and reporting how the Government proposes to make improvements in a transparent annual or biannual plan.

Response: Accept in part
The Government already has a range of interagency action plans and targets (which are publicly reported on and are supported by evidence) that focus on improving outcomes for children, including during the early years. In addition and as described in the Introduction, agencies will need to develop, review and report on a vulnerable children’s plan that sets out steps they will take to work together to achieve priorities for improving the wellbeing of vulnerable children.

The Prime Minister is already Chair of Cabinet – the highest decision making body. Cabinet receives regular updates on progress towards achievement of these targets and the work that supports them. The Prime Minister is also a member of the Cabinet Social Policy Committee, which regularly considers issues relating to improving child outcomes.

Recommendation 85

We recommend to the Government that every attempt be made to secure cross-party agreement on key priorities relating to children to avoid electoral cycle disruption as much as possible.

Response: Noted
The Government is pleased to see the cross-party agreement achieved by the Committee for this report and will continue to work with its colleagues in Parliament to achieve the best outcomes possible for New Zealand’s children.

Recommendation 86

We recommend to the Government that it refine and progress plans to change the way information is shared between professionals to enable them to recognise and act on signs of concern more readily.

Response: Accept
The Government recognises that the timely sharing of information about at-risk children is crucial to preventing harm. Information about at-risk children is often held by a number of agencies and services. As part of the work on the Children’s Action Plan, officials have recognised the need to share information more effectively between professionals to provide better support to vulnerable children. Sharing information, where appropriate, can provide frontline staff with a more complete picture of a child’s circumstances and needs.
The Government has made changes to the Privacy Act 1993 to better facilitate the sharing of personal information to improve public services. A number of other initiatives are planned, to improve the way information is shared between professionals to enable them to recognise and act on signs of concern more readily. These changes include:

- a requirement in the Vulnerable Children Bill that agencies working with children have child protection policies in place
- a requirement that staff working with children adopt the principle of safeguarding children’s welfare and interests in their policies and practice
- a new information-sharing platform for professionals to record and share concerns about children vulnerable to maltreatment, the Vulnerable Kids Information System. This system will draw together information on the most vulnerable children from government agencies and frontline professionals, who will be able to access information about the children they are working with when they need it. Cross-agency work led by the Children’s Action Plan Directorate is on track to define the high level requirements of the Vulnerable Kids Information System
- predictive risk assessment tools to support professionals to make accurate and informed assessments of whether those children are at risk of being maltreated
- standards and competencies for the children’s workforce, which could relate to knowledge about identifying and responding to child maltreatment, considering the interests of children, and working with other agencies.

**Recommendation 87**

We recommend to the Government that it progress the Vulnerable Children’s Bill as a legislative priority to give effect to the proposals in the Children’s Action Plan.

**Response: Accept**

This is currently being progressed. The Vulnerable Children Bill is being considered by the Social Services Committee who is expected to report back to the House in March 2014.

**Recommendation 88**

We recommend to the Government that it continue to develop strong inter-agency collaboration and leadership initiatives.

**Response: Accept**

The Government is providing strong leadership to ensure that its services work together to make a positive collective impact on the lives of children. The Government has set an expectation that agencies and services work together to achieve better results.

The State Services Commission is leading the Government’s Better Public Services initiative to enable the biggest transformation of the state sector in a generation through a wide ranging programme of change. It is taking a three-pronged approach:

- results – the 10 result areas for Better Public Services which aim to achieve outcomes for New Zealanders through better focused collaboration
leadership – coordinated initiatives to develop future leaders and build capability

stewardship – driving administrative efficiencies, developing expertise and improving services and delivery (often through joined up approaches).

The transformation process is being supported by amendments to the State Sector Act 1988, Public Finance Act 1989 and Crown Entities Act 2004, which introduce a broader range of tools for working together to achieve outcomes and for aligning incentives for public sector stewardship.

Please see the response to Recommendation 84 for more on interagency efforts that focus on improving outcomes for children.

**Recommendation 89**

We recommend to the Government that it continue efforts to develop predictive tools to systematically alert professionals to vulnerable children and families, and that it specifically develop predictive modelling tools to help identify at-risk women (pregnant or of child-bearing age), and thus at-risk children and families, as early as possible.

**Response: Accept**

Work is progressing on predictive risk modelling under the Children’s Action Plan. Research has been undertaken on the potential benefits and risks of using predictive risk models to support early identification of children at risk. The findings indicate that predictive risk modelling could be a useful tool for frontline professionals. It could support early intervention by providing families with services and support to prevent abuse and neglect and enable children to thrive.

The next step is to design a trial to assess whether predictive modelling can be successfully used to help practitioners identify vulnerable children and families, and get services to families early.

**Recommendation 90**

We recommend to the Government that it evaluate the case for further investment in the development of multi-disciplinary teams including paediatricians, social workers, behavioural psychologists, and family support workers, to provide an integrated system of assessment and evidence-based services for families with a high risk or history of child abuse. It is important that any such service changes are subject to thorough evaluation, randomised trials, or similar methodologies, to evaluate their success.

**Response: Accept**

The Government is making an investment in the development of multidisciplinary teams through the Children’s Teams under the Children’s Action Plan. SuPERU will evaluate the Children’s Teams and is also providing evaluative support during the implementation of the two demonstration sites for the Children’s Teams.
Recommendation 91

We recommend to the Government that it continue to support, fund, and strengthen early intervention programmes for vulnerable children, which are evidence based, agreed on and jointly designed by the agencies involved, and monitored and audited for efficacy. Any intervention programmes not found to be effective should be stopped, and replaced by programmes that work.

Response: Accept
The Government will continue to support, fund and strengthen early intervention programmes for vulnerable children and their families. Where there is evidence that a programme is not effective, the Government will modify or disinvest in the programme.

Recommendation 92

We recommend to the Government that it ensure adequate intensive home-based support is available for the most vulnerable, particularly in the first two years of life, and that there is a choice of centre-based early interventions where appropriate, from birth to five years. There must be special provision for children with disabilities.

Response: Accept in part
Intensive home-based support is available through initiatives such as Family Start and additional home visits from Well Child/Tamariki Ora providers where required.

Recommendation 93

We recommend to the Government that it develop key performance indicator's to be published annually in all sectors, to demonstrate that vulnerable children from birth to five years are receiving optimal evidence-based services, and are monitored as a cohort to ascertain outcomes.

Response: Accept in part
The Government has already developed targets under Better Public Services in key areas related to education, employment and health. The effectiveness of integrated services for vulnerable children under the Children’s Action Plan will be monitored and evaluated by SuPERU. The Well Child/Tamariki Ora Quality Improvement Framework will also report monitoring data.
Chapter 10: Immunisation

Recommendation 94

We recommend to the Government that it require enrolment of children in general practitioner health services before discharge from the postnatal ward or from the LMC’s care, to ensure continuing engagement with primary care and Well Child services and timely newborn enrolment. This should be achieved within two years of this report being published.

Response: Accept in part
The Government is continuing to work with the primary care sector to further improve the rates of early enrolment of newborn babies with general practice.

In October 2012, the Government initiated the Preliminary Newborn Enrolment Policy to facilitate the enrolment of newborn babies with a general practice and primary health organisation as soon as possible after birth so they receive essential healthcare, including immunisations, on time.

Significant gains have been achieved since the policy began. Enrolment data for the period 1 October 2009 to 30 September 2010 showed that fewer than half of newborns were enrolled with general practice at 12 weeks. The most recent data from 20 February 2013 to 19 May 2013, shows 70 percent of newborns are enrolled with general practice within three months of age, and 97 percent within six months of age.

The e-enrolment project that is under way will enable providers to electronically access an enrolment form for new patients. The form will interface with key Ministry of Health systems including Health Identity, enrolment register and payment systems.

Recommendation 95

We recommend to the Government that it continue to implement the Ministry of Health’s action plan to Enrol, Engage, Promote and Monitor, to achieve immunisation targets.

Response: Accept
This recommendation is covered by the current work programme. The Ministry of Health continues to focus on the four point action plan to Enrol, Engage, Promote and Monitor, and to assist the sector to develop quality systems and achieve the immunisation health target.

Recommendation 96

We recommend to the Government that it provide transparent, consistent delivery of immunisation services, by improving local monitoring and engagement among health professionals, developing local immunisation plans, and integration of services.
Response: Accept

This recommendation is covered by the current work programme. Monitoring of immunisation services is happening on all levels – from general practices to Primary Health Organisations, DHBs and the Ministry of Health – and this is occurring at least monthly. In addition, regions discuss their immunisation coverage and best practice for immunisation service delivery with the Ministry of Health each quarter. The DHBs’ Immunisation Steering Groups are leading this work at the local level.

Recommendation 97

We recommend to the Government that it offer choice for young people, by allowing youth health services to advise on and manage vaccinations, especially those for rubella and human papilloma virus.

Response: Noted

DHBs are responsible for contracting services to manage vaccinations. Most youth health services are able to access mainstream primary care funding, including for immunisation, via the Primary Health Organisation Agreement or the Primary Maternity Services Notice.

There may be practical barriers to having some youth health services managing vaccinations, for example the need to maintain a ‘cold chain’ of refrigeration for vaccines.

Recommendation 98

We recommend to the Government that it continue to implement the recommendations from the Health Committee’s 2011 inquiry, and that it report on outstanding recommendations not yet implemented. This should be reported on within 12 months of this report being published.

Response: Accept

On 22 June 2011, the Ministry of Health issued a response to the Committee’s report on its Inquiry into how to improve completion rates of childhood immunisation, noting the Ministry had met, or had work under way to meet, 24 of the Committee’s 30 recommendations. The Ministry reported to the Minister of Health in March 2012 and advised it had implemented, or had work under way to implement, the remaining six recommendations.

Recommendation 99

We recommend to the Government that it improve the functionality of the National Immunisation Register, and ensure the implementation of quadruple enrolment by improving the National Health Information Strategy. This should be completed within three years of this report being published.

Response: Accept in part

The National Immunisation Register is scheduled for replacement within three years and the functionality of the register will be improved as part of the replacement project.
The Government is also working with DHBs to encourage the development and implementation of multiple enrolment notification systems. These are systems that enable newborns to be automatically enrolled:

- on the National Immunisation Register
- with general practice
- with a Well Child/Tamariki Ora provider
- with an Oral Health Service.

More than half of DHBs are already implementing or working towards implementing multiple enrolment notification systems. The possibility of building a multiple enrolment system into the new National Immunisation Register will be explored as part of the National Immunisation Register replacement project.

**Recommendation 100**

We recommend to the Government that it continue to implement the advice of the Immunisation Advisory Centre regarding “hard to reach” children and Māori, who often have low completed immunisation rates.

**Response: Accept**

Advice from the Immunisation Advisory Centre on hard-to-reach children and Māori has been implemented by the Ministry of Health, resulting in further improvements to immunisation coverage for Māori.

The four point action plan focuses on enrolment, engagement with families, monitoring and health promotion. The plan covers actions to target hard-to-reach-children, including:

- enrolment at the National Immunisation Register and primary health organisation level at time of birth
- a focus on health practitioners following up with whānau
- outreach services
- monitoring to ensure families that are not engaging are followed up
- promotion plans that are specifically tailored for local population groups
- using other early childhood services, such as Well Child/Tamariki Ora services and Family Start, to promote immunisation.

There have been significant improvements in immunisation rates for Māori in recent years. National immunisation rates for two-year-old Māori children have increased from 59 percent in 2007 to 90 percent in 2013. Immunisation rates for Māori children have improved over the past four years to the extent that the Māori rates are now equal to, or better than, the New Zealand European rate in more than half of the country’s DHBs.
Chapter 11: Oral Health

Recommendation 101

We recommend to the Government that it invest in a nationwide public oral health campaign, aimed at increasing parental awareness of the importance of enrolling pre-schoolers with the Oral Health Service and attending scheduled appointments. The campaign should include good teeth-brushing practices, and the importance of drinking water or milk rather than soft drinks, fruit juice, and other sweetened drinks. This should be implemented within 18 months of this report being published.

Response: Accept in part

The Government is committed to improving the oral health of children and adolescents. Since 2008 a major reinvestment programme in child and adolescent oral health has provided $116 million of capital funding to build new fixed and mobile dental facilities. As a result of this funding, 177 fixed dental clinics will have been opened by June 2014 and an additional 112 mobile dental units are now operational, bringing the mobile fleet to 169 in total. The reinvestment has also provided an additional $32 million per year in operational funding to support increased staffing. This includes the engagement of an extra 198 full-time equivalent clinical staff and 56 full-time equivalent non-clinical staff.

A key aim of the reinvestment was to change the model of care for community oral health services: instead of the traditional focus on treating tooth decay, the new model has a proactive focus on family and whānau involvement, health education for self-care, prevention of ill-health, and early intervention. Early and ongoing family engagement is critical for children’s oral health. The new model also provides greater flexibility to prioritise care according to risk and need. The Institute of Environmental Science and Research is evaluating the implementation of the new service model.

Within the new model for community oral health services, priority is being given to:

- increasing early childhood (ie, preschool) enrolments to 95 percent by 2016
- increasing caregiver / whānau attendance at appointments, especially in early childhood
- improved profiling of children at-risk
- reducing non-attendance at appointments
- increasing adolescent use of free services.

Well Child/Tamariki Ora services also actively promote oral health in their contacts with families.

Good progress is being made. Preschool enrolments have increased substantially in recent years, from 49 percent in 2009 to 70 percent in 2012 (an increase of approximately 70,000 children). In 2009, 65 percent of adolescents accessed free oral health services, compared with 73 percent in 2012.
Recommendation 102

We recommend to the Government that it work with the Ministry of Health to ensure that the addition of fluoride to the drinking water supply is backed by strong scientific evidence and that ongoing monitoring of the scientific evidence is undertaken by, or for, the Ministry of Health, and that the Director-General of Health is required to report periodically to the Minister of Health on the status of the evidence and coverage of community water fluoridation.

Response: Accept
The addition of fluoride to drinking water is based on strong scientific evidence. The Ministry of Health ensures that this evidence is reviewed on a regular basis. The Ministry also provides advice to the Minister of Health on issues relating to water fluoridation issues and coverage.

Recommendation 103

We recommend to the Government that it work with Local Government New Zealand and the Ministry of Health to make district health boards responsible for setting standards around water-quality monitoring and adjustments to meet World Health Organisation standards (or their equivalent), including the optimal level of fluoridation of water supplies. Part of the work programme would be to ensure that costs imposed on councils relating to standards and monitoring, are realistic and affordable. This should be implemented within two years of this report being published.

Response: Not accepted
Territorial authorities and private/community providers are responsible for supplying drinking water to New Zealanders. The Minister of Health issues Drinking Water Standards under the Health Act 1956 and drinking water providers must take all practicable steps to comply with the Standards. The Standards are based on the relevant WHO guidelines but are adapted for New Zealand conditions where appropriate.

The Health Act prohibits the Standards being used to require the fluoridation of drinking water. Many local authorities, however, provide fluoridated water supplies where it is supported by their communities. This is consistent with the statutory duty of local authorities to improve, promote and protect public health.

Legislative change would be required if decision-making powers around fluoridation of drinking-water were conferred on DHBs. Further work would need to be undertaken to determine the costs and benefits of conferring the decision-making power on DHBs.

The question of the power of local authorities to fluoridate drinking water is currently subject to a High Court declaratory judgment. The Government will wait on the outcome of the High Court's deliberations before giving this issue further consideration.
Recommendation 104

We recommend to the Government that it develop and implement an action plan to improve early childhood oral health. The plan should focus on identifying the children at the greatest risk, at the earliest stage possible, and targeting resources to them. The plan should include the recommendations listed in this chapter and be completed within 18 months of this report being published.

Response: Accept in part
This recommendation is covered by current activities. Please see the response to Recommendation 101.

Recommendation 105

We recommend to the Government that the category of children classified in ethnicity reporting by the Ministry of Health as “other” be further defined and reported on to identify any at-risk ethnic groups within it.

Response: Accept
This recommendation is covered by the current work programme. Oral health service and outcome data is reported and analysed in three ethnic groups: Māori, Pacific, and ‘Other’.

The Ministry of Health acknowledges that a finer breakdown of ethnicity reporting would provide better information about service coverage. It would also inform service development and oral health promotion activity and contribute to reductions in inequalities in service use and oral health outcomes.

The Ministry of Health is sponsoring a project to support DHB development of a tailored national electronic oral health record for local implementation. This will improve clinical records and service data management and will enable reporting in accordance with the Ethnicity Data Protocols for the Health and Disability Sector.16

Recommendation 106

We recommend to the Government that it closely monitor children who miss scheduled oral health appointments and take corrective action when a pattern emerges. This might include topical fluoride applications and a delegated health worker to encourage their developing a healthy diet and a healthy home care regime.

Response: Accept in part
There is regular monitoring of scheduled oral health appointment attendance and this has shown that the percentage of enrolled preschool and primary school children overdue for scheduled examinations reduced from 20 percent in December 2008 to 10 percent in December 2013.

---

DHBs use strategies such as text reminders to increase attendance at scheduled appointments. Parents who do not bring their children for appointments (especially for surgery) are actively followed-up.

Some DHBs are investigating the option of providing applications of fluoride varnish in community settings (eg, in homes or at early childhood centres) for children who have significant dental decay. The Guidelines for the Use of Fluorides,17 published by the Ministry of Health, recommend that professionally applied, high-concentration fluoride varnishes should be provided every six months for children aged over 12 months who are at high risk of dental caries (eg, due to high sugar intake, lack of access to fluoride, or early signs of mineral loss from enamel).

Recommendation 107

We recommend to the Government that it expand taxpayer-funded oral health care, as resources allow, to include one course of basic oral health care, including oral hygiene instruction, cleaning and scaling, and management of untreated dental caries for pregnant women who hold community service cards. This service could utilise the skills of new oral health graduates with therapy and hygiene scopes of practice, and would focus limited additional health care resources on oral health improvements for a group of adults whose oral health is most associated with oral health outcomes in early childhood.

Response: Noted
Since 2012, the Ministry has commissioned three trials of low-cost oral health services for at-risk adults, including pregnant women with gestational diabetes. The Ministry will evaluate the trials by the end of June 2015. This evaluation will inform any decisions about the expansion of low-cost oral health services for at-risk adults.

Recommendation 108

We recommend to the Government that the Ministry of Health maintain a single NHI-linked health record for each child enrolled in a primary care practice. Oral health should form part of an integrated health record. All Well Child practices should have targets for the achievement of oral health checks and follow-up care. (Quadruple reporting)

Response: Accept
A single NHI-linked health record for each child enrolled in primary care practice is being piloted.

Recommendation 109

We recommend to the Government that “dental neglect” be defined as an important category of child neglect and recognised and managed accordingly. Systems must

---

be established for following up children who do not attend scheduled appointments, and therefore risk pain from dental abscesses and untreated decay.

**Response: Noted**
Currently systems do follow up children who do not attend scheduled appointments.

The development and implementation of multiple enrolment notification systems, referred to the responses to Recommendations 71, 94 and 99, will assist DHBs to identify families and whānau who are not engaged with oral health services.

Dental issues are a component, rather than a category, of child neglect. Designating dental neglect as a distinct category of child neglect may have unintended consequences. It could result in families being referred to Child, Youth and Family for dental issues only and may subject families to a disproportionate response when what is required is support to access dental services. It may also result in some families not seeking dental care for their children if they thought this was somehow linked to child protection services.

**Recommendation 110**

We recommend to the Government that it ensure that parents of pre-school-aged children can access an online health record for their children, including oral health information.

**Response: Accept in part**
The Ministry of Health is exploring the potential to access children's oral health information through self-care portals as part of a pilot in Waikato DHB.

**Recommendation 111**

We recommend to the Government that it encourage healthy food policies and dental hygiene programmes in early childhood centres and schools. All of the above recommendations should be implemented within one to two years of the publishing of this report.

**Response: Accept**
School Boards of Trustees are required to promote healthy food and nutrition for all students. There are a number of initiatives, and others are being considered, to encourage healthy food policies and dental hygiene programmes for young children. These involve early childhood centres and schools, as well as targeting families and whānau with young and school-aged children.

Please also see the responses to Recommendations 30 to 50 on improving nutrition and reducing obesity and related non-communicable diseases.
Chapter 12: Early childhood education

Recommendation 112

We recommend to the Government that it focus on achieving high participation rates in early childhood education (up to 98 percent by 2016) for vulnerable/disadvantaged children aged up to three years, where the literature suggests most benefits are obtained. The aim is to have children attending 15 to 20 hours where this is possible and benefits can be demonstrated.

Response: Accept in part

Government initiatives are making significant progress towards raising overall ECE participation for vulnerable children. The Government provides early learning support for parents and whānau in vulnerable families to engage them in their children’s learning at home and encourage involvement in quality ECE.

The Government’s Better Public Services target for ECE is focused on three and four year olds, so that in 2016, 98 percent of all children starting school will have participated in quality ECE. Regular participation in quality ECE at this age significantly increases a child’s chance of future educational success, particularly for children from vulnerable families.

The Government subsidises up to 30 hours of ECE a week, including for children under the age of three. Equity funding, which is additional targeted funding, is available for ECE services that work with children from the most vulnerable communities. Government funding for ECE subsidies has increased from $0.86 billion in the 2007/08 financial year to $1.5 billion in the 2013/14 financial year, an increase of 75 percent.

The Government has also invested $91.8 million over four years in the Ministry of Education’s Participation Programme to boost ECE participation among Māori, Pasifika, and children from lower socio-economic backgrounds. The Participation Programme comprises a package of six initiatives:

- Engaging Priority Families – intensive support programmes for three and four-year-olds and their families, aimed at leading to enrolment in ECE, regular participation in ECE, support for learning at home and a successful transition to school
- Supported Playgroups – certificated playgroups, with regular support from a kaimanaaki/playgroup educator in areas with low participation
- Flexible and Responsive Home-based Services – aims to either expand existing services and community agencies into home-based ECE delivery or to transition informal care arrangements into licensed and certificated ECE environments
- Identity, Language, Culture and Community Engagement – support packages providing identity, language and culture professional support for clusters of services that have available child spaces and are not responsive to their community
- Intensive Community Participation Programme – community-led participation projects that address the specific reasons children are not participating in ECE
• Targeted Assistance for Participation – grants, incentives and partnership opportunities to help establish new services and child spaces in those communities where new child places are needed most and are not being created quickly enough.

The Government’s increased investment in initiatives to encourage ECE participation are delivering positive results and more of young New Zealanders are getting a stronger start in their early learning. As at September 2013, 95.7 percent of children starting school had participated in ECE, an increase of 0.6 percent from September 2012. Among Māori families, the proportion of children going to early learning centres rose strongly, up to 92.7 percent in September 2013 from 91.2 percent in September 2012. In Pasifika families there was a significant increase, to 89.1 percent in September 2013 from 87.2 percent in September 2012.

**Recommendation 113**

We recommend to the Government that it continue to research and develop an evidence base for optimal provision arrangements for ECE in New Zealand, especially for children aged up to three years.

**Response: Accept**

The Ministry of Education is involved in three major projects that are contributing to an evidence base for the provision of optimal ECE in New Zealand, especially for children aged up to three years. These are:

• Growing up in New Zealand – a longitudinal survey of 7,000 New Zealand children that will provide an opportunity for understanding the nature of ECE participation for the children in the sample from birth through school, alongside variables such as their family circumstances, parent/caregivers’ labour market participation, and income

• the ECE participation evaluation – this project has focused on evaluating whether the needs of families are being met and how well Government initiatives address issues of identity, language and culture. The findings of these evaluations will contribute to improving and refining the ECE Participation Programme and supporting vulnerable communities to engage in early learning opportunities

• research on learning progress and outcomes – in May 2013 the Ministry of Education commissioned two pieces of research to provide a better understanding of how learning progress and outcomes for children aged zero to eight years are communicated and used between ECE services, family and whānau, and schools.

**Recommendation 114**

We recommend to the Government that it continue with its programme on vulnerable children, and make special provision to ensure they have the opportunity to benefit from high-quality, best-practice ECE and care in the first years of life.

**Response: Accept**

This recommendation is covered by the current work programme. Please see the response to Recommendation 112.
Recommendation 115

We recommend to the Government that it continue to ensure all early childhood education is of a standard where it can be demonstrated to be effective and positive, and that appropriate auditing and monitoring is strictly maintained.

Response: Accept

All ECE services in New Zealand must meet quality, and health and safety, standards. Quality in ECE is regulated in a number of ways, including ratios of adults to children and the qualifications of educators and teachers. New Zealand’s staff: child ratios and qualification requirements are among the best in the world.

New Zealand’s funding system also incentivises high proportions of registered teachers in teacher-led services. Teacher-led services that have 80 percent or more qualified teachers are paid at a higher rate. Currently, 94 percent of teacher-led, centre-based ECE services are funded at the 80 percent or higher qualified teachers funding rate.

ECE services are reviewed by ERO, whose reports on individual ECE services are freely available to the public. ERO makes overall judgments about each service’s capacity to promote positive learning outcomes for children. Services that are not well placed or need further development to do this are provided with targeted assistance under the government-funded ECE professional development initiative to improve service performance and delivery.

ERO has published ERO’s Evaluation Indicators for Education Reviews in Early Childhood Services\(^{18}\) that help to determine if high quality is being achieved.

Recommendation 116

We recommend to the Government that it continue to strengthen and fund its programme of early childhood education for the zero to three-year age group, particularly where evidence shows it is improving outcomes.

Response: Accept

This recommendation is covered by the current work programme. The Government is continually reviewing the inputs that support quality early learning outcomes, not only through formal ECE provision but also through initiatives that strengthen parent and whānau engagement and early learning in the home. Please see the response to Recommendation 112.

Recommendation 117

We recommend to the Government that it explore the provision of ECE services, including associating or co-locating ECE services with public schools, where analysis shows gaps in the education system. The recommendations in this chapter should be achieved within one to two years of this report being published.

Response: Accept in part

Approximately 19 percent of all ECE services are already associating or co-locating with primary schools to facilitate better transitions to school. Other ECE services are working closely with priority communities to support vulnerable children to achieve educational success.

In addition, Partnership Schools (Kura Hourua) are a new type of school in our education system, which bring together education, the business sector and community groups to provide new opportunities for students to achieve education success.

The first Partnership Schools, which target students who are underachieving, will open in 2014. These schools will have greater freedom and flexibility to innovate and engage with their students in return for stronger accountability for improving educational outcomes. In the next round of Partnership Schools, priority will be given to schools that offer innovative options for zero to eight year olds. This means there will be opportunities to focus on gaps in the education pipeline and, in particular, transitions from ECE to primary school.
Chapter 13: Collaboration, information sharing and service integration

Recommendation 118

We recommend to the Government that it continue to refine a system of information sharing, collaboration, and integration of services, taking appropriate steps to protect privacy, while allowing early identification of children at risk, and ensuring children do not fall through the cracks. This should be achieved within two years of this report being published.

Response: Accept
The Government will continue its work in this area, including development of the Vulnerable Kids Information System. This system will draw together information from government agencies and frontline professionals on the most vulnerable children. Government agencies and frontline professionals will be able to access information about the children they are working with, when they need it. Cross-agency work led by the Children’s Action Plan Directorate is on track to define the high level requirements of the Vulnerable Kids Information System.

Recommendation 119

We recommend to the Government that it introduce a key performance indicator for district health boards requiring the efficient enrolment of newborn babies with primary health services (that newborns be enrolled with a general practice and a primary health organisation before six weeks, and that immunisations and Well Child checks are on time, and a general practitioner chosen antenatally). This should be achieved within two years of this report being published.

Response: Accept in part
The Government is continuing to work with the primary health care sector to further improve the rates of early enrolment of newborn babies with general practice.

In October 2012 the Government initiated the Preliminary Newborn Enrolment Policy to facilitate the enrolment of newborn babies with a general practice and primary health organisation as soon as possible after birth so they receive essential healthcare, including immunisations, on time.

Significant gains have been achieved since the policy began. Enrolment data for the period 1 October 2009 to 30 September 2010 showed that fewer than half of newborns were enrolled with general practice at 12 weeks. The most recent data from 20 February 2013 to 19 May 2013, however, shows 70 percent of newborns are enrolled with general practice within three months of age, and 97 percent within six months of age.

Please also see the response to Recommendations 94 and 99.
Recommendation 120

We recommend to the Government that it ensure that the system facilitates identification of at-risk women and babies as early as possible in pregnancy, to allow home visiting programmes such as Family Start and Early Start to begin at an appropriate time. This should be achieved within two years of this report being published.

Response: Accept in part

Community-based universal services, such as maternity services, Well Child/Tamariki Ora services and schools, play a key role in identifying at-risk women and children who need additional support and more intensive services, such as Family Start, to address their needs.

A number of other initiatives under the Children’s Action Plan will help support front line staff to identify vulnerable children and families.

Recommendation 121

We recommend to the Government that it implement quadruple enrolment of infants (on the National Immunisation Register, in WCTO, with a primary caregiver or general practitioner, and an oral health provider), within two years of this report being published.

Response: Accept

The Ministry of Health is working with DHBs to encourage the development and implementation of multiple enrolment notification systems. These are systems that enable newborns to be automatically enrolled:

- on the National Immunisation Register
- with general practice
- with a Well Child/Tamariki Ora provider
- with an Oral Health Service.

More than half of DHBs are already implementing or working towards implementing multiple enrolment notification systems.

Recommendation 122

We recommend to the Government that under the Children’s Action Plan, a single lead professional for each child be assigned overall responsibility for ensuring that appropriate interventions are carried out and followed through (along the lines of the Scottish model of a “named person” for every child).

Response: Accept

This is the model for the Children’s Teams, established under the Children’s Action Plan. Each child who is assessed as being at risk of maltreatment and referred into a Children’s Team will have a lead professional assigned to them.
Recommendation 123

We recommend to the Government that it continue to develop service hubs tailored to the needs of particular communities (particularly for Māori and Pasifika people) and focused on delivering high-quality appropriate services.

Response: Accept
This approach is consistent with the Government’s policy direction. For example, as part of Government’s Better Sooner More Convenient programme, the Ministry of Health has supported the development of service hubs called Integrated Family Health Centres, which provide seamless access to a range of health services in one location. There are more than 20 Integrated Family Health Centres across New Zealand, which have evolved to meet the needs of local communities.

The Government has also established thirteen Early Years Service Hubs, which are service hubs located within or alongside existing community facilities (eg, community centres or schools) and have been set up to improve access to services for high-needs families with young children. These hubs provide a convenient central point where families can access a range of services including antenatal care, Well Child/Tamariki Ora checks, immunisation programmes and outreach services, as well as quality childcare and education for children aged zero to six.

Please also see the section of the response to Recommendation 27 relating to the Auckland-wide Healthy Homes Initiative.

Recommendation 124

We recommend to the Government that it continue to develop information-sharing support and integrated working, such as the national shared maternity record of care and the clinical health record, and ensure they are fully available throughout New Zealand within three years of this report being published.

Response: Accept
The Government has made changes to support better information sharing and integrated ways of working, and will continue to make improvements in these areas.

For example, the Government has made changes to the Privacy Act 1993 to improve information sharing among Government agencies and services. These changes, including the use of Approved Information Sharing Agreements, are being used to facilitate information sharing in the Children’s Team demonstrations sites.

The integrated maternity information system is expected to be implemented in all DHBs within the timeframe recommended by the Committee. Please see earlier responses to Recommendations 70 and 78 on the Maternity Clinical Information System and the National Child Health Information Platform, respectively.
**Recommendation 125**

We recommend to the Government that it implement the vulnerable kids information system as soon as issues regarding information sharing and privacy law reform are resolved by legislation. We strongly support the Government in this work and consider it to be a crucial instrument for preventing child abuse.

*Response: Accept*

The Government will continue to develop the Vulnerable Kids Information System.
Chapter 14: Research on children

Recommendation 126

We recommend to the Government that it ensure all programmes related to child services are carefully monitored and evaluated using best-practice, evidence-based techniques, wherever possible.

Response: Accept

The Government’s establishment of SuPERU helps address this recommendation. Under its new mandate, the functions of the Families Commission include commissioning and managing social sector research contracts on behalf of government, as well as identifying research to help determine policy priorities. The Families Commission will work with the Social Sector Forum to ensure that current and long term policy and research priorities are aligned.

All Children’s Action Plan programmes include provision for monitoring and evaluation.

In addition, all government agencies with policy interests have monitoring functions and are responsible for collecting data and research evidence to support decision-making.

Recommendation 127

We recommend to the Government that it ensure reports on child health and wellbeing outcomes, including the Social Report published by the Ministry of Social Development, are of the highest quality and give an accurate picture of the data that can be used for evaluation and research.

Response: Accept

The Government publishes a number of reports that include social indicators:

- Statistics New Zealand’s *Key Progress Indicators* covers a range of economic, social and environmental indicators
- Statistics New Zealand publishes *New Zealand: Social Indicators*, which uses the Social Report framework but is more broadly a social indicators report
- the Families Commission recently published its first *Families and Whānau Status Report 2013*.

It will continue to ensure these and other reports on child health and wellbeing outcomes are of high quality and provide an accurate picture of the data.

The Ministry of Social Development will continue to work with other agencies to improve the quality of reporting of social outcomes and wellbeing indicators, and to examine where it can best contribute from available data sources.
Recommendation 128

We recommend to the Government that it ensure the Social Policy Evaluation and Research Unit is well resourced, and audited for the quality of its evaluation of programmes; and that it cultivate a readiness to add or drop programmes in response to evidence of effectiveness.

Response: Accept

SuPERU is appropriately resourced. The Government agrees that the quality of SuPERU’s evaluations should be audited, and this is planned for the 2015 year. This will take the form of an independent review of the operation of the Families Commission. The review will include an examination of the extent to which SuPERU has influenced the adoption of best practice evaluation and research methodologies in the social sector, and whether Families Commission projects have led to improvements in the indicators of family and whānau wellbeing.

The audit is in addition to the regular scientific oversight and review of SuPERU’s projects by an expert advisory group. SuPERU also has considerable internal expertise, with chief advisors for evaluation and social science, and it has implemented processes designed for excellence, including external peer review of its reports.

Recommendation 129

We recommend to the Government that Whānau Ora “action research” be evaluated to ensure it produces high-quality evaluation of programmes, and there is a readiness to add programmes or drop them if they are shown to be ineffective.

Response: Accept in part

Action research is an accepted methodology for evaluating programme effectiveness. The Whānau Ora action research approach tracks the transformation of providers and the impact of service delivery on whānau. The focus of action research is not at the programme level; rather, it looks at the effect of services and service delivery on whānau as a whole and its objectives are not specific to child health.

Recommendation 130

We recommend to the Government that research into human development and foetal and child health be strongly supported and sustained, with the inclusion of social science and economic research, and that funding be at least equivalent to international benchmarks, well-coordinated, and monitored for outcomes and value for money. Funding to achieve international benchmarks should be budgeted within three years of this report being published.

Response: Accept in part

The Government has made changes that have the potential to improve the coordination of social science research across Government. The Families Commission Amendment Bill has
been introduced into Parliament and proposes a new role for the Families Commission to support and manage social science research for Government.

As part of its new role, the Families Commission took over responsibility for the Growing Up in New Zealand Study from the Ministry of Social Development in October 2013. There has been significant government investment in this Study, with the Government committing a further $6.4 million over two years for the Study in July 2013.

The Growing Up in New Zealand Study has significant potential to provide contemporary longitudinal evidence to inform cross-sector policy. The Study commenced before birth, and the first three data collection waves included interviews with both mother and partner. The cohort is now four and half years old and the next data collection wave has begun.

The Commission aims to maximise the Crown's investment in the Study by increasing the use of the Study findings and data to inform policy development, programme design and service delivery. In 2014, more data will become available for external release, in particular data from the when the children were two years old. This will provide a rich data source to support Government’s priorities in early intervention and for vulnerable children.

The Government has also announced 10 National Science Challenges, which are focusing on key research areas that are designed to take a more strategic approach to science investment and are aimed at tackling some of the biggest science-based issues and opportunities facing New Zealand. Three of the 10 challenges – A Better Start, Healthier Lives, and Ageing Well – concern the social sciences.

The Government is also working with the Families Commission to explore other ways of developing a strategic view of research and evaluation across the government sector. The Government expects this would lead to the development of longer-term strategic partnerships across agencies and across the government and academic sectors, to address enduring issues of high concern. It would also assist in focusing joint investments on key strategic and infrastructure initiatives.
Conclusion

In summary, the Government largely supports the Report and notes that it generally reflects current priorities within agencies’ work programmes.

The Government thanks the Committee for the contribution it has made through its work on improving child health outcomes and preventing child abuse, first, by raising awareness of the issues and promoting public discussion and also by examining the effects over the life-course of social conditions and access to appropriate supports early in life.

The Government notes that the Report, its recommendations and our responses highlight the wide range of factors that influence health and wellbeing. They also highlight that an initiative focused at addressing one factor is likely to have a broader impact. As a result, the responses to many recommendations have linkages with activities described in other parts of the Government Response. There is some overlap, for example, between the recommendations on nutrition and related issues in Chapter 6, Recommendations 101 and 111 on oral health and healthy food in Chapter 11 and the recommendations relating to enrolment and information systems in other parts of the Report.

The Government also notes that the report of the Māori Affairs Committee titled *Inquiry into the determinants of wellbeing for tamariki Māori* was tabled on 20 December 2013. The recommendations of the Māori Affairs Committee and the Health Committee cover a similar range of health and other services for tamariki Māori. The Government is currently preparing its response to the report of the Māori Affairs Committee.

The Government will continue to pursue its goals for improved outcomes for children, better services and supports and a more effective public sector.
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Introduction

The Government welcomes the Justice and Electoral Committee’s report: *Inquiry into the 2011 General Election*.

The report makes 32 recommendations. These are attached as Appendix 1. The Government has examined the Committee’s recommendations and responds to the report in accordance with Standing Order 249.

Recommendations and Government Response

The recommendations of the Justice and Electoral Committee can be separated into three categories.

1. One recommendation, *Amending the Electoral Regulations 1996 to allow overseas voters to scan and upload their ballot papers to a secure elections server, and supporting the Electoral Commission in developing such a system*, has already been addressed through recent amendments to the Electoral Regulations 1996.

2. Seven other recommendations do not require legislative change. The Government will consider the recommendations for implementation as appropriate, in consultation with the Electoral Commission. These recommendations are:

   - Providing funding, as fiscal conditions permit, to continue developing the Long Term Strategy for Voting Technology.
   - Asking the Electoral Commission to report on the implications of the increasing trend towards advance voting.
   - Requesting the Electoral Commission to liaise with the Ministry of Education on the feasibility, including resourcing implications, of incorporating ongoing comprehensive civics education into the New Zealand school curriculum.
   - Supporting the Electoral Commission to expand the public civics education programmes, resources permitting.
   - Ensuring that future public information campaigns about electoral matters provide sufficient detail and are accessible to all voters.
   - Examining the merits of a standalone postal vote versus a referendum in conjunction with the general election when making decisions about future public referenda.
   - Continuing to regularly update and cull the dormant roll as appropriate.

3. The remaining recommendations would require amendment to the Electoral Act 1993 and/or the Electoral Regulations 1996 if they are to be implemented. The Government will carefully consider the policy implications of these remaining recommendations to determine whether change should be implemented for the 2014 election through a Bill to amend the Electoral Act 1993 or through amendments to the Electoral Regulations 1996.

The recommendations which require more significant consideration are unlikely to be included in a Bill prior to the 2014 election. However, the Government is seeking advice from Ministry of Justice officials on these recommendations and will consider including them in future legislative change to electoral law.
Conclusion

The Government thanks the Justice and Electoral Committee for its thorough report. The Government will be considering its recommendations, with a view towards what can be implemented in time for the 2014 General Election, either for inclusion in a Bill to amend the Electoral Act 1993 or through amendments to the Electoral Regulations 1996.
Appendix - Inquiry recommendations

(note: recommendation numbers have been added and do not feature in the Inquiry Report)

Electronic enrolment and voting systems

1. Making provision, as fiscal conditions permit, for online enrolment using Electronic Identity Verification, and amending the Electoral Act 1993 accordingly.

2. Providing funding, as fiscal conditions permit, to continue developing the Long Term Strategy for Voting Technology.

Advance voting

3. Asking the Electoral Commission to report on the implications of the increasing trend towards advance voting.

4. Amending Part 2 of the Electoral Regulations 1996 to allow scrutineers to be appointed to advance voting places.

5. Amending sections 174C(5)(a) and 174F(4) of the Electoral Act 1993 to change the starting time of the early count of advance parliamentary and referendum votes from 3 pm to 2 pm.

Accessibility

6. Exploring the suggestions contained in the submission of the Human Rights Commission for improving the voting rights of people with disabilities, especially regarding improved data collection.

7. Requiring a minimum distance between voting booths and providing an alternative area with a mock voting paper for people who need to have the ballot paper explained in their primary language. This would mean that a voter could then go unaccompanied into the voting booth.


Education

9. Requesting the Electoral Commission to liaise with the Ministry of Education on the feasibility, including resourcing implications, of incorporating ongoing comprehensive civics education into the New Zealand school curriculum.

10. Supporting the Electoral Commission to expand the public civics education programmes, resources permitting.

11. Ensuring that future public information campaigns about electoral matters provide sufficient detail and are accessible to all voters.

Overseas voting

12. Amending the Electoral Regulations 1996 to allow overseas voters to scan and upload their ballot papers to a secure elections server, and supporting the Electoral Commission in developing such a system.

13. Seeking better ways of ensuring the integrity of votes cast overseas.
Disruption to electoral events

14. Commissioning a review of legislation to determine whether it provides adequately for the disruption to electoral events by a significant emergency, and the wider constitutional and political issues of such an event, and amending the legislation accordingly.

Referenda

15. Examining the merits of a standalone postal vote versus a referendum in conjunction with the general election when making decisions about future public referenda.

Electioneering on election day

16. Prohibiting electioneering activity on election day, including the wearing of rosettes, lapel badges, ribbons, streamers, and party apparel, other than the wearing of a party rosette by a scrutineer inside a polling station.

17. Commissioning a review of existing regulations applying to social media on election day, to determine whether they are workable.

18. Reducing the fine for not removing an election advertising billboard by election day.

Election advertising/programme

19. Establishing in time for the 2014 general election a mechanism for clarifying what work of a member of Parliament constitutes an election advertisement, ahead of the regulated period.


21. Aligning the liability for breaching Part 6 of the Broadcasting Act 1989 so that provisions would apply to the broadcaster and any person who arranged for the broadcast of an election programme in contravention of the Act, whether within or outside an election period.

Filing return of election expenses

22. Retaining the existing timeframe for candidates and third party promoters filing election expenses within 70 working days of election day, but increasing the timeframe for filing party returns to within 90 working days of election day.

23. Amending the Electoral Act 1993 to ensure that there is a significant penalty to act as a deterrent to failing to file a return in a deliberate attempt to defeat the operation of electoral law.

24. Amending the Electoral Act 1993 to make loans to parties and to candidates subject to the same disclosure rules as donations.

Technical recommendations

25. Continuing to regularly update and cull the dormant roll as appropriate.

26. Amending Part 6 of the Electoral Act 1993 to authorise the Electoral Commission to use an EasyVote card as the record an ordinary vote has been issued and as evidence that a special voter is eligible to vote, and to compile manual or electronic records of who has cast an ordinary or special vote using the EasyVote card or other verification methods.

27. Amending the Electoral Regulations 1996 to extend the period in which postal votes can be received, in line with the Electoral Commission’s recommendations.
28. Amending the Electoral Act 1993 to make it clear that the Electoral Commission has the power to recalculate and amend the allocation of list seats for an election as the result of a successful election petition regarding an electorate seat.

29. Amending the Electoral Act 1993 to allow bulk nomination and party list deposits to be submitted by direct bank deposit, and bulk nomination and party list documents to be lodged by email. These changes could be made as technical amendments in a statutes amendment bill.

30. Allowing only registered parties to maintain registered logos.

31. Amending the Electoral Act 1993 and Citizens Initiated Referenda Act 1993 so the counter-signature to the writ would no longer be required.

32. Examining the current electoral enforcement provisions to determine whether they are adequate.
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Introduction

The Government has carefully considered the Committee’s report on the report of the Parliamentary Commissioner and two petitions relating to the management and use of 1080 for pest control operations.

The Government responds to the report in accordance with Standing Order 249.

The Government accepts the recommendations in the report and will ensure that they are implemented as far as practicable through government work programmes.

Recommendations and government response

Recommendation 1: That the agencies using 1080 in pest control operations ensure that it is used as safely, effectively, and efficiently as possible, and that every care is taken to prevent the poisoning of non-target species.

Response: The Government notes that the Environmental Risk Management Authority (now the Environmental Protection Authority) issued the results of its review of 1080 in August 2007, and set out new rules relating to its use. The Government is confident that compliance with those rules will ensure safe use, and prevent the poisoning of animals on land not included within the treatment area. Steps have been taken by all agencies to ensure compliance.

The Department of Conservation has an ongoing programme of research to ensure that use of 1080 in its operations is as efficient as possible, and that poisoning of non-target species is minimised. There has been a major reduction over the last decade in the amount of poison required per hectare for possum control, and it is hoped that this trend can be continued through effective research and adaptive management. Preventing the poisoning of native non-target organisms in general, and protected species in particular, continues to be a key area of research for the Department.

Recommendation 2: That the Department of Conservation and the Animal Health Board provide, in a timely manner, sufficient and accessible information about pest control operations in their areas to communities to address their concerns.

Response: The Department of Conservation and Animal Health Board are committed to providing timely information to communities about pest control operations. Information is provided to relevant councils and other authorities. Information is provided through the DOC website to hunters who may be affected by closures of areas to hunting. Neighbours will be directly advised, where possible, and signage is used to ensure that visitors are aware of operations.
The Government notes, however, that the provision of accurate information will not necessarily address all concerns, if communities are unwilling to accept current scientific understanding, or wish alternative methods to be used for reasons which are outside the mandate of the agency undertaking the pest control (e.g. because the community wishes to see more jobs generated).

**Recommendation 3:** That further research into alternatives to 1080 continue to be a priority.

**Response:** The Government is committed to further research into alternatives. For example, one recent initiative is the funding of testing of self-resetting traps, to see whether they offer an effective new tool that might increase the types of land on which trapping is feasible. The Government notes, however, that, despite investing millions of dollars in improving pest management tools, no replacement for 1080 has been found. The Government, therefore, strongly agrees with the Parliamentary Commissioner for the Environment that 1080 remains an essential tool to allow the restoration of New Zealand’s unique biodiversity, and to allow the eradication of Tb.

**Conclusion**

The Government welcomes the report of the select committee, which provides a useful contribution to the ongoing community debate about the use of 1080 as a pest control tool.

The Government endorses the findings of the Parliamentary Commissioner for the Environment (PCE), and appreciates the thorough and professional approach she took to a complex and controversial issue. The Government agrees with the PCE that 1080 continues to be an essential tool for pest management in New Zealand.

The Government is committed to ensuring that the best tool is used for each pest control operation, that all tools are used correctly and efficiently, that the community is kept fully informed about pest control operations, and that there is ongoing effort to improve the range of tools available, and their effectiveness.

The Government is, and will continue, taking steps to implement the committee’s recommendations.
Government Response to the Māori Affairs Select Committee briefing on Damien and George Nepata and their entitlement to compensation
On 12 July 2013 the Māori Affairs Committee presented a briefing on Damien and George Nepata and their entitlement to compensation. In this briefing the Committee recommended to the Government that both Damien and George Nepata be awarded additional compensation for their injuries and subsequent hardship.

In response to this recommendation, the Minister of Defence will submit a Paper to Cabinet to consider whether additional compensation should be awarded to Damien and George Nepata.

Hon Gerry Brownlee
Leader of the House
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Government response to Report of the Māori Affairs Committee on its  
Inquiry into the Determinants of Wellbeing for Tamariki Māori

Introduction

The Government welcomes the Māori Affairs Committee’s (the Committee’s) report on its Inquiry into the determinants of wellbeing for tamariki Māori (the Report). The findings of this inquiry are timely as the Government has a particular focus on improving outcomes for vulnerable children, including tamariki Māori. The Government responds to the Report in accordance with Standing Order 249.

The Committee made 40 recommendations to the Government on improving the wellbeing of tamariki Māori. These recommendations focus on: research and policy; practice in service provision; and service provision related to health, education, housing, and incomes and employment. Overall, the Government supports these recommendations and notes that it generally reflects current priorities within agencies’ work programmes. A further eight recommendations were made which were not supported by the entire Committee. The Government also responds to these additional recommendations.

The Government either accepts, accepts in part, notes, or does not accept the recommendations. Where recommendations are noted, this signals that the Government is addressing the matter in a different way to that recommended by the Committee. Where the Government accepts only part of the proposal and is partially addressing the recommendation, then these recommendations are accepted in part.

In addition to the recommendations, the Committee makes high level statements in relation to: taking a holistic whānau centred approach to service delivery in order to be effective for Māori; Whānau Ora; and the Treaty of Waitangi with specific regard to tamariki Māori wellbeing. This discussion and a comment are outlined below.

Taking a whānau-centred approach to service delivery

The Report supports taking a holistic and whānau-centred approach to improving tamariki wellbeing, which acknowledges tamariki as important members of their wider whānau, and empowers the adults in their lives to take a leading role in improving tamariki Māori wellbeing.

The Committee noted the wellbeing of tamariki Māori is inextricable from the wellbeing of their whānau and urged all sectors to work in a whānau-centred and whānau friendly way in order to achieve the best outcomes for tamariki Māori and provide effective services. This requires acknowledging the importance of collective identity for tamariki Māori and the intergenerational nature of many of the problems facing tamariki Māori. The Committee supports increasing opportunities for tamariki Māori and whānau to connect
with their Māori identity by establishing their whakapapa and whānau connections.

**Whānau Ora**

In particular, the Report supports expanding Whānau Ora to reach more whānau. Government and non-government organisations (NGOs) are encouraged to work collaboratively to support Whānau Ora and similar approaches to working with Māori whānau. They are also encouraged to revise their programmes to utilise and support manaakitanga and whānaungatanga in the whānau with which they work.

The Committee noted the Whānau Ora approach is targeted at improving outcomes for Māori households and whānau. This approach was a response to a concern that previous interventions without a cultural, whānau or whakapapa component did not work for vulnerable whānau and tamariki Māori.

**Treaty of Waitangi**

The Committee note that responses to wellbeing issues must fit into a Te Tiriti framework, which acknowledges tino rangatiratanga and kāwanatanga working together: that is, a Government and tāngata whenua relationship. The Committee states Te Tiriti o Waitangi is based on the rights of Māori as tangata whenua, it is the responsibility of the Government of the day to respond to those rights, and there is a direct correlation between Te Tiriti o Waitangi and the health and wellbeing of tamariki Māori.

**Government comment**

The Government supports all New Zealanders through a wide range of universal and targeted services and approaches. There are also a number of Māori specific strategies and approaches in various sectors. These include *He Korowai Oranga – the Māori Health Strategy* and *Ka Hikitia – the Māori Education Strategy*.

In general, Māori, including tamariki, remain negatively over-represented in health and wellbeing outcome statistics. Therefore, ensuring state sector effectiveness for iwi, hapū and whānau Māori is a priority with a desire to see a greater sense of responsibility and accountability across the state sector for its performance for Māori.

The Government's view is that government agencies, and their sectors, are responsible for supporting whānau ora and equity of outcomes for tamariki Māori and their whānau, as part of their responsibilities for ensuring the wellbeing of the whole population. All government agencies need to consider Māori models of health and wellbeing, principles and Māori viewpoints; understand the impacts of their policies and practices on wellbeing outcomes for Māori; consider Māori as a distinct group, with diversities within it; and report outcome information for Māori alongside other groups.
This government response, outlined below, highlights a wide range of existing activity which responds to the Committee’s recommendations. This includes:

- targets, under the Better Public Services programme, for the public sector to achieve over the next five years, including five specific targets for vulnerable children;
- the White Paper for Vulnerable Children and the Children’s Action Plan, which demonstrate the Government’s commitment to providing strong leadership to support positive outcomes for vulnerable tamariki; and
- the Vulnerable Children Bill, which aims to make government agencies jointly accountable to a responsible Minister for producing, reviewing and reporting on a vulnerable children’s plan.

As tamariki Māori are over-represented in the group of vulnerable children, they are likely to benefit from these initiatives.

**Treaty of Waitangi**

The Treaty of Waitangi is New Zealand’s founding document and forms part of its constitutional fabric. The principles of Partnership, Participation and Protection will continue to underpin the relationship between iwi, hapū, whānau, Māori and the Crown:

- Partnership - working together with iwi, hapū, whānau and Māori communities to develop strategies to improve outcomes for Māori and access to appropriate services;
- Participation - involving Māori at all levels of sectors, in decision-making, planning, development and delivery of services; and
- Protection - working to ensure Māori have at least the same level of outcomes as non-Māori, and safeguarding Māori cultural concepts, values and practices.

**Effectiveness for Māori and taking a whānau-centred approach**

Successfully improving effectiveness for tamariki Māori and their whānau requires agencies to have a consistent and long-term commitment to improving outcomes for Māori. Effectiveness is in part linked to an agency’s ability to engage successfully with Māori in a way that is meaningful, viewed as an opportunity to better understand the needs of Māori and to ensure that outcomes for Māori are fully maximised. It is also linked to the ability of an agency to put in place interventions that are more holistic in nature, whānau focused and that address multiple needs. The State Services Commission and the Treasury include a link to the guidance *Measuring performance and effectiveness for Māori: key themes from the literature*, developed by Te Puni Kōkiri, on their websites as part of their guidance for Crown entities and departmental accountability.

**Ongoing support for Whānau Ora**

Significant changes are being made to the future scope and direction of Whānau Ora to include a NGO ‘commissioning for results’ model. The initial focus on building capability to provide whānau-centred services is progressing.
well and the focus will now shift to building whānau and family capability to self-manage.

Glossary of Māori terms

A glossary of Māori terms is attached as Appendix 1.
Recommendations and government response

Research and Policy

Recommendation 1
Requiring extensive, high-quality research to be undertaken into the wellbeing of tamariki Māori, and developing whānau-focused health and social services policies and programmes based on the findings. The effectiveness of these programmes should be monitored by the developers against agreed targets for which providers should be held accountable and required to report progress annually.

Response: Accept in part
The Government recognises that research to better understand the pathways to improved wellbeing for tamariki Māori, and to inform the development of policies and programmes that are effective in improving wellbeing, has the potential to generate a range of social and economic benefits. The Social Policy Evaluation and Research Unit (SuPERU), within the Families Commission, was created in 2012 to assist with this. Over time, the SuPERU’s research and evaluation programme will provide the Government with information that will help it reprioritise funding from less to more effective programmes, including programmes that aim to improve the wellbeing of tamariki Māori.

Pending legislation also directs the Families Commission ‘to establish and maintain a database of social science research undertaken by or on behalf of the Government’. The Families Commission will ensure all central and local government agencies are aware of the existence of this database, including any work being carried out on the wellbeing of tamariki Māori.

Two key long term research projects into young people and children include Growing Up in New Zealand (funded by the Ministry of Social Development and led by Auckland University) and Te Ohonga Ake; The Health Status of Māori Children and Young People in New Zealand (funded by the Ministry of Health and led by the University of Otago). Over time, the Government expects Growing Up in New Zealand to provide high quality longitudinal information on the pathways that lead to successful and equitable child development. A series of reports from the Te Ohonga Ake study examines the health of Māori children and young people and is an important resource for the health sector.

The Ministry of Health also funds the New Zealand Health Survey, which is a key vehicle for monitoring the health of tamariki Māori. Key findings from the survey are published on an annual basis, with reporting of key health indicators for tamariki Māori and non-Māori children. Rotating modules will enable a range of information about the health of tamariki Māori and their health service usage to be addressed each year.

The lack of information on programmes that are effective within a New Zealand context, and on programme effectiveness for tamariki Māori, has...
been acknowledged for some time. There is, however, work to address this lack. For example:

- the recently completed Ministry of Social Development Incredible Years pilot study examined programme acceptability and programme impacts for tamariki Māori and non-Māori children;

- across a range of services within the health sector, there are programmes that are being trialled and evaluated to ensure their effectiveness for Māori. These include:
  - a Ministry of Health funded pilot in three District Health Board (DHB) regions to test new approaches to improve integration and increase the accessibility of maternity, child health, and social services, informed by partnerships between the DHBs, local consumers and community based providers;
  - a Taitamariki Substance Misuse Prevention Service provided in three demonstration sites offering prevention services to taitamariki with the objectives of building individual and whānau resilience and preventing the onset or reducing the impact of substance abuse and other mental health problems;
  - the implementation of Rising To The Challenge: The Mental Health and Addiction Service Development Plan 2012-2017, led by the Ministry of Health. Through the implementation of this plan, DHBs are required to evaluate service effectiveness for Māori and use this information to inform future funding and service development decisions and improve services for Māori;

- each DHB must produce a Māori Health Plan, which underpins the DHB’s legislative requirement to improve Māori health. The Māori Health Plans include indicators, such as Ambulatory Sensitive Hospitalisation rates for Māori children 0-4 years of age, which are used to monitor the health of tamariki Māori. The plans are publicly available and detail the actions the DHB plans to undertake in order to address health issues and achieve indicator targets set nationally, regionally and at a district level. The information in Māori Health Plans provides annual monitoring of health outcome measures for programmes to utilise to ensure services for tamariki Māori are effective;

- the Ministry of Education is developing an approach to monitoring effectiveness of the Positive Behaviour for Learning initiative, in partnership with iwi, whānau and schools. This programme promotes positive behaviour in children and young people to improve their education outcomes; and

- SuPERU is also undertaking a review of effective parenting programmes for parents of vulnerable children, including a discussion of parenting programmes for Māori and Pacific parents.

There is also a range of activities within the Ministry of Social Development that aim to ensure that purchased services are based on evidence of effectiveness:

- the Investing in Services for Outcomes Strategic Investment Framework aims to bring greater clarity, consistency, transparency and a sharper outcomes-focus to all of the Ministry’s purchasing;
• as part of the Cross-Agency Strategy for Children and Young People in Care, Child Youth and Family is aiming to increase its investment in evidence-based services, and deliver an enhanced range of care and multi-agency support and therapeutic and educational interventions for children and young people within the high needs cohort (which has an over-representation of tamariki Māori);
• all Children’s Action Plan programmes include provision for monitoring and evaluation; and
• in the context of family violence, in 2012/13 the Ministry of Social Development undertook research into the effectiveness and best practice in primary prevention, as well as effective secondary and tertiary interventions for victims of intimate partner violence, children exposed to this violence and for elder abuse.

In addition, as part of the Whānau Ora initiative, Te Puni Kōkiri has commissioned action research to explore the development and impact of whānau-centred service delivery on whānau wellbeing. This research has highlighted findings about whānau-centred services that are beneficial to policy development. The Government’s ongoing commitment to Whānau Ora is demonstrated in its support for the new service delivery model, which establishes NGO commissioning agencies. As the commissioning agencies become embedded, it is expected that findings from action research and other Whānau Ora monitoring will be translated into practice.

**Recommendation 2**

*Developing coherent cross-government policies and an interdepartmental culture of communication and collaboration to ensure that the wellbeing of tamariki Māori is a priority for all and the necessary information is accessible.*

**Response: Accept**

The Government supports the development of coherent cross-government policies to support tamariki Māori, as well as an interdepartmental culture of communication and collaboration.

During 2013, the passage of the State Sector and Public Finance Reform Bill made changes to the State Sector, Public Finance and Crown Entities Acts which mean:

• the extension of chief executives’ responsibilities to consider collective interests of government and longer-term sustainability; and
• improved financial flexibility to support innovation and different ways of working within government.

With respect to children, the Government has sought specific cohesive policies and plans through a number of cross-agency mechanisms that include the following:

• targets under the Better Public Services programme for the public sector to achieve over the next five years, in particular with respect to supporting vulnerable children. This result area includes targets to increase participation in early childhood education, reduce the number of assaults on children, increase infant immunisation rates and reduce the incidence
of rheumatic fever. This programme cannot be achieved without lifting results for Māori, including tamariki;

- Whānau Ora, an inclusive interagency approach to providing health and social services to build the capacity of families in need. While focused on the whānau, individual needs are also addressed, including the needs of tamariki;

- Social Sector Trials, which were established to test and support the model of local solutions to local issues. Innovative ideas and joined up solutions are encouraged to improve social, health and educational outcomes for communities. The trials, while not specifically targeted at Māori, are operating in areas with high Māori populations. The model is showing improved outcomes at the local level for children and young people, which is likely to include tamariki Māori and rangatahi;

- the Children’s Action Plan, which demonstrates the Government’s commitment to providing strong leadership to support positive outcomes for vulnerable children. The Government has also introduced the Vulnerable Children Bill, which aims to make government agencies jointly accountable to a responsible Minister for producing, reviewing and reporting on a vulnerable children’s plan. That plan must set out how these agencies will work together towards collectively achieving the Government’s priorities for vulnerable children. The Government expects its whole of government approach, set out in the Vulnerable Children Bill, will ensure tamariki Māori are a priority. The Bill also has significant potential to operate as a mechanism to both improve the coherence of government policy and services for vulnerable children, and there is scope to include explicit consideration of policy and services for tamariki Māori;

- Drivers of Crime, which is a cross-agency programme that coordinates action to achieve early intervention and long term, intergenerational change to reduce offending and victimisation. A refreshed work programme was agreed in late 2013, with a greater emphasis on Māori and youth. A new priority area is about tailored local innovation with a strong focus on hard-to-reach Māori communities, particularly the youth in these communities;

- the Youth Crime Action Plan, a 10-year plan to reduce crime by tamariki and rangatahi and help those who offend to turn their lives around. Government agencies will be working together more closely and partner with Māori, communities, parents, schools and others to tackle youth crime and the factors that lead to offending. Improving outcomes for tamariki and rangatahi Māori is a critical objective of this Plan;

- the Prime Minister’s Youth Mental Health Project, which aims to significantly improve the way the Government supports rangatahi with mild to moderate mental health problems; and

- the Social Sector Forum is a mechanism governing a broad cross agency work programme on a range of issues.

Further, as part of creating a culture of communication and collaboration, Government supports improved information sharing between agencies. The Government has made amendments to the Privacy Act 1993 to facilitate the sharing of personal information to improve public services. The changes made clarify and improve the rules around how government agencies share
personal information, while ensuring safeguards are in place to protect individual's privacy. Approved Information Sharing Agreements enable the use and sharing of information between and within agencies delivering public services by modifying or clarifying the application of the information privacy principles.

Increasing the accessibility of ‘necessary information’ can occur at both a client (individual, family or whānau) level, as well as at a population level (based on agencies’ respective reporting data). As part of the Children’s Action Plan, government agencies are also exploring ways to improve information sharing at a client level (including legislative changes and privacy assessments).

**Recommendation 3**  
*Requiring a strengths-based, kaupapa Māori approach to building the capability of whānau to design and implement solutions to ensure the wellbeing of their tamariki.*

**Response: Accept**  
The Government supports the view of creating inclusive environments where whānau are active participants in designing and implementing solutions to ensure the wellbeing of their tamariki, by using Māori philosophical frameworks and practice approaches.

The Government sees the identification of whānau strengths as a core part of good practice when working with tamariki Māori. However, the adoption of a whānau-based approach must also be balanced against the needs of the child, particularly when addressing serious family issues, including physical abuse, sexual abuse and child neglect. This is consistent with the Government’s position that children’s safety should always be the overriding consideration.

Since its inception in 2010, the Government's investment in Whānau Ora has focused on achieving outcomes for whānau, including tamariki, through service and organisational transformation, and whānau integration, innovation and engagement. The collaborative effort to date includes 32 collectives and two providers representing more than 160 independent Māori, Pacific and general primary health and social services providers, as well as tribal rūnanga, marae and Māori trusts. These groups offer wrap-around services tailored to whānau. Whānau will have a practitioner or ‘navigator’ work with them to identify their needs, develop a plan to address those needs and build capacity, and broker their access to a range of health and social services. Changes to Whānau Ora will see a focus on commissioning agencies working to build whānau capacity.

The Kaitoko and Oranga Whānau programmes are two Whānau Social Assistance (WSA) programmes launched in 2009 by the Minister of Māori Affairs. The WSA programmes contract dedicated workers in at-risk communities to connect Māori whānau and individuals with appropriate social assistance services. In 2010, separate reviews were undertaken for each of
the initiatives. Analysis showed participating whānau have made significant gains in their overall wellbeing. Both initiatives have empowered whānau to make positive decisions, good choices and significant life changes.

In the education sector, the Government’s Māori education and language in education strategies, *Ka Hikitia – Accelerating Success* and *Tau Mai Te Reo*, set the frameworks for the education system to deliver effectively for and with Māori learners and their whānau. The Government has also prioritised improving participation for the most vulnerable children, including tamariki Māori, through the Early Childhood Education (ECE) Participation Programme, which began in 2010 with an initial investment of $91.7 million. The Participation Programme aims to:

- ensure solutions are appropriate to particular local communities;
- improve the responsiveness of ECE services to the needs of non-participating children and their families by using different models of provision (e.g. supported playgroups, home-based projects and identity, language and culture projects); and
- increase the supply of ECE services in target communities through full and partial funding of property projects and one-off grants.

There is also a range of current or planned initiatives that will address the way Child Youth and Family works with tamariki/mokopuna and whānau Māori, many of which are outlined in Child Youth and Family’s strategic plan for working with Māori, *Mā Mātou Mā Tātou (Changing Young Lives)*.

The Ministry of Social Development is working to ensure that families build their resilience and resources so they have the skills and knowledge to manage their own futures well. As with other Ministry services, integral to Family and Community Service’s planning and delivery processes is consideration of:

- the independence of the family and the role it plays;
- the need to focus on all families and their strengths, rather than just their weaknesses; and
- thinking about the kind of environment that helps families thrive.
Provision of Services – Practice

Recommendation 4
Providing long-term funding (multi-year appropriations) for pertinent service providers, to allow them to develop trusting relationships with whānau.

Response: Accept in part
The Government notes that financial stability, through long-term funding arrangements, can assist service providers to develop trusted relationships with whānau. However, trusting relationships with whānau are only one element that services need to ensure they help clients achieve better outcomes. Other features of effective services include a clear definition of which clients are targeted, the outcomes sought for them, a rigorous methodology for intervention; and the ability to measure outcomes, and adapt and improve over time in response to client feedback. Consequently, decisions about which providers should receive long-term funding should be based on evidence about service effectiveness for clients rather than solely on the basis of needing to develop trusting relationships with whānau.

Work across government is underway on long-term funding arrangements. Te Puni Kōkiri will contract three NGOs to deliver commissioning agency functions for Whānau Ora. The commissioning agencies will be contracted to deliver measurable improvements in whānau outcomes. Contracts will be multi-year to allow time for establishment and formation of relationships, which are required to achieve outcomes for whānau.

The Ministry of Social Development is already seeking to tie funding to achieving better outcomes for clients through the Investing in Services for Outcomes (ISO) programme. ISO is about better aligning the services the Ministry of Social Development purchases with the needs of children and families at risk of harm (particularly family violence, child maltreatment and youth offending). It will do that by more specifically defining the outcomes sought, closely targeting services to those in need, and ensuring there is evidence that the services purchased actually are effective. ISO will help clarify that services that are effective for the general population may not be the same (or not sufficient by themselves) as those that work in a Māori context.

The Ministry of Social Development also funds a number of Māori and Iwi social service providers and mainstream providers to deliver culturally-appropriate services to Māori. For example, Child, Youth and Family currently funds approved Iwi Māori Social Service providers and other Māori providers to deliver a range of services to children and families who are in care or are at risk of being in care. Some of this funding is provided in the form of long-term funding. Decisions about which providers receive this longer term funding are based on evidence about provider effectiveness.

In the health sector, the Ministry of Health’s Māori Provider Development Scheme provides funding for the capability and capacity of Māori health providers. Through the Scheme, eligible providers are now being moved to a
three-year funding pathway to allow providers to have certainty of funding for development, and provide a longer timeframe to achieve project objectives and activities.

The Ministry of Business, Innovation and Employment has developed a streamlined contracting framework that will be used by multiple government agencies when they purchase a broad range of social, health, justice and education services from NGO providers. Among other things, the contracting framework encourages Government agencies to consider whether they should use multi-year contracts rather than the more frequently used one year contracts. Expanding the length of contract term can provide significant benefit to NGO providers because it offers them greater certainty of income that allows them to better plan for, and deliver the services they are contracted to perform. Longer term contracts should provide greater opportunity for NGO providers to focus on whether the services are meeting client needs and achieving the desired results.

**Recommendation 5**
*Requiring services to be mapped demographically, or mesh-blocked, to ensure key services are available in areas of high need.*

**Response: Accept in part**
The Government notes that mapping needs geographically and matching services to identified needs (e.g. using demographic data), is a useful way to ensure that services are matched to high need areas and clients. Whether this mapping occurs at a Territorial Authority, Unit Area or Mesh Block level of aggregation depends on a range of factors. Consequently, the specific unit of analysis should remain flexible to allow for the best data to be used to support the best allocation decision-making. Services should be accessible in areas of high need but should avoid defining those communities of high need by their problems and deficits.

Agencies have varying mapping tools. For example, the Ministry of Social Development has a contract mapping tool and most services purchased and provided by the Ministry are already targeted based on demographic information. Work is also underway to increase the accuracy of the Ministry’s geographic targeting of services to need, with the option now available to target as low as area unit, and is available to many contracts.

The Ministry of Education currently geocodes ECE service locations as part of the licensing process. In the future, data from the Early Learning Information project should provide a clearer picture of where children attend ECE in relation to their home. This will support further planning for ECE services in high needs areas.

Other agencies, such as the Ministries of Health and Justice, and Te Puni Kōkiri, also map data, (e.g. geography, population, target group), relating to the contracts and services they fund. This information, along with the mapping information provided by the Ministries of Social Development and Education,
are included in the New Zealand Government website http://www.contractmapping.govt.nz

Recommendation 6
Developing the concept of mobile multi-disciplinary whānau teams to provide professional home-based services, particularly in low-income and isolated areas.

Response: Accept
The Government broadly supports developing the concept of mobile multi-disciplinary whānau teams to provide professional home-based services, particularly in low-income and isolated areas. This is the approach of the Whānau Ora, Kaitokowhānau and Oranga Whānau initiatives, which involve navigators ensuring services are comprehensive and match needs. Action research in Whānau Ora has emphasised the value of multi-disciplinary teams that can respond to whānau needs across sectors and being accessible in areas of high need.

In 2013, the Ministries of Health and Social Development implemented short-term actions to improve the way Well Child/Tamariki Ora (WCTO) and Family Start services work together. Activities included more explicitly funding joint WCTO and Family Start visits to high need families and funding joint care planning with health and other agencies as an additional contact. Linkages were also strengthened in both contracts, advice provided regarding appropriate information sharing and Family Start Key Performance Indicators were reviewed to better support timely immunisation.

As well as Family Start, the Ministry of Social Development has a number of programmes which adopt a holistic approach, e.g. Strengthening Families, Early Years Service Hubs and Whānau Toko I te Ora. Service providers are required to look at the total needs of the families involved and, where applicable, to broker relationships with other relevant agencies.

The Children’s Action Plan is currently piloting Children’s Teams, which are designed to get agencies working together to better provide cohesive support services for families and whānau in raising their children to ensure children and young people do not require a statutory intervention.

The Ministry of Education makes an education-focussed contribution to home-based services through the Parents, Family and Whānau team, which assists whānau in high potential, high risk communities, to support the learning and achievement of their children. The Team is responsible for: providing whānau with information that will help them to get involved with their children’s learning; providing intensive support to those whānau that require more targeted assistance to support their children’s learning; and promoting Ministry-led programmes to whānau.
Recommendation 7

Determine which government agency is the most appropriate to support whānau following statutory intervention in the lives of children.

Response: Noted

One of Child, Youth and Family's roles is to intervene to protect and help children, who are being abused or neglected or who have problem behaviour. It provides residential and care services for children in need of care and protection, and for young offenders and it also funds community organisations working with children, young people and their families to support the community’s role in protecting and helping children.

As part of the Children's Action Plan, a multi-agency Strategy for Children in Care is being implemented. This strategy recognises that a multi-agency response is required to addressing the multiple needs of children and young people in care and their whānau. An element of the strategy is comprehensive Gateway Assessments, which assess the full range of a child's needs and involves multiple agencies. Children’s Teams are also being set up to provide better cohesive support for tamariki from at-risk whānau before they are involved in a statutory intervention.

The Vulnerable Children Bill also includes measures to improve Child, Youth and Family’s practice post-intervention, by strengthening requirements set out in both Court and Family Group Conference plans. This aims to drive improved practice by ensuring plans following intervention include clear parental obligations and definite timeframes on decision-making, and ensure that agencies are engaged in reviewing plans for children and young people.

Over the last two years, as part of its Mā Mātou Mā Tātou strategy, Child, Youth and Family has undertaken individual site evaluation of their efforts to be more responsive in working with tamariki and whānau Māori. In addition, an investment strategy is currently being developed, which will look at the way Child, Youth and Family currently allocates its resources to ensure that it uses them in a way that is most effective. This may include the way in which whānau are supported following statutory intervention.

There is also a range of other actions currently in place within Child, Youth and Family to improve the effectiveness of its support following intervention, including:

- strengthening organisational leadership;
- the Mā Mātou Mā Tātou three year Strategic plan;
- development of an indigenous and bicultural principled practice framework;
- galvanizing of regional Rōpū Māori;
- Iwi Connect;
- tangata whenua and bi-cultural supervision; and
- reinforcing the value and use of whānau-hui and hui-a-whānau.
Recommendation 8
Requiring the Ministry of Corrections to strengthen and maintain the development and implementation of a plan to increase support for children of prisoners.

Response: Accept
The Government accepts that supporting the children of prisoners is important. In February 2013, the Department of Corrections established a Working with Children of Offenders work programme. Its purpose is to improve the quality of visits for the children of prisoners and their wider family. As a result, the Department has:

- introduced more toys and activities for children in waiting and visiting areas;
- supported Pillars\(^1\) with its Children of Prisoners awareness campaign;
- launched a new website with updated content for offenders’ friends and family members. Information on locating a prisoner, phone calls, mail and visits is now more tailored to visitor needs and expectations;
- developed a Child Protection Protocol that sets out the framework for all staff to respond where issues of a child protective nature are raised;
- implemented a dedicated phone line for Department staff to contact Child, Youth and Family to obtain expert advice and practice guidance where child abuse or neglect is either identified or suspected; and
- enabled families in Taranaki to visit family in Whanganui using Audio Visual Links (AVL). Guidelines for the implementation of virtual visits between prison and probation sites have been developed. As the AVL network in prisons is extended, the Department will work with sites to implement these guidelines.

Recommendation 9
Reviewing the provision of services regarding youth offending, with a focus on rehabilitation, integration into society, and reducing reoffending.

Response: Accept
Reducing youth crime is one of the Government’s Better Public Services target and one of the priorities for the Department of Corrections this year is early intervention in the lives of at-risk youth under its Youth Strategy. This strategy will increase accessibility, target interventions for young people and actively support young people to live pro-social lives, steering them away from offending. A bi-cultural framework has been employed to reflect the disproportionately high numbers of Māori under the age of 20 who have contact with the Department.

Within the Youth Crime Action Plan there is specific work proposed to increase the use of programmes that reduce youth offending, increase reintegration and improve rehabilitation. These are captured within a number

\(^1\) Pillars is a charitable organisation whose mission is, “to provide support to the children of prisoners in New Zealand, helping them cope with parental imprisonment, and reducing the rate of intergenerational offending.” See [http://www.pillars.org.nz](http://www.pillars.org.nz)
of the action areas including actions to ‘increase the use of evidence-based programmes’; and ‘improve the transition post youth justice residential intervention’.

Furthermore, in line with the 2013 Education Review Office review of the quality of education in Child, Youth and Family residences, including Youth Justice residences, the Ministry of Education is working to strengthen education services and develop a more integrated education and care model in these residences.

In 2013, the New Zealand Police Commissioner’s Māori Focus Forum, comprising Māori leaders from across the country, agreed on a strategy with New Zealand Police to ensure all Māori will live full and prosperous lives, free from crime and road trauma. The strategy, Turning of the Tide, was developed in partnership with these leaders, who drew on the knowledge of their own communities and iwi crime prevention strategies. The Turning of the Tide strategy identifies reducing offending and reoffending by children and young people as a priority and has set youth specific targets over a five year period from 2011/12 to 2017/18 of:

- a 10% decrease in the proportion of first time youth offenders who are Māori; and
- a 20% decrease in the proportion of repeat youth offenders who are Māori.
Provision of Services - Health

Recommendation 10
Implementing early intervention programmes for at-risk whānau.

Response: Accept
The Government is committed to supporting early intervention programmes to ensure the best outcomes for at-risk whānau. The Government provides a range of universal health services for all tamariki and their whānau, such as WCTO services and maternity services. Additional services and support are available for those assessed as high need (see below under recommendation 16).

An example is Family Start which facilitates the early identification of at-risk women and babies largely through midwives, doctors and WCTO services referring at-risk families to the programme. Thirty two social service providers are contracted to deliver home-based support to the families and whānau of 6,000 vulnerable babies and infants each year. In addition, at-risk women and babies are referred to Parents As First Teachers during the antenatal period, and Whānau Toko I Te Ora also identifies and provides services for at-risk Māori women and babies who do not normally engage with structured parenting programmes.

As outlined above, the Government has also adopted a wider strategy to address factors that place whānau and tamariki at risk in the first place, through the development of the White Paper for Vulnerable Children and the Children’s Action Plan. Central to the Children’s Action Plan’s approach is improving support to parents and strengthening the existing government services universally available to all children. A key element of the programme is the development of local Children’s Teams that will bring together frontline professionals to work with vulnerable children who have been identified as being at risk of abuse or neglect. Children who meet the threshold of acceptance into a Children’s Team will be provided with coordinated wrap-around services. In the absence of Children’s Teams, many DHBs have established multi-disciplinary groups who help connect vulnerable pregnant women to the appropriate support agencies.

Additionally, the Government’s Better Public Services targets support early intervention for vulnerable children, aiming to increase participation in ECE, increase infant immunisation rates, reduce the incidence of rheumatic fever and reduce the number of assaults on children.

Recommendation 11
Implementing a national quadruple health enrolment scheme, involving enrolling every child with a general practitioner, a Well Child Tamariki Ora provider, on the national immunisation register, and with an oral health provider.
Response: Accept in part
The Government is working with DHBs to encourage the development and implementation of local systems for multiple enrolment notification. More than half of DHBs are already implementing or working towards implementing multiple enrolment notification systems. The remainder will be expected to in the next 12 months. The Ministry of Health will continue to work with these DHBs to ensure better access to key health services at the earliest stage of life and improved health outcomes for tamariki Māori.

Recommendation 12
Developing community hubs, linked to Whānau Ora providers, to offer integrated health and social services from single locations.

Response: Accept in part
The Government is working towards a more integrated approach to the delivery of health and social services.

As part of the Government’s Better Sooner More Convenient programme, the Ministry of Health has supported the development of service hubs called Integrated Family Health Centres or Whānau Ora Centres. These service hubs meet the needs of local communities by providing seamless access to a range of health services in one location. Some hubs linked to Whānau Ora providers have been opened, such as Te Whānau O Waipareira’s ‘Whānau Centre’, which is a one-stop frontline Whānau Ora hub integrating all whānau services.

In Budget 2013, the Government funded $1.2 million to develop marae and community hubs that will deliver social services to communities. This project will encourage marae based learning and initiatives to promote whānau literacy, including financial literacy and health literacy which will boost iwi engagement and student achievement. Ten demonstration sites have been nominated. Other hubs include Early Years Service Hubs, Family Service Centres, Community Links and Youth One-stop Shops.

Recommendation 13
Creating incentives for the health sector to find and use a consistent, robust, reliable way to assess and reach every whānau, with a particular emphasis on those that are hard to reach.

Response: Noted
The Government intends to implement a new Integrated Performance and Incentive Framework from July 2014 with the initial scope focussing on primary health care services. In addition to current measures and incentives focussed on individual providers, the new Framework plans to measure and incentivise collective performance of the system including DHBs, primary health organisations and providers. This means that regions will need to lift performance and health outcomes across the communities within their district if they wish to receive the financial and non-financial incentives on offer. The proposed framework will report information by population groups, including
Māori, enabling the health sector to identify and reach the population groups that most need assistance.

**Recommendation 14**

*Working to build the Māori health workforce by increasing support for education and recruitment.*

**Response: Accept**

The Government has worked on growing and developing the Māori health and disability workforce through a range of Māori health workforce service programmes. Examples include the Hauora Māori Training Fund that supports the development of the Māori non-regulated health and disability workforce, and the Hauora Māori Scholarship programme that provides financial assistance to Māori students who are undertaking a tertiary health related programme and are committed to improving Māori health.

The Ministry of Health requires DHBs to identify baseline figures and increase the numbers of Māori health care workers to better reflect the demography of the community being served. Health Workforce New Zealand (HWNZ) has funded regional training hubs that have progressed work on increasing the number of graduates, including Māori, in the health workforce, and increasing the level of support to DHBs to strengthen and ensure national consistency of workforce planning. Components of HWNZ’s clinical training budgets are ring-fenced for Māori workforce development, including funding to provide cultural support for graduate and postgraduate nurses. HWNZ is also working with education providers and employers to increase the number of Māori trainees through the Voluntary Bonding Scheme and Advanced Trainee Fellowship Scheme, as well as support entry for Māori into Rural immersion and Rural Origin Medical Preferential Entry programmes.

For 2015 Investment Plans, the Tertiary Education Commission will expect to see evidence that Tertiary Education Organisations are responding to the needs of the Māori health workforce by actively growing Māori enrolments in health fields of study and at higher levels through recruitment and by providing relevant qualification programmes. The Tertiary Education Commission’s draft strategy for ensuring Māori success, *Tū Māia e te Ākonga 2014-2018*, currently being finalised for public consultation, will reinforce this approach.

In addition, one of the priorities of the draft *Tertiary Education Strategy* is to increase the number of Māori achieving at higher levels of the New Zealand Qualifications Framework from levels 4 and above, because this is the level that has good employment and labour market outcomes. There is also a focus on guiding Māori learners into high-growth, high-demand fields with high potential for progression; health is considered to be one of these fields.
Recommendation 15
Funding evidence-based initiatives to reduce teenage pregnancy.

Response: Accept
The Government is committed to reducing teenage pregnancy and providing services to support existing teen parents and their children. The Government provides funding of around $56 million each year into nationwide health promotion and sexual and reproductive health services. Budget 2011 provided $7.3 million over four years for new sexual health initiatives, including sexuality education evaluation, condom promotion initiatives, and community health projects. Resources will be refocused to enable better support for high-needs groups, such as young Māori and Pacific people.

The Government funds school-based health services, which are nurse-led health clinics located in state secondary schools that provide accessible, low-cost, comprehensive youth focused services. Of the schools that provide these services, 47% of their students are Māori. Recent evidence indicates that school-based health services are associated with fewer teen pregnancies among students. Additionally, access to a range of medications, including contraceptives, is provided through the New Zealand Pharmaceutical Schedule.

Sexual and reproductive health is a core part of the education curriculum. The effectiveness of this in individual schools is reviewed through the Education Review Office. The Ministry of Education will review the sexuality education guidelines in 2014 to better support boards of trustees and principals to deliver sexuality education programmes in line with the New Zealand Curriculum.

The Government also provides a range of subsidies to reduce financial barriers for young people accessing primary health care services, including sexual and reproductive health services. Subsidies include Very Low Cost Access funding for access to primary care, capitation funding for enrolled patients and a fee-for-service subsidy for non-enrolled patients.

Recommendation 16
Ensuring access for all whānau to well-designed pre-birth programmes, antenatal care and education, and early childhood development programmes.

Response: Accept
The Government provides a wide range of programmes to support whānau to maximise their child’s developmental potential and health during their early years, and establish a strong foundation for healthy development.

WCTO is a universal screening, surveillance, education and support service offered to all tamariki and their whānau from birth to five years of age. Plunket provide the majority of service coverage with the remaining WCTO providers being predominantly Māori and Pacific providers. All children and their whānau are eligible for core contacts at specific stages of infant and child development. Additional contacts are provided for high-needs and hard-to-
reach whānau who are assessed as requiring further support. WCTO services support whānau health and wellbeing, and play a key role in supporting breastfeeding and promoting safe sleep. The Ministry of Health has also been working on building connections between WCTO providers and other services, such as Family Start. These links facilitate greater access for tamariki and whānau to a wide range of other services.

The B4 School Check is the final WCTO core contact and offers a free health and development check for four year olds. The B4 School Check aims to identify and address any health, behavioural, social, or developmental concerns which could affect a child’s ability to get the most benefit from school, such as a hearing problem or communication difficulty. In 2013, the Government announced additional funding of $7 million over four years to increase coverage of the B4 School Check from 80% to 90% of the eligible population, including 90% of the eligible high deprivation population. Each DHB plans and implements the B4 School Check in a way that suits the needs of its local population and health workforce.

Additionally, the Ministry of Health funds Sudden Unexplained Death of an Infant (SUDI) prevention through three contracts with NGOs. Activities include:

- up-skilling health professionals who work with whānau, and work with DHBs to develop and progress SUDI prevention initiatives;
- more targeted SUDI prevention support for DHBs that have the highest risk populations; and
- maintaining and expanding a network of safe sleep champions who communicate safe sleep messages.

The Ministry of Health has also supported the World Health Organisation’s Baby Friendly Hospital Initiative global campaign since 2002. The goal of the campaign is to increase breastfeeding initiation and duration rates by protecting, promoting and supporting breastfeeding. The exclusive breastfeeding rates on discharge from hospitals have increased from 55.6% in 2001 to 82.8% in 2012.

Further, the Ministry of Health is working to improve the quality and outcomes of maternal and infant health services. This work includes increasing early engagement with primary maternity services through DHB maternity quality and safety programmes, and improving new-born health service enrolment rates by supporting DHB multiple enrolment systems.

The Ministry of Health has undertaken a review of DHB funded Pregnancy and Parenting Information and Education, and will introduce a new service specification in 2014 to ensure that DHB funded services best meet the needs of families, as well as providing practical support for healthy pregnancies, healthy families and positive parenting. The new service specification will set a clear expectation that education for pregnancy and parenting will extend beyond the traditional scope of childbirth education.
The Ministry is a joint funder, with the Health Research Council, of a research project that studies the causes and consequences of preventable severe acute maternal morbidities to reduce the impact of severe harm for pregnant Māori women and their whānau.

In the education sector, the ECE Participation Programme includes the initiative Poipoiā te mokopuna[^2] which aims to support whānau to engage in their children’s early learning through their role as their child’s first teacher. The programme supports whānau to understand the value of early learning and be informed, demanding and determining of their children’s learning by providing opportunities for whānau to:

- acknowledge their potential to champion their children’s learning;
- acknowledge and build on the skills they already have as first teachers;
- embrace everyday interactions and activities as learning opportunities;
- understand the value of early learning and make this a priority;
- build confidence and a culture of learning within whānau and communities; and
- develop a readiness to enrol in formal ECE programmes.

**Recommendation 17**
Commissioning an intensive review of the provision of specialised mental health services for Māori.

**Response: Noted**
The Ministry of Health leads implementation of *Rising to the Challenge: The Mental Health and Addiction Service Development Plan 2012-2017*. *Rising to the Challenge* includes a requirement for DHBs to evaluate service effectiveness for Māori and use this information to inform future funding and service development decisions. DHBs are required to measure and compare the performance of mental health and addiction programmes and services (in both mainstream and kaupapa Māori settings) in terms of access and outcomes for Māori, relative to other population groups, and to use this information to improve services. All DHBs (with the exception of two) will have completed this action by July 2015. The Ministry of Health is working closely with the remaining DHBs to support them in achieving this action.

**Recommendation 18**
*Increasing support for the promotion of smokefree environments, by way of policy, cessation services, and mass media campaigns targeting Māori youth, pregnant women and parents.*

**Response: Accept**
In March 2011, the Government committed to a goal of New Zealand becoming smokefree by 2025. Māori and Pacific youth, and pregnant women have been identified as groups who need additional support as the Government pursues this goal. The Government provides support through:

[^2]: Nurture the grandchildren
• the promotion of smokefree environments, undertaken by all DHBs. Local authorities also play a key role in this area with many having smokefree parks and malls;
• funding a number of national tobacco control providers such as Action on Smoking and Health (known as ASH), Smokefree Coalition and Te Ara Hā Ora; and
• the provision of face-to-face and telephone smoking cessation services.

The Ministry of Health, through contracts with the Health Promotion Agency, is also running a social media campaign "The Movement" that targets young people. It is developing a new mass media campaign aimed at increasing the prevalence of anti-tobacco and pro-smokefree attitudes, and reducing uptake and increasing cessation among young adults. The focus of the campaign is young adults aged 17-24 years old, predominantly focused on Māori, with additional at-risk groups such as pregnant women and Pacific people also being targeted. A media campaign targeting smoking in cars was also run in early 2014, and further work is now being carried out to assess next steps.

The Government has a health target, better help for smokers to quit. Within this target there is a sub-target that measures progress towards 90% of pregnant women who identify as smokers being offered advice and support to quit. Additionally, in 2013, the Ministry of Health contracted a new training programme, Te Hapū Ora³, to enable midwives to support pregnant women to quit smoking. The Ministry of Health is also in the process of developing a workshop for the pregnancy specific smoking cessation services. Workshops will focus on best practice strategies that will assist smoking cessation providers to increase their capacity to support more pregnant women to quit smoking and improve the performance of their services.

A national maternity and neonatal system is also being implemented by the Maternity Information System Programme, which will allow for maternal tobacco use and smoking cessation to be nationally captured and reported on.

The Ministry of Health has recently commissioned a review of all smoking cessation services to determine whether existing services are still supported by current evidence, are appropriately configured and ideally located based on need and prevalence, in order to achieve the Smokefree New Zealand 2025 goal. Though there is already the expectation on all funded services to prioritise Māori, and in particular Māori women who are pregnant, the outcome of the review will inform the ongoing development of effective smoking cessation programmes that target the most at-risk groups, in order to meet the 2025 goal.

³ Pregnancy well-being
Recommendation 19
Facilitating partnerships between health providers, community groups, and marae to encourage the production and consumption of healthy food.

Response: Accept in part
The Government is investing in a range of prevention programmes to reduce unhealthy weight and promote healthy lifestyles. For example, this year the Government will launch a new community-level health promotion and risk prevention initiative, Healthy Families NZ. This will see community-led local health promotion activity taking place to help families make healthier choices, and reduce risk factors for chronic disease.

Other services currently delivered work to improve personal skills and knowledge about nutrition and physical activity, and support healthy choices at a community level. Many of these services are delivered by Māori health providers, some of which include working with community groups and marae around the production and consumption of healthy food, for example through collaborative Maara Kai initiatives. Maara Kai, launched in 2009, is one of three Te Puni Kōkiri Whānau Social Assistance Programmes, which aims to boost the level of involvement by Māori in community gardening projects and produce health, financial and social benefits. The initiative continues to draw positive anecdotal feedback. Whānau, marae, kura and other groups who have received Maara Kai funding, have told Te Puni Kōkiri, that the presence of this initiative has not only raised access to fresh, nutritional kai, but brings the additional benefits of skills, cultural and new knowledge, and resource development associated with growing, maintaining and harvesting maara.

Recommendation 20
Encouraging the medical profession to offer specific vocational training in order to serve Māori patients better as a routine component of on-going professional development.

Response: Noted
The Health Practitioners Competence Assurance Act 2003 sets out a requirement for each regulatory authority to set standards of cultural competence to be observed by health practitioners (see s118(i) of the Act). As such, all sixteen regulatory authorities are required to set standards of cultural competence for their respective workforces.

To support regulatory authorities in this work, the Ministry of Health has developed an online cultural competency tool. The online tool provides foundation level training in cultural competency, has an in-depth emphasis on Māori culture and Māori health and a module on health literacy that is intended to raise awareness of different levels of health literacy amongst health professionals. Between June 2012, when the tool was launched, and December 2013 over 9,900 health professionals accessed the cultural competency training tool. The tool is accessed by both the regulated and non-regulated health workforce.
Recommendation 21

Increasing promotion of and participation in Māori health promotion models such as Te Pae Mahutonga, Te Whare Tapa Whā, and Te Wheke.

Response: Noted

The Ministry of Health promotes Māori health models through its website (http://www.health.govt.nz). The three models included on its website are Te Pae Mahutonga, Te Whare Tapa Whā, and Te Wheke and these models are presented in summary and in diagrammatic form.

Recommendation 22

Ensuring community services, including health services, operating out of school grounds are not at a cost to school budgets.

Response: Accept in part

The Government funds a range of health services that are delivered out of school grounds. The services are funded through the Ministry of Health or the local DHB, but the service providers involved may require access to appropriate school facilities in order to deliver these services. How this is determined varies depending on the nature of the services. Some examples of health services delivered on school grounds are:

- as part of the Prime Minister's Youth Mental Health Project, the Ministry of Health and DHBs fund $8.96 million worth of school-based health services for decile 1-3 secondary schools, teen parent units and alternative education facilities. School-based health services are nurse-led services that provide accessible, free, comprehensive youth focused health services;

- public health services also provide a range of services within schools. These include 280 full-time equivalent public health nurses who work closely with schools to provide free health services that include clinical assistance with health issues, health promotion, immunisation programmes (to children in year 7 and 8 in participating schools), and follow-up home visits with whānau to help them access any supports they may require;

- other public health services delivered in schools include the Health Promoting Schools programme (HPS), which provides advice and support to schools to identify issues that may impact upon their students' health and learning, and how best to address these using a whole school and community approach. HPS also supports coordination of the Ministry of Health funded Fruit in Schools programme, which provides a piece of fruit five days a week to all students in low decile primary and intermediate schools. Nationally, over 96,000 children in 473 schools will enjoy more than 18 million pieces of fruit in 2014. The Government provides funding of $6.9 million for the Fruit in Schools programme. The schools are not charged a fee for these services;

- the Rheumatic Fever Prevention Programme provides a school based throat swabbing service for schools with at-risk population groups. As at January 2014, there are 49,212 at-risk children in more than 200 schools covered by the school-based throat swabbing programme to treat sore throats. The programme is on track to achieve the target of more than
50,000 children being involved by the end of February 2014. The schools are not charged a fee for the service; and
- community oral health services are often delivered from school-based dental clinics. From 2009 onwards, DHBs upgraded and relocated dental clinics with transfer of ownership from the Ministry of Education to DHBs so that DHBs now own, control and maintain dental clinics. For mobile dental clinics located on school grounds, there are lease arrangements that set out the terms under which the DHB funded service can use the site (such as that the DHB pays for the power used).

**Recommendation 23**

*Ensuring that health literacy education is based on kaupapa Māori, and communicated in a culturally appropriate way.*

**Response: Accept**

The Ministry of Health’s work around health literacy has focused on building a health literacy evidence base, ensuring health programmes work for people with lower health literacy levels, and raising awareness of health literacy within the health workforce. Central to this work has been the release of an online Foundation Course in Cultural Competency (containing a module on health literacy) that is available free for all health workers to access.

Other examples of current and recent Ministry of Health activities include research projects on effective approaches that strengthen health literacy, the development of a tool for assessing health literacy environments in health care organisations, and whānau-centred health literacy projects. Many of these projects focus on Māori and have generally used a whānau-inclusive kaupapa Māori approach when seeking opinions and gathering and providing information.
**Provision of Services - Education**

**Recommendation 24**  
Encouraging whānau-friendly parenting programmes and adult education courses in schools to encourage all parents to take part in the school community.

**Response: Accept in part**  
The Government agrees with the importance of whānau-friendly parenting programmes and the role they play in encouraging all parents to take part in the school community. The Government funds a number of parenting programmes including some kaupapa Māori and culturally adapted programmes. The White Paper for Vulnerable Children highlighted the importance of positive parenting practices for optimal child development and the value of supporting parenting, especially in the early years. Resulting from the White Paper, SuPERU is undertaking a review for the Vulnerable Children’s Board on what are effective parenting programmes and whether New Zealand has the right mix of such programmes. The report will include an examination of parenting programmes within a whānau context.

Some schools and ECE providers are currently used for non-educational services and/or as sites of community interaction. Through the SKIP (Strategies with Kids, Information for Parents) Local Initiatives Fund, the Ministry of Social Development has supported a range of parenting projects based in and around schools, ECE sites and kōhanga reo. Additionally, 15 of the existing 32 HIPPY (Home Interaction Programme for Parents and Youngsters) sites are located in schools. Feedback from families has been that these activities have helped to support their children’s transition to schools and the relationship with school communities.

High quality ECE and childcare programmes for infants usually include strong parent participation components, and can provide an opportunity for parents to learn about child development, increase their parenting skills and confidence, develop positive social networks, and ‘tap into’ wider community resources and support.

**Recommendation 25**  
Taking steps to increase the number of Māori teacher aides as a pathway to increasing the number of Māori teachers.

**Response: Not accepted**  
This recommendation is interpreted as seeking an increase in the number of teacher aides proficient in the Māori medium of language, culture and identity for the purpose of scaffolding these people into qualified teaching positions. The Government agrees there is a need to increase the number of teachers but disagrees that this is achieved through a focus on Māori teacher aides.

Currently, there is no strong evidence that the role of teacher aide is one that leads directly to successful enrolment in and completion of teacher education qualifications. The decision to fund teacher aide positions is made on a
school-by-school basis, and decisions about who is employed in these roles is also made at the level of the individual school.

The Government is, however, aware of, and responding to, the ongoing shortage of teachers specialising in te reo Māori and Māori medium in the schooling sector. Over the last three years, the focus of TeachNZ scholarships (primary and secondary education) has been tightened and targets only te reo Māori and Māori medium teaching qualifications.

Since 2013, virtually all new TeachNZ scholarships are targeted to support the recruitment of Māori trainee teachers. These scholarships do provide a pathway for Māori language speakers to train to become teachers. The scholarships are for people who are either proficient or fluent in te reo Māori, have a depth of life and work experience, and who wish to change careers to work as a teacher in te reo Māori.

Currently there are 567 students with a TeachNZ scholarship working through the 3-5 years of study required to complete these qualifications; of these, 458 began their scholarship in the last three years. This clearly shows the focus on recruitment has lifted the profile of te reo Māori and Māori medium qualifications.

The Ministry of Education’s supply and demand research indicates that sufficient numbers of Māori medium teachers are being trained but concerns remain over the retention of beginning teachers in Māori medium. This is being addressed through the Budget 2013 initiative for a Retention Pilot Programme for Māori Medium Beginning Teachers.

**Recommendation 26**

*Implementing teacher training programmes to improve teachers’ awareness of the social justice issues regarding education and tamariki Māori in poverty, and to equip teachers to teach in empowering and culturally appropriate ways. These programmes should be a core part of teachers’ initial training and ongoing professional development.*

**Response: Accept**

All programmes of teacher education are directly informed by the Registered Teacher criteria, the criteria for quality teaching that must be met by all fully registered teachers in New Zealand. The criteria include the following overarching statements:

- teachers play a critical role in enabling the educational achievement of all akonga/learners;
- the Treaty of Waitangi extends equal status and rights to Māori and Pakeha. This places a particular responsibility on all teachers in Aotearoa New Zealand to promote equitable learning outcomes;
- in an increasingly multi-cultural Aotearoa New Zealand, teachers need to be aware of and respect the languages, heritages and cultures of all akonga/learners; and
in Aotearoa New Zealand, the Code of Ethics/Ngā Tikanga Matatika commits registered teachers to the highest standards of professional service in promoting the learning of those they teach.

Current centrally funded professional learning and development for practicing leaders and teachers has a strong emphasis on culturally responsive pedagogy, particularly for priority learner groups. Professional learning and development providers are required to demonstrate improved outcomes particularly for these learner groups, across a range of areas.

A review of professional learning and development is currently underway and includes a focus on improving teachers’ awareness of the social justice issues regarding education and tamariki Māori in poverty, and equipping teachers to teach in empowering and culturally appropriate ways.

The Ministry of Education’s Professional Development programme for ECE, *Strengthening Early Learning Opportunities*, is focused on providing expert assistance to ECE services. For example, one programme focuses on Māori leadership to strengthen culturally intelligent leaders in ECE. Another focuses on working with ECE services catering to vulnerable communities to ensure that the service is culturally intelligent and responsive to the needs of its communities.

In time, there is potential for the proposed new body, taking over the functions of the New Zealand Teachers Council, to be asked to further review and identify options to strengthen the programme requirements. Specifically those linked to the registered teacher requirements that focus on culturally responsive pedagogies with tamariki Māori, issues of social justice, and children living and learning in poverty.

**Recommendation 27**

*Extending programmes and interventions such as Te Kotahitanga to all schools.*

**Response: Noted**

There are a number of professional learning and development programmes that have specifically focussed on improving outcomes for tamariki and rangatahi via culturally responsive leadership (*He Kākano*); teaching and learning design (*Te Kotahitanga*); and iwi partnerships with schools (*Te Kauhau* and others). The newly developed *Building on Success* professional learning and development programme for secondary schools has drawn from the findings of these initiatives to have continued impact on improved outcomes and ensure greater equity for Māori students.

*Building on Success* contributes to the Government’s Better Public Service NCEA Level 2 target, the focus on priority learners, and learners in Years 9 and 10. It also directly contributes to the outcomes of *Ka Hikitia Accelerating Success 2013-2017*, the Ministry’s education strategy for Māori learners.
Recommendation 28
Taking the lead in ensuring equitable access to technology for all tamariki Māori.

Response: Accept
Digital technology provides opportunities for tamariki Māori to access learning experiences that recognise their identity, language and culture, build on their strengths and talents and address their particular learning needs through personalised learning programmes. For example, Ngāti Hine, an iwi located in the Far North, is in the process of piloting a literacy programme using technology to tell its iwi history and stories. Several iwi are developing digital archives to provide historical digital records, which will form the basis of teaching resources.

The Government, through the Ministry of Education, also helps support the Te Rangitawaea festival on the East Coast, which is focused on using digital technology linked to local language and culture, and involves the whole community. Work is underway in the Learning with Digital Technologies work programme to ensure that digital technologies enable every student to achieve educational success.

In addition, Te Kura Māori (Victoria University) provide professional learning and development for te reo Māori in Māori medium education. Te Kura Māori developed the ‘Kura App’, a free te reo Māori application available to Apple iPhone users, on itunes, and on google and playstore. It can be directly loaded on to laptops for schools.

Recommendation 29
Address the funding inequities between kōhanga reo and other early childhood education services.

Response: Accept
The Government has agreed to a process with Te Kōhanga Reo National Trust to respond to the Waitangi Tribunal report on WAI 2336, which includes how kōhanga reo are funded.

Recommendation 30
Requiring the Ministry of Education and the Ministry of Māori Affairs, in conjunction with teacher training providers, to develop and implement a plan to increase the number of Te Reo-speaking teachers and improve delivery of education services in Te Reo Māori, in both full immersion and bilingual settings.

Response: Accept
In 2013, the Ministry of Education released the Government’s Tau Mai Te Reo – the Māori Language in Education Strategy 2013-2017, which provides a way for increasing the value of the Government’s investment in Māori language in education over the next five years. There are several programmes and initiatives currently underway within the Tau Mai Te Reo implementation plan to support this recommendation, such as efforts to boost the number of
qualified, culturally intelligent and enthusiastic teachers in early learning and the compulsory schooling sector. Other examples are:

- **Whakapiki i te reo**\(^4\), provision of professional development for kaiako to strengthen skills for teaching te reo Māori;
- the setting of te reo Māori proficiency levels for entry to and exit from Māori medium initial teacher education programmes; and
- lifting the quality of teaching in Māori medium settings (language quality and pedagogy).

The Government also provides scholarships through TeachNZ to support people who are proficient or fluent in te reo Māori to train as teachers at ECE, primary and secondary levels.

---

\(^4\) Promote the language
Provision of Services - Housing

Recommendation 31
Promoting partnerships between central and local government, the Māori Trustee, and iwi organisations to utilise property assets to build housing for whānau on Māori land and address the shortage of affordable and appropriate social housing.

Response: Accept
The Government is developing a Māori Housing Strategy - He Whare Ahuru He Oranga Tangata, which will be considered by Cabinet in April/May 2014. The focus of the Strategy is the key role housing plays in whānau well-being as well as providing opportunities for Māori collectives to become housing developers and/or provide housing services. The success of the strategy depends on partnerships between central and local government, and key stakeholders such as the Māori Trustee, iwi, hapū and land trusts.

In addition, there are Government programmes that support housing for Māori; Putea Māori from the Social Housing Fund, Kāinga Whenua Loans and the Kāinga Whenua Infrastructure Grant. Kāinga Whenua Loans are provided by Kiwibank and guaranteed by Housing New Zealand Corporation for building, relocating or repairing a house on Māori land. In November 2013, the Government agreed to a further change to the Kāinga Whenua Loans product so that Māori Trusts can apply for a loan to undertake a multi-house development (papakainga), thus making building on multiple-owned Māori land easier.

In December 2013, the Government launched the $3 million per annum Kainga Whenua Infrastructure Grant Fund to help Māori individuals, land trusts and other collectives develop housing on ancestral Māori land. The funding is provided for those additional infrastructure costs, such as establishing roading and services.

The Government also made changes to an existing proposal development programme so that it can better support Māori organisations and trusts to prepare for social and affordable housing development on Māori land. The Kainga Whenua Project Capability or Proposal Development Grant, of between $500,000 and $1 million, is available to assist housing providers with initial up-front proposal development costs and for building their capability to manage future housing projects and portfolios, leveraging off the Special Housing Action Zones funding programme administered by Te Puni Kōkiri.

From 2009, Te Puni Kōkiri entered into a three year agreement as a joint agency group (JAG) with Western Bay of Plenty District Council, Tauranga City Council, Bay of Plenty Regional Council, Māori Land Court, Housing New Zealand Corporation. The JAG approach is an approach to test and work collaboratively, to minimise respective agency barriers to developing housing on Māori land, by working with a Māori land trust. They support the trust on aspirational and conceptual visioning to develop and complete a papakāinga
housing project and then document the process into a toolkit (Te Ketepara
mō ngā Papakāinga).5

This JAG approach was further accelerated from 2011 to 2013 by holding
papakāinga workshops and utilising the steps in the papakāinga toolkit with 35
land trusts. For the Western Bay of Plenty region, this approach has worked
successfully and, to date, four papakāinga developments have been
completed. A further three projects have made application to the Putea Māori
fund. This approach is now being implemented in Taitokerau, Tairawhiti, and
West Auckland.

**Recommendation 32**

*Implementing housing warrants of fitness for rental properties, in line with the
recommendation from the Children’s Commissioner’s Expert Advisory Group
on Solutions to Child Poverty.*

**Response: Noted**

The Government is currently trialling a Warrant of Fitness system on Housing
New Zealand Corporation housing properties. No decisions have been made
regarding application of the standards beyond these properties. Officials will
report to Cabinet by 31 July 2014 on the results of this trial, and then Ministers
will consider next steps. The design of any legislative framework to implement
a Warrant of Fitness for the private rental market would need to consider the
full range of costs and benefits, and potential unintended consequences such as
increased rent for low income tenants.

5 Toolbox/kit for the home base/village
Recommendation 33
Requiring government departments, in consultation with Māori authorities, to develop initiatives to target long-term unemployed young people and increase investment in tamariki Māori and rangatahi.

Response: Noted
Work and Income New Zealand delivers a range of initiatives to support young people into work and out of welfare dependency, including for Māori clients. For example:

- the Youth Service is delivered through youth-focused community providers or specialist youth case managers and aims to get disengaged youth back into education or training;
- Limited Service Volunteer (LSV) is a six-week programme for 18 to 25 year old beneficiaries who are at risk of long-term unemployment. LSV aims to increase the number of young people entering employment by improving participants’ discipline, confidence, motivation and initiative; and
- Work and Income New Zealand offers wage subsidies and training for youth clients at risk of long-term benefit dependency, including Job Streams (which helps employers take on beneficiaries by providing wage subsidies, training and in-work support) and Industry Partnerships (which involves partnering with employers, training organisations and other agencies to meet employers’ needs and provide job opportunities for clients).

Further, the Government has:

- strengthened its response to unemployed young people through the introduction of its Youth Service for at-risk 16-17 year olds who are not engaged in education, employment or training (NEETs). Approximately half of these young people are Māori; and
- introduced welfare reforms underpinned by its ‘Investment Approach’, which directs resources towards those most at risk of long-term benefit dependency, including Māori clients.

Recommendation 34
Develop region-specific sustainable economic and employment plans in areas of high Māori unemployment in collaboration with whānau, hapū, iwi, Māori corporations, the Māori business sector, and regional economic development agencies.

Response: Noted
The Government is currently focused on lifting educational outcomes for Māori through its:

- Better Public Services priority - boosting skills and employment;
- Business Growth Agenda: ‘Skilled and Safe Workplaces’; and

The key initiative under the Business Growth Agenda’s ‘Skilled and Safe Workplaces’ programme is the implementation of New Zealand
Apprenticeships and the expansion of Māori and Pasifika Trades Training initiatives.

Goal 2 in *He Kai Kei Aku Ringa* is developing a skilled and successful workforce. Recommendation 7 under this goal is to increase the level of Māori participation in the labour market. The associated action is to develop place-based workforce strategies in areas with high Māori populations and high unemployment rates, where there are sectors with employment potential.

Work and Income New Zealand also has partnerships with a number of iwi, which include support to develop and implement workforce development strategies that create work for Māori, and advance relationships with employers to match workers and services tailored to their needs. Iwi partnerships also increase employers’ capability and the resilience of their workforce.

The Māori Business Facilitation Service, within Te Puni Kōkiri, provides nationwide access to research, information, skills and knowledge for potential business owners.

The Government is aware of the need to work with regions to identify opportunities for growth (economic and employment), especially those regions where there is a high Māori population and significant Māori unemployment. A study is being undertaken on the East Coast region on the economic potential of the area.

**Recommendation 35**

*D: Develop, in cooperation with industry, educational institutions, iwi, and communities, skill acquisition and retraining opportunities in emerging sectors for workers in insecure or transitional industries in areas of high Māori population.*

**Response: Noted**

As already noted in Recommendation 34, the Government has a number of strategies designed to build the skills of Māori to improve their employment opportunities. *He Kai Kei Aku Ringa* includes a recommendation that 'Iwi and collectives determine future skill needs, either using existing tools available from government agencies or by developing their own tools/models.' It also includes actions to target aspects of skills, sectors and regional opportunities.

In addition, the Government has a draft *Tertiary Education Strategy 2014 to 2019* that emphasises the need to strengthen labour market outcomes, includes a focus on providing skills for industry and has a specific priority of improving Māori and Pacific achievement.

Other programmes that are focused on accelerating Māori success in tertiary education include:

- New Zealand Apprenticeships – combining Modern Apprenticeships and other apprenticeship-type training into an expanded and improved scheme;
• the Māori and Pasifika Trades Training Initiative;
• fee-free level 1 and 2 study for those aged under 25;
• Trades Academies; and
• improved information for learners and whānau.

**Recommendation 36**

*Develop clear higher education pathways and meaningful paid employment opportunities for parents and caregivers.*

**Response: Accept**

The Government’s focus has been on shifting the welfare system from a benefit dependency state to an investment approach that assists parents and caregivers into higher education and meaningful paid employment. The Ministry of Social Development is implementing changes by aligning supports and services for parents and caregivers receiving welfare benefits where they will make the biggest difference to improving their employment outcomes and thereby reducing the overall liability of the benefit system. Over time, the Ministry of Social Development will identify cohorts of beneficiaries, which could include specific groups of parents or caregivers, to work with more intensively to support them into work – or into education or training that will lead to work.

The Ministry of Social Development also has a number of programmes that support beneficiaries, including parents and caregivers, to enter into higher education:

• the Training Incentive Allowance;
• contracts with providers to deliver employment related training;
• facilitating access to specified level 1-2 tertiary education courses;
• childcare and out of school care subsidies;
• the Youth Service which provides wraparound support to unemployed or disengaged young people and teen parents to help them into education, training or work based learning;
• work brokers that operate out of service centres link up employers and beneficiaries by matching skill and labour needs;
• Job Streams which provides a wage subsidy or training related to industry needs; and
• the Working for Families package.

The Tertiary Education Commission also administers the Youth Guarantee scheme and is fine-tuning the New Zealand qualifications system to better channel young parents and care-givers into vocational pathways.

The Government has also developed Vocational Pathways to provide clear pathways into and through higher education. This programme provides students with tools to build a NCEA qualification, focusing on specific sectors, and a guide to what skills are valued by an industry.
The Government is also considering the Employment Relations Amendment Bill 2013, which will, among other matters, enable a wider range of employees to request flexible working conditions.

**Recommendation 37**  
*Continue to increase the minimum wage.*

**Response: Noted**  
The Minister of Labour has a statutory obligation under the Minimum Wage Act 1983 to review the minimum wage rates by 31 December each year. The Government’s objective for the minimum wage review is ‘to keep increasing the minimum wage over time to protect the real income of low-paid workers while minimising job losses’.

To fulfil the objective of the minimum wage review, the Ministry of Business, Innovation and Employment has a practice of developing a range of options for the minimum wage and assessing the impacts of each option. Recent minimum wage reports have analysed the impact of the options on wages and inflation, employment, minimum wage workers, industries, the state sector and the interface with other government interventions.

The Government has progressively raised the levels of the minimum wage over the last five years, within the fiscal and other constraints it is operating under, that gives increases to low income earners, including Māori, and also ensures employers can stay in business to recruit workers.

**Recommendation 38**  
*Review Working for Families to assess whether it is achieving its intended purpose.*

**Response: Noted**  
The Government has no plans to fundamentally review the Working for Families package. It was reviewed in the 2011 Budget to ensure better targeting of payments toward lower income families. The changes proposed in the 2011 Budget are being progressively implemented. The Government will continue to consider ways to make the scheme more effective through enhancements to delivery that contributes to the Better Public Services result areas 9 and 10.⁶

**Recommendation 39**  
*Support the provision of financial literacy education and information, by government and non-government agencies, to help whānau.*

**Response: Accept**  
The Government accepts the importance of financial literacy education to help whānau. Currently many government and non-government agencies provide financial literacy services to Māori (and others) or contribute to better

---

⁶ Result 9: New Zealand businesses have a one-stop online shop for all government advice and support they need to run and grow their business. Result 10: New Zealanders can complete their transactions with government easily in a digital environment.
understanding of financial literacy. The two main vehicles through which financial literacy education for whānau is being considered and implemented are Hei Kai Kei Aku Ringa and the Commission for Financial Literacy and Retirement Income.

Goal 3 in He Kai Kei Aku Ringa is increased financial literacy and savings. Following the launch of He Kai Kei Aku Ringa in November 2012, a Partner Working Group supported by the Commission for Financial Literacy and Retirement Income was formed to progress work on the two recommendations under goal 3. The Group identified the importance of improving financial literacy and knowledge among tamariki and rangatahi to improve long-term outcomes for Māori. In 2013, the Group undertook a survey of financial literacy service providers to gain a better understanding of the services currently available to Māori. This survey showed that gains have been made in Māori financial literacy, but it also highlighted areas where there are gaps in the provision of financial literacy services for Māori as well as potential barriers to building financial literacy. The Commission has developed a financial literacy strategy and action plan for Māori that is expected to address these gaps.

Through the Ministry of Social Development, the Government currently provides $8.9 million per year for Budget Advice Services. In addition, Budget 2013 announced a one-off top up of $1.5 million, and a strategic review of budgeting services to determine the best ongoing approach, including the extent to which funding decisions are consistent with government priorities. Significan progress has been made on the review, with announcements due for Budget 2014.

**Recommendation 40**

*Support the provision of new models of social lending.*

**Response: Noted**

The Government’s Credit Contracts and Financial Services Law Reform Bill is currently being considered by the Commerce Select Committee. This Bill will address lending practices of unscrupulous lenders, which can be the cause of some families struggling with huge debt.

In response to the Children’s Commissioner’s Expert Advisory Group on Solutions to Child Poverty’s report, the Government has also been exploring alternative means of providing low/no interest finance to low-income people. This year, a micro-finance scheme will be piloted to help low-income people avoid debt traps.
Additional recommendations

The Committee made eight additional recommendations which were put forward by some members, but not supported by Government members due to the need for fiscal restraint.

Recommendation 41
Consider appointing a Cabinet Minister for Children and a ministry for children, with responsibility for a children’s action plan and a Māori children’s action plan, enshrined in a Children’s Act, to set targets for children’s health and wellbeing against which all ministries and departments would be required to report. A Children’s Act should also take into account and refer specifically to New Zealand’s obligations under the United Nation’s Convention on the Rights of the Child and the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, and include a requirement for a child impact assessment of all new legislation to be prepared by the ministry for children, detailing each bill’s potential impact on children.

Response: Noted
An inter-agency work programme to address issues of vulnerability amongst New Zealand’s children is already underway. This programme is led by the Vulnerable Children’s Board, consisting of key government chief executives. This work programme, the Children’s Action Plan, includes both policy and legislative changes to the way that agencies work together, recognising that coordinated action across agencies is required to address the challenges facing our children.

The Vulnerable Children Bill also includes a responsible Minister, designated by the Prime Minister, responsible for setting Government priorities for improving the wellbeing of vulnerable children. Chief executives of prescribed agencies will be responsible for working together to develop and report against a vulnerable children’s plan, which will need to set out the steps they will take to work together to achieve the Government priorities for improving the wellbeing of vulnerable children. This legislation will put in place cross-government accountability arrangements for a targeted response to improving outcomes for children. This will sit alongside the universal services for children provided by government.

How the Government defines vulnerable children will be determined in the setting of its priorities. This will enable the Government to narrow or widen the scope of future children action plans depending on policy priorities. Under the Bill, Government will be able to set priorities for improving the wellbeing of vulnerable children, which could, for example, include

- setting targets for children’s health and wellbeing; and
- development of a Māori children’s action plan.

Specifically introducing legislation to address the content of the United Nations Convention on the Rights Of the Child and United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (in, for example, a Children’s Act) is unnecessary. New Zealand is bound to comply with the treaties it executes,
which requires it to ensure that its domestic laws are consistent with them. There is, therefore, a presumption in law that the wording of legislation should be read in a way which is consistent with New Zealand’s international obligations.

**Recommendation 42**  
*Extending free after hours healthcare to all children to the age of 18.*

**Response: Not accepted**  
The Government does not accept this recommendation. The Government extended its free healthcare to children aged under six to include after-hours access in July 2012. Currently, 97% of children under the age of six who are enrolled with a primary health organisation are receiving free after-hours general practice visits.

**Recommendation 43**  
*Investigate the provision of free healthcare to all children to the age of 18.*

**Response: Not accepted**  
The Government does not accept this recommendation. The Government has a policy of free healthcare for children aged under six and currently 97.9% of children under the age of six who are enrolled with a primary health organisation are receiving free day-time general practice visits through either the Very Low Cost Access or Zero Fees for Under Sixes schemes. An additional 241,557 children between six and 17 years old are enrolled in Very Low Cost Access practices, which have a maximum co-payment of $11.50 per general practice visit. In addition to this, oral health services are free for all children up to age 18.

**Recommendation 44**  
*Requiring the Ministry of Health, in cooperation with other ministries and departments as appropriate, to develop a cross-sectoral needs assessment tool for pregnant women, and ensure that all pregnant low-income vulnerable women are contacted by case workers to implement the needs assessment protocol and coordinate services.*

**Response: Accept**  
Needs assessment of vulnerable and other pregnant women is already undertaken and supported as part of existing programmes. These range from universally available assessments of all pregnant women, to more targeted assessments and support where there is identified need.

**Recommendation 45**  
*Funding the expansion of effective teen parenting unit programmes in secondary schools to strengthen and support young Māori parents.*

**Response: Accept**  
The Government, through the Ministry of Education, provides funding to establish teen parent units. There are currently 22 teen parent units attached to high schools and a further six are under development as part of the normal establishment process. In addition, a pilot of 100 places for teen parents in
mainstream schools throughout 2014 - 2016 is underway. As at July 2013, there were 288 Māori enrolled in teen parent units.

Other options for teen parents include:
- Te Aho o Te Kura Pounamu – The Correspondence School (Te Kura) which provides personalised learning programmes based on individual interests, needs and goals;
- Youth Guarantee initiatives;
- activity centres, which provide alternatives for secondary learners at risk of educational under-achievement, including teen parents. There are 14 activity centres across New Zealand;
- the Association of Teen Parent Educators has a website that aims to share information on the provision of teen parent education; to provide links to existing schools in New Zealand and overseas; and to encourage the sharing of research information on the education of young parents internationally; and
- the new Youth Service supports around 1,300 teen parents to be in education and training and do budgeting and parenting courses. Over half are Māori. $7.9 million has been committed to provide teen parent intensive case workers and volunteer supporters to help teen parents get educational and other services.

**Recommendation 46**

*Improve the adequacy of benefits and incomes for whānau without paid work to ensure the wellbeing of their tamariki.*

**Response: Noted**

The Government’s primary strategy for lifting incomes and improving outcomes for vulnerable New Zealanders is to promote social mobility through paid employment driven by economic growth, while ensuring that New Zealand’s social security safety net continues to support people who cannot support themselves. The focus is on addressing the long-term consequences of poverty, and improving material wellbeing through employment.

New Zealand spends a considerable amount to support the incomes of beneficiaries and other low-income New Zealanders. In the 2013/14 financial year, over $10 billion was forecast to be spent on welfare benefits, of which Māori make up approximately one third of recipients. In addition, there is a considerable spend on other support that reduces demand on the family budget through subsidies or direct provision (for example, free primary health care for younger children, and the Warm Up New Zealand home insulation programme). These initiatives, together with the direct income support assistance, help reduce material hardship among families with children.

The Government is also continuing to consider measures to address child poverty, in response to the Children’s Commissioner’s Expert Advisory Group on Child Poverty, and as part of the Ministerial Committee on Poverty.
Recommendation 47
*Investigate the introduction of a universal child payment.*

**Response: Not accepted**
The Government does not support the introduction of a universal child payment. This option was considered and rejected by the Government in its response to the Children’s Commissioner's Expert Advisory Group on Child Poverty, on the basis that any new spending should be tightly targeted to those on the lowest incomes who have the greatest need.

The Government provides significant support to children and their families through Family Tax Credits, significant ECE subsidies, and a range of welfare and health initiatives.

Recommendation 48
*Investigate partnering with employers, unions, local government, and iwi to address job shocks that may adversely affect whānau.*

**Response: Noted**
Work and Income New Zealand already provides comprehensive support services to employers who are experiencing change, such as downsizing, closure, or the relocation of their operations. This includes engaging with iwi to discuss social and employment issues. Work and Income New Zealand works closely with employers to help affected employees find suitable jobs and enable the employer to continue its day-to-day operations.

**Conclusion**
In summary, the Government largely supports the Report and notes it generally reflects current priorities within agencies’ work programmes. The Government is committed to ensuring equity of outcomes for Māori and improving the effectiveness of services for tamariki Māori and their whānau.
Appendix 1 - Glossary of Māori terms[^5]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Māori Term</th>
<th>English Term</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>akonga</td>
<td>student, pupil, learner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iwi</td>
<td>extended kinship group, tribe, nation, people, nationality, and race - often refers to a large group of people descended from a common ancestor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kaiāko</td>
<td>teacher, instructor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kāwanatanga</td>
<td>government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>maara kai</td>
<td>food garden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>manaakitanga</td>
<td>hospitality, kindness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mokopuna</td>
<td>grandchild, descendant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>papakāinga</td>
<td>original home, home base, village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rangatahi</td>
<td>younger generation, youth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tamariki</td>
<td>children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>taitamariki</td>
<td>youth, teenagers, young person (of either sex), adolescent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tangata whenua</td>
<td>local people, hosts, indigenous people of the land</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>te reo</td>
<td>the language; usually referring to the Māori language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tino rangatiratanga</td>
<td>self-determination, sovereignty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>whakapapa</td>
<td>genealogy, lineage, descent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>whānau</td>
<td>extended family, family group, connected by genealogical ties to a common ancestor; usually comprising three generations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>whānau-hui / hui-ā-whānau</td>
<td>gatherings and meetings of extended families</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>whānaungatanga</td>
<td>relationship, kinship, sense of family connection - a relationship through shared experiences and working together which provides people with a sense of belonging</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[^5]: Refer to [www.maoridictionary.co.nz](http://www.maoridictionary.co.nz). Not all meanings for each term are included as set out in this dictionary. The meanings that best describe the terms in the context of the report are included.
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The Government has carefully considered the Committee's report and responds to the report in accordance with Standing Order 249.

Recommendation and Government Response

Recommendation

The Committee recommended that an amendment bill amending section 17 of the Ombudsmen Act 1975 (the Act), drafted in consultation with the Office of the Ombudsmen, be introduced into the House.

Response

The Ombudsmen investigate complaints relating to state sector agencies, and undertake a range of roles that protect the rights of New Zealanders. They are independent, impartial, and focus on fairness for all.

Section 17 specifies the grounds on which the Ombudsmen may refuse to investigate complaints. Currently an Ombudsman may refuse to continue investigating a complaint on the grounds that the investigation is unnecessary. The complaints process in the Act requires the Ombudsmen to commence an investigation by formal written notification to the Chief Executive of the agency concerned, before it can then be discontinued. The Ombudsmen may make informal inquires before taking this formal step.

The Committee noted that the Ombudsmen favoured amending section 17 to allow them to decline to commence an investigation if it was considered to be unnecessary. Further, the Ombudsmen consider that formal written notice before they can decline to take any further action is largely bureaucratic and runs counter to their attempts to seek early resolutions in a timely and efficient way.

The Ombudsmen are the last resort for members of the public to resolve complaints against the State, and provide a valuable safety valve for the general public. There is no right of appeal once the Ombudsmen have made a recommendation. For these reasons complainants need to be confident that the Ombudsmen have given their complaint appropriate attention.

Launching a formal investigation by writing to the Chief Executive of an agency before it can be discontinued is adding additional administration, sometimes for no or little benefit. Therefore, the Government agrees that section 17 should be amended.
Complaints need to be resolved efficiently, but this needs to balanced against ensuring that complaints are considered appropriately. The Government proposes a legislative amendment to allow the Ombudsmen to decline to commence investigating a complaint on the grounds that an investigation is unnecessary once informal inquiries are complete. The legislative amendment would be supported by guidelines specifying the process and procedures for conducting informal inquiries.

The Ombudsmen have suggested some procedures to ensure the new flexibility in section 17 will not undermine public confidence. In particular the Ombudsmen are introducing:

- A formal early resolution process, with negotiated protocols with agencies, established steps for staff to follow, procedures for obtaining agreement by both the agency and complainant, and procedures for direct referral of matters to agencies for action; and

- A two step assessment process for complaints where the Office of the Ombudsmen consider there would be no benefit in proceeding with an investigation, with provision for personal review by an Ombudsman of any decision made in that respect.

The Government supports the proposals from the Ombudsmen. The Government considers that the proposal for legislative change, supported by guidelines specified above, will ensure the Office of the Ombudsmen gain the maximum administrative efficiencies while still ensuring the Ombudsmen can fulfil their functions and contribute to a fair and just society. The Government will work with the Office of the Ombudsmen to develop the legislative amendment and to identify an appropriate legislative vehicle.

**Conclusion**

The Government agrees that section 17 of the Ombudsmen Act should be amended to allow the Ombudsmen to decline to commence an investigation on the grounds that it is unnecessary once informal inquiries are completed. Guidelines will be developed specifying the process and procedures for conducting informal inquiries.
Government Response to the Report of the Privileges Committee on Question of privilege concerning the defamation action Attorney-General and Gow v Leigh
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The Government welcomes the Privileges Committee’s report: Question of privilege concerning the defamation action Attorney-General and Gow v Leigh.

The Report makes 16 recommendations, attached at Appendix 1. The Government has examined the Privileges Committee’s recommendations and responds to the report in accordance with Standing Order 249.

The Government notes that the Report builds on over two decades of previous work on privilege including the former Standing Orders Committee report presented in 1989.

Recommendations and Government Response

Recommendation to the House

The first recommendation is that the House notes that the Committee respectfully disagrees with the Supreme Court decision in Attorney-General and Gow v Leigh in applying the test of necessity to ascertain the scope of Parliament’s privilege of freedom of speech.

Recommendations requiring legislative change

Recommendations 2 to 16 all require legislation. The Committee recommended that the Government introduce a Parliamentary Privilege Bill to clarify the nature of parliamentary privilege in New Zealand. The Committee made a number of recommendations relating to the Bill’s scope and contents. Once enacted, the Bill would be administered by the Clerk of the House of the Representatives. The Committee recommended that the Government work with the Clerk to draft the Bill.

The Government notes that the Supreme Court and the Privileges Committee have reached different views about the extent to which advice from an official connected to parliamentary proceedings is itself the subject of parliamentary privilege. Such a fundamental constitutional issue should be clarified. The rules for Parliament’s freedom of speech should ensure that the House can operate effectively on a day to day basis.

The Government agrees that there should be a Parliamentary Privileges Bill. Where the judiciary and legislature come to different views, legislation is usually the appropriate means of addressing the issue. Given the fundamental importance of Parliament’s freedom of speech in our democracy, the Government will adopt the recommendations of the Privileges Committee and introduce a Parliamentary Privileges Bill. The legislative process will provide a further opportunity for full consideration of the Privileges Committee’s proposals.

Conclusion

The Government thanks the Privileges Committee for its thorough report. The Government will consider the timing of the Parliamentary Privileges Bill in the context of its overall legislative programme.
# Appendix - recommendations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>We recommend to the House that it note that we respectfully disagree with the Supreme Court decision in <em>Attorney-General and Gow v Leigh</em> in applying the test of necessity to ascertain the scope of Parliament’s privilege of freedom of speech.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>We recommend to the Government that it introduce a Parliamentary Privilege Bill to clarify for the avoidance of doubt the nature of parliamentary privilege in New Zealand.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>We recommend to the Government that the Parliamentary Privilege Bill contain a clear statement of purpose to aid in determining the extent and scope of parliamentary privilege.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>We recommend to the Government that the Parliamentary Privilege Bill replace the Legislature Act 1908, the Legislature Amendment Act 1992, and section 13 of the Defamation Act 1992.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>We recommend to the Government that it consider and where appropriate incorporate the recommendations in the <em>Second Report of the Standing Orders Committee on the Law of Privilege and Related Matters</em>, November 1989 (I.18B) in drafting the Parliamentary Privilege Bill.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>We recommend to the Government that the Parliamentary Privilege Bill provide for the avoidance of a doubt a definition of “proceedings in Parliament” and what is meant by “impeaching and questioning” such proceedings, as set out in article 9 of the Bill of Rights 1688.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>We recommend to the Government that the Parliamentary Privilege Bill provide for the power of the House to fine for contempt.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>We recommend to the Government that the Parliamentary Privilege Bill provide for the power of the House to administer oaths or affirmations in respect of witnesses giving evidence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>We recommend to the Government that the Parliamentary Privilege Bill confirm that the House does not have the power to expel its members.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>We recommend to the Government that the Parliamentary Privilege Bill provide that the live broadcast of Parliament’s proceedings, including select committee hearings, is protected by absolute privilege.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>We recommend to the Government that the Parliamentary Privilege Bill provide that delayed broadcasts or rebroadcasts of Parliament’s proceedings, including select committee hearings, that are made by order or under the authority of the House of Representatives are protected by absolute privilege.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>We recommend to the Government that the Parliamentary Privilege Bill provide that a fair and accurate report of proceedings in the House, or summary using extracts of proceedings in the House, by any person is protected by qualified privilege.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>We recommend to the Government that the Parliamentary Privilege Bill provide that the broadcast and other publication of extracts of Parliament’s proceedings, including select committee hearings, that are not made by order or under the authority of the House of Representatives are protected by qualified privilege, in a manner consistent with the provisions of the Defamation Act 1992.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>We recommend to the Government that the Parliamentary Privilege Bill make explicit that a member of Parliament, or any other person participating directly in or reporting on parliamentary proceedings, who makes an oral or written statement that affirms or adopts what he or she or another person has said in the House or its committees will not be liable to criminal or civil proceedings unless the statement in and of itself could be defamatory.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>We recommend to the Government that once enacted the Parliamentary Privilege Bill be administered by the Clerk of the House of Representatives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>We recommend to the Government that it work with the Clerk of the House of Representatives to draft the Parliamentary Privilege Bill.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Government Response to

Interim Report of the Regulations Review Committee

on


Presented to the House of Representatives
In accordance with Standing Order 249

Introduction

The Government has carefully considered the Committee’s interim report on Orders in Council made under the Canterbury Earthquake Response and Recovery Act 2010 and the Canterbury Earthquake Recovery Act 2011.

The Government responds to the report in accordance with Standing Order 249.

Recommendation and Government response

Recommendation:

The Regulations Review Committee recommends that the Government clarify that the placards are notices under section 124 of the Building Act for limited purposes which are reasonably necessary or expedient for the purposes of the Canterbury Earthquake Recovery Act 2011.

Response:

Further clarification of the relationship between the red and yellow placards issued under the Civil Defence Emergency Management Act 2002 (CDEMA) during the state of emergency following the Canterbury earthquakes and dangerous building provisions of the Building Act 2004, as modified by the Canterbury Earthquake (Building Act) Order 2011 (Building Act Order), is not considered necessary at this time.

The provisions in the Building Act (as modified by the Building Act Order) are sufficiently clear that the red and yellow placards are for limited purposes:

- New red and yellow placards cannot be issued unless a new state of emergency is declared.
- The effect of red and yellow placards deemed to be dangerous building notices, is limited to warning people not to approach, or restricting entry to, a building. The council cannot require work to be carried out on a building unless it issues a new dangerous building notice under the Building Act.
- The deemed notices are only effective for 12 weeks (though they can be renewed for a further 12 week period);
- The Building Act Order only applies to Christchurch City Council, Selwyn District Council and Waimakariri District Council; and
The Building Act Order expires on 16 September 2013.

If Government becomes aware of any misunderstandings, it will issue guidance to clarify.

**Recommendation:**

The Regulations Review Committee recommends that the Government permits information about the cards to be included on a LIM only if the property in question has been inspected to the standard otherwise required by the Building Act.

**Response:**

The Government considers the Councils have adequate procedures in place to manage these concerns without a change to the requirements for including information on LIMs.

The Building Act Order does not modify or have any effect on section 44A(2)(d) the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987. Section 44A(2)(d) requires councils to include in a property’s LIM:

- information concerning red and yellow placards issued under the CDEMA
- information concerning any dangerous building notices issued under the Building Act 2004.

Red and yellow placards issued under the CDEMA have to be noted on a property’s LIM regardless of the provisions in the Building Act Order.

The Government understands the Councils have processes in place to ensure the information included on properties files, and in LIMs, makes the nature of a red or yellow placard issued under the CDEMA clear. In particular Councils are making it clear the same level of assessment as that undertaken for a dangerous building notice under the Building Act was not carried out when the red or yellow placard was issued during the state of emergency.

Owners also have the option of providing updated information to councils on what has happened to the property since the red/yellow placard was issued so this can also be recorded on the LIM.
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Government Response to the Report of the Regulations Review Committee

Complaint regarding the Canterbury Earthquake (Building Act) Order 2011
(SR 2011/311)

Introduction

On 24 April 2014 the Regulations Review Committee (the Committee) presented a Report, “Complaint regarding the Canterbury Earthquake (Building Act) Order 2011 (SR 2011/311)” (the Report) to the House.

The Report considers complaints the Committee received from Hon Ruth Dyson and Mr Philip Elmey about the Canterbury Earthquake (Building Act) 2011 (the 2011 Order) on 4 February 2013 and 18 September 2013, respectively.

The 2011 Order was made under the authority of section 71 of the Canterbury Earthquake Recovery Act 2011 (CER Act). Among other things, the 2011 Order modified the Building Act 2004 (the Building Act) to give the three Canterbury councils the authority to restrict access to buildings by issuing extended section 124 notices under the Building Act, where there was a risk of injury or death from the collapse of nearby land (including rockfall, landslip, cliff collapse or subsidence). This modification lowered the risk threshold in section 121 of the Building Act, which defines a building as dangerous if it is likely to cause injury or death, in the ordinary course of events.

The 2011 Order expired on 16 September 2013, and was replaced by the Canterbury Earthquake (Building Act) Order 2013 (2013 Order). The 2013 Order was limited to continuing the existing extended section 124 notices in force until the CER Act expires on 18 April 2016.

The complaints focused on the Christchurch City Council’s (CCC’s) use of the modified powers to issue dangerous building notices to prohibit access to houses in the Port Hills that are considered to be at risk from rockfall. The rocks that pose a risk are on land that is publicly owned.

The complainants objected to the 2011 Order on four grounds specified in Standing Order 315(2), submitting that it:

- was not in accordance with the general objects and intentions of the statute under which it is made (Standing Order 315(2)(a))
- trespassed unduly on personal rights and liberties (Standing Order 315(2)(b))
- appeared to make an unusual or unexpected use of the powers conferred by the statute under which it was made (Standing Order 315(2)(c))
- contained matters more appropriate for parliamentary enactment (Standing Order 315(2)(f)).

The Government has carefully considered the Committee’s Report and is responding to the Report in accordance with Standing Order 249.
Finding and recommendation

The Committee found that none of the Standing Order grounds raised by the complainants had been made out. The Committee acknowledged the extended section 124 notices must be causing difficulty for many homeowners in the Port Hills in Canterbury.

Recommendation: That Government, “as a matter of urgency, issue explicit guidelines for the relevant local authorities concerning the removal of extended section 124 notices issued under the 2011 Order.”

Government Response

The Government is not planning to act on the Committee’s recommendation. This is because the Government is satisfied that CCC has a process for removing extended section 124 dangerous building notices. CCC has used this process to remove notices from Port Hills properties where:

- rocks and rockfall sources causing the hazard were removed from the site, or
- rock protection structures were put in place, or
- the building has been demolished.

Rather than produce additional guidelines, the Government is targeting its support to areas where CCC has identified a need. Specifically, the Ministry of Business, Innovation and Employment (the Ministry) is working with CCC on a rockroll hazard mitigation process and to refine CCC’s current Technical Guideline for Rock Protection Structures. The hazard mitigation process will assist affected property owners and approved geotechnical professionals to:

- determine whether a boulder source above a property is capable of releasing boulders with sufficient energy to cause harm to people in the building
- design a proposed rock protection structure (or other means) to mitigate the risk to an acceptable level, and if feasible, to facilitate the removal of the extended section 124 notice.

The rockroll hazard mitigation process can lead to a report being prepared for the property owner, with a proposal to mitigate the rockroll risk to life to an acceptable level (where feasible). If submitted to CCC, the report would provide a basis for CCC to decide whether a dangerous building notice should either remain in place or be removed, if the proposed structure (or other means) is built as specified.

Reducing the risk of rockroll to an acceptable level using the rockroll hazard mitigation process will require building consents, resource consents, and agreements between affected property owners, adjacent property owners, CCC and the Crown, depending on site specific circumstances. In some cases it might not be practicable, or feasible, to
mitigate the rockroll hazard to an acceptable level. In these situations, affected property owners may choose to accept the Crown offer to purchase their property\(^1\).

The Ministry will continue to provide support to CCC on issues related to the extended section 124 notices, for example, undertaking research related to rockroll hazards and mitigation techniques.

**Conclusion**

The Government considers that it is not necessary to issue guidelines for CCC to remove extended section 124 notices. The Government is satisfied that CCC already has a process in place to consider whether the notices can be removed.

The Government is targeting its support to areas where CCC has identified a specific need in relation to the extended section 124 notices and will continue to provide support to CCC on issues related to the extended section 124 notices.

---

\(^1\) The Crown offered to purchase properties in the Port Hills where residents face an unacceptable level of life risk and an engineering solution to mitigate the life risk for the properties would be uncertain, disruptive, not timely and not cost effective.
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INTRODUCTION

The Government has carefully considered the report of the Regulations Review Committee (the Committee) entitled “Complaint regarding the Legal Services Regulations 2011 (SR 2011/144) and responds to the report in accordance with Standing Order 249.

The response addresses the Committee’s recommendation that the Government:

- review the lack of provision in the Legal Services Act 2011 for merits review by a provider of a decision to decline out-of-time payment following a grant of legal aid as envisaged by Standing Order 315(2)(d).

BACKGROUND

The report responds to a complaint made by Cooper Legal, in November 2011, about the Legal Services Regulations 2011 (SR 2011/144).

These regulations are promulgated under the Legal Services Act 2011 (the Act) which came into force on 1 July 2011. The purpose of the Act is to promote access to justice by establishing a system that provides legal assistance to people of insufficient means, and to deliver the necessary services in the most effective and efficient manner.\(^1\)

The Act (section 99) sets out the process for claims for payment for legal aid services. The Secretary for Justice is required to refer a claim for payment from a provider to the Legal Services Commissioner. The Commissioner may decline some or all of a claim on specified grounds, which include the circumstance where the claim was not made in accordance with the time frame set by the Legal Services Regulations 2011 (the regulations). At the time of Cooper Legal’s complaint, the regulations set the time frame as three months after the day that the legal aid services are provided or, in the case of a fixed fee arrangement, three months after the day the legal services are completed.

The complaint related to the time-frame set, under regulation 19, for making claims for payment for legal aid services. The complaint was based on four grounds set out in Standing Order 315(2) of the Standing Orders of the House of Representatives 2011, as follows:

A. SO 315(2)(a): that regulation 19 is not in accordance with the general objects and intentions of the Act

  o The complainant claimed that the time frame imposed by regulation 19 had created an administrative burden on providers, created a backlog of claims awaiting processing and caused delays in processing claims

\(^1\) Section 3, Legal Services Act 2011.
which was evidence that the time frame was not consistent with the delivery of legal aid services in the most effective and efficient manner.

B. SO 315(2)(b): that regulation 19 trespassed unduly on personal rights and liberties

  o The complainant claimed that the requirement under regulation 19 created a volume of work, with accompanying administrative costs and burden of compliance, which was an unreasonable interference with its right to run its business.

C. SO 315(2)(c): that regulation 19 appears to make some unusual or unexpected use of the powers conferred by the Act;

  o The complainant claimed the strict enforcement of the time frame by the Ministry and the lack of any apparent discretion to deal with situations where enforcement of the time frame would lead to unfairness, were an unusual or unexpected use of the power to impose a time frame for making claims under the Act.

D. Or SO 315(2)(f) as an alternative to SO 315(2)(c): that regulation 19 is a matter more appropriate for parliamentary enactment.

  o The complainant claimed, as an alternative to SO 315(2)(c), that as no time frame existed under the Legal Services Act 2000, the introduction of one in the current Act was a significant change and matter of broad policy and principle more appropriate for inclusion in the principal act.

At the hearing on 5 April 2012 the complainant set out that the new time frame imposed a heavy administrative burden. The complainant held that this new requirement had also created a backlog of claims within the Ministry of Justice. The complainant saw an apparent lack of discretion or flexibility regarding the three-month time frame and suggested the Ministry should be subject to some obligations regarding its processing of claims.

The Ministry advised that the introduction of the new time limit saw a much larger number of claims than expected with some made years after the services were provided, which in turn made them difficult to process. The backlog was a transitional issue. The Ministry also noted the previous lack of a time limit had made it difficult to administer legal aid funding.

The Ministry advised a proposed change to regulation 19 to increase the time period from three to six months, with provision in particular circumstances for the Ministry to formally request a claim to be lodged within three months. In its report, the Committee noted the amendment had been made and the time frame for claims would increase to six months from 2 July 2012.

The Committee presented its report to the House of Representatives on 1 June 2012.
COMMITTEE’S CONCLUSIONS

Conclusions Regarding the Complaint

The Committee considered the complaint against the four grounds under Standing Order 315 (2) and found the following:

A. SO 315(2)(a): that regulation 19 is not in accordance with the general objects and intentions of the Act

   o The Committee considered that the ground of complaint had been made out. It found that a reasonable time frame is not inconsistent with the purpose of the Legal Services Act which is to deliver legal aid services in the most effective and efficient manner. It was found that the three month time frame, as at the date of the hearing, was not reasonable.

   o Ordinarily, the Committee would recommend the disallowance of the regulation on this ground. However, the regulation has been amended so that it now complies with the Standing Order so no further action is necessary in this regard.

B. SO 315(2)(b): that regulation 19 trespassed unduly on personal rights and liberties

   o The Committee did not consider that the ground of this complaint had been made out.

C. SO 315(2)(c): that regulation 19 appears to make some unusual or unexpected use of the powers conferred by the Act;

   o The Committee accepted that the Legal Services Commissioner’s discretion under section 99 of the Act regarding late claims for payment is an answer to the complainant’s claim on this ground.

D. Or SO 315(2)(f) as an alternative to SO 315(2)(c): that regulation 19 is a matter more appropriate for parliamentary enactment.

   o The Committee did not consider that the ground of this complaint had been made out.

Conclusion Regarding Other Standing Orders Grounds

The Committee considered there was cause for concern on the grounds of SO 315(2)(d) although this matter had not been raised with the Committee by the complainant.

SO 315(2)(d) states that one of the grounds on which a regulation can be brought to the special attention of the House is that it unduly makes the rights and liberties of persons dependent upon administrative decisions, which are not subject to review on their merits by a judicial or other independent tribunal.
The Committee concluded that SO 315(2)(d) envisages a right of review on the merits. However, the Legal Services Act does not appear to empower that as there is no formal review mechanism under the Act.

RECOMMENDATION

The Committee recommended the Government review the lack of provision in the Act for merits review by a provider of a decision to decline out-of-time payment following a grant of legal aid, as envisaged by SO 315 (2)(d).

GOVERNMENT RESPONSE

The Government acknowledges the Committee’s assessment that the current Act does not provide for an independent merits review mechanism of decisions by the Legal Commissioner to decline out-of-time payment following a grant of legal aid.

A merits review is designed to ensure fair and independent treatment of all persons affected. The review decision can result in an affirmation or variation of the original decision. By improving the quality and consistency of the decisions of primary decision-makers, merits review enhances the openness and accountability of government decisions.

The Government accepts the status quo is in contravention of Standing Order 315(2)(d), as it unduly makes the rights and liberties of persons dependent upon administrative decisions, which in themselves are not subject to review on their merits by a judicial or other independent tribunal.

Therefore, the Government proposes to amend the Legal Services Act so that legal aid providers will be able to seek a reconsideration of the Commissioner’s decision, where it is to decline claims that are not made in accordance with the time frame in the regulations. The amendment will also establish the right to an independent review of the Commissioner’s reconsideration through the Legal Aid Tribunal. The grounds for review are that a decision is manifestly unreasonable and wrong in law. Providers would have a further right of appeal to the High Court on a question of law, and then to subsequent appellate courts.

The Government agreed to the amendment of the Legal Services Act on 20 August 2012. This amendment will be progressed through the Legal Assistance (Sustainability) Amendment Bill, currently before the Justice and Electoral Committee. It is expected that this amendment will come into effect in 2013.

Government Response to the
Report of the Regulations Review Committee

on

Complaint regarding the New Zealand Teachers Council (Conduct) Rules 2004 (SR 2004/143)

Presented to the House of Representatives in accordance with Standing Order 249
Complaint regarding the New Zealand Teachers Council (Conduct) Rules 2004 (SR 2004/143) – Government Response to the Regulations Review Committee’s Recommendations

1. The Government welcomes the recommendations made by the Regulations Review Committee in its report entitled “Complaint regarding the New Zealand Teachers Council (Conduct) Rules 2004 (SR 2004/143)”. The Government has carefully considered these recommendations and is responding in accordance with Standing Order 249.

2. The Regulation Review Committee’s report is the result of considerable work by the Committee over a seven month period. It represents an important step in maintaining public confidence in the teaching profession.

3. The Government believes that the recommendations set out in the Regulations Review Committee’s report are well founded, and should be acted upon as a matter of priority.

4. The New Zealand Teachers Council has developed a proposal to amend rules 26 and 31 to 35 of the New Zealand Teachers Council (Conduct) Rules 2004. Public consultation has commenced, with a view to a decision being made on the final amendments on 18 February 2014. The amendments will ensure that Disciplinary Tribunal proceedings are open to the public, while also ensuring protection for vulnerable witnesses such as children and young people.

5. The Government also intends to amend the Education Act 1989 to specify that the proceedings of the Disciplinary Tribunal are open to the public, unless the Disciplinary Tribunal makes an order to the contrary on specified statutory grounds in order to ensure transparency and maintain public confidence in the teaching profession.
Government response to
report of the Regulations Review Committee
on
Investigation into the Marine and Coastal Area (Takutai Moana) Reclamation Fees Regulations 2012

Presented to the House of Representatives
In accordance with Standing Order 249
GOVERNMENT RESPONSE TO REPORT OF THE REGULATIONS REVIEW COMMITTEE ON ITS INVESTIGATION INTO THE MARINE AND COASTAL AREA (TAKUTAI MOANA) RECLAMATION FEES REGULATIONS 2012 (SR 2012/363).

Introduction

This paper sets out the government’s response to the report of the Regulations Review Committee (the Committee) on the Marine and Coastal Area (Takutai Moana) Reclamation Fees Regulations 2012 and responds in accordance with Standing Order 249.

The Committee’s report found that regulation 14:

i. is not in accordance with the general objects and intentions of the statute under which it is made (Standing Order 315 (2)(a));

ii. appears to make some unusual or unexpected use of the powers conferred by the statute under which it is made (Standing Order 315 (2)(c)); and

iii. is indirectly retrospective where this is not expressly authorised by the empowering statute (Standing Order 315(2)(g)).

The Committee drew regulation 14 to the special attention of the House of Representatives (the House) and asked that the government consider whether fees may lawfully be collected in accordance with regulation 14 in light of its report.

The government has carefully considered the Committee’s report. The government’s view is that:

i. regulation 14 is within the general objects and intentions of the Marine and Coastal Area (Takutai Moana) Act (the Act) – in particular, the Act envisages that regulations could prescribe fees to be payable after an application is made;

ii. regulation 14 is not an unusual or unexpected use of the powers conferred by the Act – while the government now agrees that the confirmation step in regulation is not within the scope of the “methods or rates” referred to in section 118(1)(h) of the Act, it is within the clear scope of “the other matters contemplated” by the Act as referred to in section 118(1)(k); and

iii. on closer scrutiny, and for various reasons, regulation 14 in fact operates prospectively and is intra vires the Act.

Background

The Act provided a new regime governing reclamations which is administered by Land Information New Zealand (LINZ). The previous regime was administered by the Department of Conservation (DOC) under the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA).
Under the Act, an application can be made to the Minister for Land Information for reclaimed land to be vested in the applicant (section 35). The applicant is liable to pay any fees set in regulation for the consideration and processing of such an application.

Twenty-two applications made under the old DOC regime were pending at the commencement of the Act in April 2011. A transitional provision in the Act (section 41) allowed these applicants to elect to have their applications transferred for consideration and determination under the Act. Section 41 permitted applicants to request a transfer to the new regime at any time from the Act’s commencement until October 2011. Of the 22 pending applications, five elected to transfer their applications to the new LINZ regime. Having been transferred to the new regime under section 41, there was no ability for applicants to elect to transfer back to the old regime.

Between April and October 2011, the Marine and Coastal Area (Takutai Moana) Reclamation Fees Regulations were being developed but were not then in force. Each of the five applicants who elected to transfer to the new regime was consulted on the fees that were proposed. No one raised any concern with the proposed fees, including the amounts to be paid and the fact that the fees were not known at the time the applicants had elected to transfer.

The regulations were promulgated on 10 December 2012 and came into force on 18 January 2013. Regulation 14 concerns four of the five applications that were transferred to the new regime. Regulation 14 does not relate to any other application. Regulation 14 requires the four applicants to confirm they wish to proceed with the application under the Act and states when the fees set elsewhere in the regulations are payable.

LINZ did not commence any work on the four applications prior to the applicants confirming that they wished to proceed under the new regime. At the time the applicants did confirm that they wished to proceed, the fees for the work involved in considering and processing the applications were known because the regulations had, by that time, come into force. To date, no fees have been collected as a result of regulation 14.

The relevant regulation making powers in the Act are:

118(1) The Governor-General may, by Order in Council, make regulations for any of the following purposes:

... 

(h) prescribing the fees payable, or the methods or rates by which fees are to be assessed, for —

(i) the consideration and processing of applications made, or actions taken, under sections 34-45:

...

(k) providing for any other matters contemplated by this Act or necessary for giving it full effect.

**Committee’s findings and government response**

**Finding 1:** Regulation 14 is not in accordance with the general objects and intentions of the statute under which it is made (Standing Order 315 (2)(a)).
The Committee considered that regulation 14 is not consistent with the scheme and objects of the Act for the treatment of applications that were pending under the RMA at the time when the Act came into force. The Committee said:

The Act specifies that from the point when an application is transferred ... the application is to be treated as a section 35 application, and that any fees prescribed for a section 35 application become payable when the application is made. The effect of the confirmation procedure in regulation 14 is to prescribe a different time and procedure for the payment of the prescribed fees, both of which are contrary to section 35. In our view the procedure prescribed by regulation 14 is therefore inconsistent with the scheme of the Act.

The Committee considered that, as a consequence, the catch-all empowering provision in 118(1)(k) (which would ordinarily be appropriate as a source of authorisation for the confirmation procedure) was not appropriate in this case. The Committee said: “a catch-all provision is intended to cover matters that are ancillary or incidental to what is enacted in the statute, but does not support a widening of, or departure from, the underlying intent and purpose of the Act.”

**Government response**

The government does not agree the Act requires that all fees must be paid at the time an application is made. Section 35(5) states:

A developer or other person who makes an application under this section becomes liable to pay any fees payable under regulations made under this Act.

Section 35 does not state that all fees for section 35 applications must be paid at the time an application is made. Rather, the potential liability to pay fees arises once the application is made. The regulations will then specify what fees are payable and when.

The government considers the regulations could impose a fee payable at the time an application is made and/or at a later stage or later stages.

Section 118(1)(h) confirms this view because:

i. it specifies that methods may be employed to calculate fees, which in itself suggests that fees could be imposed at some point after an application is made;

ii. it specifies that fees may be imposed for “the consideration and processing of applications”, which also suggests that fees might be imposed that are payable after an application is made and after consideration and processing of the application has occurred; and

iii. section 118(1)(h)(i) uses the phrases "applications made" and "actions taken" which are both in the past tense and which contemplate fees being payable or being assessed after applications have been made or actions have been taken.

It follows that the government considers the confirmation procedure can be regarded as an ancillary or administrative matter that is authorised by the catch-all empowering provision in section 118(1)(k).

**Finding 2:** Regulation 14 appears to make some unusual or unexpected use of the powers conferred by the statute under which it is made (Standing Order 315 (2)(c)).

The Committee questioned whether the confirmation step is within the scope of the words “methods or rates” in section 118(1)(h). The Committee said:
We consider that “methods or rates” in this context is intended to refer to such things as mathematical formulae, ratios, or proportions for deriving the amount in fees to be paid. It would be straining the ordinary meaning of the phrase “method or rates” to suggest that it could include an applicant’s act of confirming that the application could proceed.

**Government response**

In previous correspondence with the Committee, the government suggested that the confirmation procedure is authorised by section 118(1)(h) as a “method” by which the fees are to be assessed or that it is authorised by the catch-all provision in 118(1)(k). Having reviewed the Committee’s report, the government now agrees that it would strain the ordinary meaning of the phrase “methods or rates” to suggest that it could include the confirmation step.

As noted above, the government nevertheless considers the confirmation step is within the ambit of the catch-all provision in 118(1)(k): “providing for any other matters contemplated by this Act or necessary for giving it full effect”.

**Finding 3:** Regulation 14 is indirectly retrospective where this is not expressly authorised by the empowering statute (Standing Order 315(2)(g)).

The Committee considered:

> ... the overall effect of regulation 14 is to require applicants to pay a fee that had not been set at the time it became payable under the Act – in other words, at the time they lodged their applications. We therefore consider that regulation 14 has the effect of indirectly imposing a retrospective fee.

**Government response**

The Committee makes a fair point. It is correct, as the Committee notes above, that the four applicants in question were not aware what the fees would be under the new regime when they elected to transfer their applications to that regime.

The government does not accept, however, that this means regulation 14 is *ultra vires* the Act.

The government notes:

i. The Act necessarily contemplated from its commencement that certain applicants would have the choice to transfer to the new regime (under section 41) at a time when there were no fees regulations in place (under section 118). The Act therefore contemplated that fees could be set after applicants decided to transfer.

ii. It follows that while the four applicants in question did not know what the new fees would be at the time they elected to transfer to the new regime under section 41, they did know (or should have known) that fees would be set for that regime under section 118.

iii. As noted above, section 118(1)(h)(i) expressly permits regulations to prescribe fees for the consideration and processing of “applications made” and “actions taken”, matters which are both in the past tense. Section 118(1)(h)(i) therefore contemplates fees being
payable or being assessed after applications have been made or actions have been taken.

iv. The confirmation step in regulation 14 ensures that fees are not applied retrospectively. The confirmation step requires applicants to confirm they wish to proceed under the new regime before any fees are applied.

v. In fact, regulation 14 operates prospectively. The fees that are applied under regulation 14 are for the consideration and processing of the applications after the fees have come into force. No fee is applied to work that was done prior to the coming into force of the regulations. In each of the four applications to which regulation 14 applies, no work was done, and no fee was applied, prior to the consideration and processing of the applications prior to the fees being made. In addition, no work was done, and no fee was applied, prior to the four applicants confirming that they wished to proceed. As noted above, at the time the four applicants confirmed they wished to proceed, they knew what the fees would be.

For the above reasons, the government’s response is that regulation 14 does not operate retrospectively – it in fact operates prospectively – and is intra vires the Act and section 118 in particular.

In addition, the government notes that:

i. All four applicants who requested the transfer were consulted on the proposed fees and none expressed concern about the “retrospective” application or level of those fees.

ii. Regulation 14 applies to four people only. Regulation 14 has no broader or further effect. Regulation 14 will not apply to any other applicant.

iii. The imposition of a fee is fair in the circumstances given that:

a. LINZ incurs costs in considering and processing each application (estimated in the vicinity of $8,000 – $10,000 plus disbursements and GST) for which it receives no Crown funding;

b. applicants would have paid a similar fee to DOC had they elected to have their applications considered under the RMA; and

c. the fee is a very small component of the overall cost of each reclamation, which are each multimillion dollar developments and the applicants stand to gain a fee simple estate for the land in question.

**Conclusion**

For the reasons set out above, the government’s response to the Committee’s findings is:

i. regulation 14 is within the general objects and intentions of the Act – in particular, the Act envisages that regulations could prescribe fees to be payable after an application is made;

ii. regulation 14 is not an unusual or unexpected use of the powers conferred by the Act – while the government now agrees that the confirmation step in regulation 14 is not within the scope of the “methods or rates” referred to in section 118(1)(h) of the Act, it is within the clear scope of “the other matters contemplated” by the Act as referred to in section 118(1)(k); and

iii. on closer scrutiny, and for various reasons, regulation 14 in fact operates prospectively and is intra vires the Act.
Government response to the Report of Social Services Committee into the Inquiry into the identification, rehabilitation, and care and protection of child offenders

Presented to the House of Representatives in accordance with Standing Order 249
Introduction
The Government has carefully considered the Social Services Committee’s Report on the Inquiry into the identification, rehabilitation, and care and protection of child offenders. This response to the Select Committee's report is in accordance with Standing Order 248. The Government believes that the Committee’s recommendations are timely and highlight issues that are important in order to improve the care and rehabilitation of child offenders.

The Government recognises that issues involving child offenders are complex and the impact of their offending can be serious, both for the children who offend and for the victims of that offending. Effective interventions with child offenders will support them to be nurtured and address the underlying causes of their behaviour. Dealing with child offenders requires a balance between the effective care and protection of each child and ensuring children understand the consequences of their offending. The Government acknowledge that more can be done to improve the care and rehabilitation of child offenders.

The Government takes the safety and welfare of children and the community very seriously. Our strong focus on vulnerable children is based on the vision that every child thrives, belongs and achieves. The Family Group Conference (FGC) review is an example of efforts to enhance responses to children who offend.

As part of the Government’s Better Public Services work programme there is a target to reduce youth crime by 5 per cent. This is to be achieved by reducing the number of appearances of young people in the Youth Court by 5 per cent. Early identification and effective intervention with child offenders is key to reducing youth crime and recognises the link between repeat victimisation and offending. Many of the actions arising from the Government response to the Child Offenders Inquiry will be addressed within the Youth Crime Action Plan. The Youth Crime Action Plan is being developed to support the Better Public Services goal of reducing youth crime. It will support the related goals of reducing rates of offending and victimisation.

The Select Committee made 31 recommendations to strengthen the response to child offenders. These are grouped into four areas: identifying potential child offenders, effectiveness of rehabilitative programmes, care and protection referral process, and effectiveness of the care and protection model.

The Government response to the recommendations is outlined below. The Government response provides context to the recommendations at the start of each section and areas for further work are highlighted at the end of each section.

Identifying potential child offenders
The Committee’s report emphasised the importance of the early identification of children who offend, or are at risk offending, in order to improve life outcomes. This focus includes preventing children from offending or entering into a pattern of repeat offending and becoming youth or adult offenders. The benefits of early identification are well recognised. Early identification means we are able to intervene early in the life of a child and early in the life of a problem in order to promote positive outcomes for children. Interventions are most likely to be successful and effective if they occur before problem behaviours become entrenched.

---

1 The definition of child offenders used by the Inquiry was children aged 10 to 13 years, as this is the definition in the Children, Young Persons, and Their Family Act 1989.
2 This measure is still being finalised.
The Government’s responses in this section highlight work currently underway on providing early intervention and how these early intervention initiatives will be enhanced in response to the Committee’s recommendations.

There is a strong connection between early intervention with child offenders and the Government’s focus on vulnerable children. The Government knows the most vulnerable children are victims of abuse and neglect and that there is a strong correlation between child maltreatment and later offending. The solutions that will be outlined in the White Paper on Vulnerable Children will be far reaching and will provide a way forward for better protecting our vulnerable children, including those that re-offend.

The Youth Crime Action Plan, currently in development, will help drive coordinated early responses between and within agencies for children that have begun to offend. Consultation on the Youth Crime Action Plan is currently seeking views on how agencies could better share information to identify children at risk of offending or with care and protection needs who are in contact with the justice system. Once needs are identified the focus will be on coordinated early and effective responses across the social and justice sectors.

**Recommendation 1:**

_Requring Government agencies to focus on the risk and protective factors identified in this report, the importance of effective early intervention, and the need for cross-agency collaboration._

**Response:** The Government agrees that it is critical for government agencies to focus on risk and protective factors for vulnerable children, particularly as this can reduce the number of children presenting as offenders. We know that children who enter the care and protection or justice systems have poorer long term outcomes than those that do not.

The Government funds a wide range of initiatives to address risk and protective factors for vulnerable children across a number of agencies. These include universal services such as health and education. More targeted interventions include:

- Social Workers in Schools (SWiS) (Vote Social Development)
- support for parenting programmes (Vote Social Development)
- school attendance services that respond to disengaged and truanting children (Vote Education)
- participation in early childhood education as part of getting children on track for success from an early age (Vote Education)
- child health services including WellChild/Tamariki Ora services, child and adolescent mental health services and alcohol and other drug services (Vote Health)
- Gateway Assessment of health and education needs of children entering, or in, the care and protection system (Vote Social Development)
- The Break-Away School Holiday Programme that provides children with an opportunity to attend school holiday programmes at no cost to participants (Vote Social Development)
- Police Youth Development case management programmes (Vote Social Development).
The Government's work on vulnerable children will be particularly important in preventing child offending and addressing the needs of child offenders, as these children often first appear as victims of abuse or neglect. New Zealand research cited in the Green Paper on Vulnerable Children suggests that at any one time 15 per cent of children (or 163,000 children aged under 18 years) are particularly vulnerable. Without significant support and intervention, these children will not thrive, belong or achieve.

The Green Paper for Vulnerable Children presented options to ensure timely coordinated responses to aid early identification and intervention. These are likely to be further developed in the White Paper, due for release in October 2012. Options for timely coordinated responses include increasing:

- mechanisms to regularly assess and monitor children to better protect them from maltreatment and abuse
- information-sharing between professionals at the frontline
- efforts to improve and promote collaboration between professionals and services
- the use of early childhood education centres and schools as sites for the delivery of a wider range of services.

The Government is developing a Youth Crime Action Plan to guide work on reducing child and youth offending and victimisation. Key objectives shaping the development of the plan are to better integrate responses by government agencies and their non-government partners and to intervene earlier with children and young people who offend or are at risk of offending. The Youth Crime Action Plan will have a focus on effective interventions for Māori children and young people who offend. Whanau will also be involved. This focus will help address the significant over-representation of Māori in offending statistics.

Police and Child, Youth and Family are focusing more on early intervention, using screening tools to identify wider needs. The Police Youth Offender Risk Screening Tool is used with children who come to Police attention on a second occasion for an incident (such as truancy) or for offending. Child, Youth and Family’s Gateway Assessment aims to ensure every child or young person entering care receives an assessment that helps build a complete picture of the child or young person’s needs, and sees that they get access to health and education services to address their needs.

The Police Prevention First National Operating Strategy 2012-2015 is about preventing crime and being visible in the community. Children and young people are one of the priority areas outlined in the strategy and the Police Youth Policing Plan 2012-2015 focuses on prevention, early intervention and coordinated responses. Police aim to keep vulnerable children and young people safe and decrease the number entering into, and remaining within, the criminal justice system. Police Youth Education and Youth Development programmes are designed to prevent children and young people from entering the criminal justice system.

**Recommendation 2:**

*Requiring child offending intervention and identification programmes to operate to consistent performance standards throughout the country.*

**Response:** The Government agrees that consistent performance standards are useful to ensure that interventions reflect good practice and are delivered consistently. We believe there is now a suite of effective identification tools available to agencies to identify and assess needs for young children at risk of or offending.
Two key tools are the Police Youth Offender Risk Screening Tool (YORST) and Child, Youth and Family the Gateway Assessment which assesses the health and education needs of children entering or in the care and protection system. Other tools include the TRAX wellbeing assessment and Substances and Choices Scale (SACS) tool which provides alcohol and other drug screening. The use of these tools aids in the identification and assessment of appropriate interventions based on the specific needs of each child.

If a child offends or comes to police attention for an incident more than once, Police use YORST to screen for a range of factors in the child's life. These factors can include offending history, peer group, education or employment involvement, drug and alcohol use, care and protection history and family factors. YORST indicates the likelihood (or risk) of the young person re-offending so that appropriate decisions can be made about intervention pathways. An independent evaluation in 2011 showed that YORST was as effective at screening as comparable tools used in other countries.

Police are often initial responders to child offending and report that they divert 90 per cent of child offenders away from the formal justice system. This work is primarily led by Police Youth Aid who work with children beginning to offend, or at risk of offending. YORST is used by Police Youth Aid to screen child offenders at their second offence and/or incident (such as truancy), or those who have been referred to Child, Youth and Family for care and protection due to serious offending.

For more serious offending, FGCs are held and where necessary the Family Court is involved. There are approximately 300 child offenders a year involved in these high-end FGC processes. The Office of the Chief Social Worker's review of FGCs will ensure they operate to consistent performance standards.

Agency funding agreements for child offender interventions include performance standards. These contracts include reporting processes. Monitoring the effectiveness of interventions, outlined in the response to recommendations 11 and 12, will help identify what interventions are most effective. This information will then inform performance standards.

**Recommendation 3:**

*Giving youth offending teams a clear mandate to work on individual cases, while retaining their strategic role.*

**Response:** As part of this Government's work to develop a Youth Crime Action Plan (see response to recommendation 1), consideration is being given to the most effective way to bring agencies together at a local level to achieve coordinated case management where appropriate. The role and function of Youth Offending Teams is already being considered and will be factored into this work.

---

3 CYF is due to complete the rollout of the Gateway Assessments in December 2012. The consistency of the application of both these tools is being monitored.

4 YORST was introduced nationwide for Police use in 2010. By 30 June 2011 YORST was being used in 75 per cent of cases where an offender is referred to an FGC. Work is being done to lift the use of the tool to 95 per cent of all FGCs and compliance is being monitored.
Recommendation 4:

*Developing protocols to allow the Ministry of Social Development to share information about at risk children with relevant agencies and organisations.*

Response: The Government recognises that the timely sharing of information about at risk children is crucial to prevent harm. Information about at risk children is often held by a number of different agencies including the Ministry of Social Development. The White Paper for Vulnerable Children is considering how to effectively and efficiently share information and what information may be required to gain a complete picture of a child’s circumstances and needs. The Green Paper for Vulnerable Children suggested that the Government review current legislative provisions regarding information sharing. This is to ensure professionals at the frontline are able to share information about children they work with in order to accurately assess the needs of a child, their family and whānau.

The Government is already working to enhance information sharing. When the Privacy (Information Sharing) Bill is passed into law, it will support better sharing of personal information between government agencies when there is a serious threat to public safety, or the life or health of an individual. This may enhance the ability of Child, Youth and Family to track outcomes for child offenders in its care, something already being done where possible. The Bill will also introduce a new process for approving information sharing agreements. These could be used to further improve interagency information sharing.

Further options for information sharing are currently under active consideration as part of the development of the White Paper for Vulnerable Children and the development of the Youth Crime Action Plan.

Recommendation 5:

*Clarifying where the accountability of Governmental agencies for child offenders lies.*

Response: The Government acknowledges that further work is required to ensure that all agencies that can contribute to supporting a child offender are involved in a coordinated way at the earliest appropriate point. Cross-agency case management (recommendation 3) could ensure that agencies have full information and work together early, without waiting until offending escalates to a more serious point.

Across the child offender system, agencies have different roles and accountabilities regarding child offending and these are outlined in the Children, Young Person, and Their Families Act 1989 (the Act). Approximately 90 per cent of the incidents of child offending are initially dealt with through warnings or other alternative actions led by Police. If Police have concerns regarding a child’s care and protection they will make a referral to Child, Youth and Family or an application to the Family Court when they think a child is in need of care or protection. Frontline Police are also able to arrest a child who has offended.

Child, Youth and Family lead the FGC process or respond when a notification is made regarding non-offending care and protection concerns. Delivering on an FGC plan can involve working with other agencies and providers. The Family Court can also become involved if Police, Child, Youth and Family or an FGC decide this level of intervention is required.
As part of the Fresh Start Youth Justice package, Police appointed 22 designated child case managers to enhance its focus and accountability in relation to child offenders. The child case managers work with families, agencies and community organisations to provide early and targeted interventions for children who offend or are at risk of offending.

The objectives of the Youth Crime Action Plan include addressing issues related to agency accountability, improving how agencies work together and delivering interventions in a timely coordinated way. Another area of focus will be on agency accountability to respond in more effective and relevant ways with Māori children who offend.

Recommendation 6:

*Considering lower thresholds for intervention, so that at risk children could receive support and intervention before they begin to offend.*

**Response:** The Government agrees early intervention and support in a number of areas can prevent child offending, including retaining children in education or responding to health issues. Some of this Government’s other Better Public Service targets are aimed at addressing these, including:

- 98 per cent of children starting school in 2016 having participated in early childhood education
- reducing children experiencing physical abuse by five per cent by 2017.

The Government recognises that severe conduct and behavioural problems in childhood are among the most important predictors of later chronic antisocial behaviour, including crime. The ‘Addressing Conduct and Behavioural Problems in Childhood’ work stream within the Drivers of Crime programme, focuses on developing initiatives and implementing programmes and services that prevent, treat and manage conduct and behavioural problems in at risk children and young people.

Providing access to appropriate interventions without a child having to become part of the formal justice system is something the Government is interested in. We know that the greater the exposure to the justice system the higher the chance of further offending, when other variables are controlled.

The Green Paper for Vulnerable Children suggested that increasing spending on early intervention as soon as problems become apparent could help quickly return children to being able to achieve good life outcomes. During the development of the White Paper for Vulnerable Children and a possible Vulnerable Children’s Action Plan, Government will consider ways in which early intervention and prevention can prevent children becoming vulnerable. The Youth Crime Action Plan will also provide guidance on early intervention opportunities.

Recommendation 7:

*Considering expanding the eligibility criteria for Social Workers in Schools to make it available to more schools with potential child offenders on their rolls.*

---

5 The Fresh Start reforms, introduced in October 2010, are the most fundamental change to the youth justice system in the last 20 years. Youth Court judges now have more options to deal with offenders, including powers to order mentoring programmes, alcohol and drug rehabilitation, and parenting education, and the ability to impose longer sentences for the most serious offenders. This reform allowed the most serious child offenders to be dealt with in the Youth Court. Funding as part of the package led to the creation of 22 Police Child Case Managers and supported expansion of Police Youth Development programmes.
Response: The Government recognises that school staff are often the first to notice when something is not right with a child. Many problems identified are complex and difficult. Qualified social workers are needed to address these issues with children and their families. The Government is in the process of expanding Social Workers in Schools (SWiS) to all decile 1-3 primary schools. There were 285 decile 1-3 schools with SWiS services and 125 SWiS social workers at the start of 2012. The expansion will mean 390 new schools will be able to access SWiS by the end of 2013. The first 95 schools covered by the expansion started receiving services from 50 social workers in term three of 2012.

The Government’s work on vulnerable children is also considering the role of schools as sites for the delivery of a wider range of services.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Part One: Areas for further action regarding identifying child offenders</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>As part of the Youth Crime Action Plan, it is proposed that further work be undertaken to:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• target activities and programmes to children who offend, or are at risk of offending earlier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• improve cross-agency information sharing for child offender cases to improve cross-agency wrap around support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• examine how local cross-agency case management would contribute to the response to children who offend</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• improve the consistent application of YORST for children who re-offend or come to Police attention on more than one occasion due to offending risk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• consider the roles and accountabilities of agencies for children who offend to ensure that the right agencies are involved at the right time for the right reason and work together early enough to reduce future offending.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The effectiveness of rehabilitation programmes

The Committee reported that it was “pleased that there is a wide range of programmes available, which cater to various cultural groups” (p22). The Committee wanted to see evaluation of the effectiveness of programmes and information on programmes to be more widely available to judges. A key aspect of programme effectiveness highlighted by the Committee was responsiveness to care and protection issues.

The Government’s response highlight how Police and Child, Youth and Family are working to better monitor the offending of repeat child and youth offenders. Work underway includes better data sharing and monitoring of outcomes of interventions and providers. There is also a focus on better targeting of interventions to a child’s specific needs. To achieve, this Child, Youth and Family maintains information on providers. The timeliness of interventions is important and is dependent on communication between and within agencies.
Recommendation 8:

_Ensuring that intervention for child offenders responds to any care and protection issues as well as the offending._

Response: The Government agrees with the recommendation that child offenders’ care and protection needs must be responded to, as well as their offending. Police child case managers, Youth Development and Youth Aid staff address the risks and needs of a child by working with their family to ensure all identified risk factors are taken into consideration. Police child case managers identify children at risk of persistent and serious offending early. Then they identify the risks and needs that contribute to these children’s offending, and work with the child and their family or whānau to reduce these risks and address needs. Providing follow-up and support to children who have offended and been given ‘Alternative Action’ by Police is part of their role. This helps provide an additional level of intervention, supplementary to Police Alternative Action, but prior to Family Court involvement.

Police collaborate with Child, Youth and Family in regards to a child or young person’s care and protection issues when required. The YORST tool assists Police and other agencies to identify issues that require follow up or referral (see recommendation 3 for more detail on YORST). For example, YORST information is provided to Child, Youth and Family prior to an FGC.

Child offenders are often at the interface of care and protection and justice services. If their offending reaches the point that an FGC is required, it is a care and protection FGC convened by a Child, Youth and Family youth justice FGC coordinator. The FGC considers care and protection concerns as the underlying causes of offending and considers how the child can be held accountable for their offending. Child, Youth and Family is aware of issues that can arise in the interface between their care and protection and justice services and are exploring ways to better connect the responses of these two service arms.

At times, there can be issues with the ability of agencies to respond to child offender needs when other cases take priority. The Youth Crime Action Plan will consider how child offender care and protection interventions can be enhanced, including consideration of a case work approach that will influence front line responses to the diverse issues affecting child offenders (as discussed in recommendation 3). The development of the White Paper on Vulnerable Children will consider how children’s needs for care and protection can be best met.

Recommendation 9:

_Speeding up the process of referral to rehabilitation programmes so that child offenders could benefit from these programmes sooner and effectively._

Response: The Government agrees that the timeliness of interventions is important. Waiting too long to intervene can have adverse consequences. However, it can take time to gather information to inform decision making in regards to effective interventions for a child, and if necessary their family.

The focus with child offenders is on individualised interventions, wherever possible, within the context of their family. A key part of speeding up referrals to providers is ensuring they are made early in the life of a problem, without agencies, children, or their families having to go through a number of formal processes or more severe or frequent offending before then can access them. Early intervention can include participation in sports or cultural activities, counselling and support to access health or education services. Interventions can also focus on the family.
The Green Paper on Vulnerable Children identified the value of early intervention and this issue is being considered further in the White Paper. The Youth Crime Action Plan will consider ways to improve the timeliness of agency responses and early intervention services.

**Recommendation 10:**

*Establishing and maintaining a national database of the rehabilitative programmes available for child offenders, to provide judges with a comprehensive overview of treatment options for child offenders.*

**Response:** Information about programmes and services available to support child offenders at a local and national level is critical to ensure good decisions are made through FGCs and Court proceedings. The Government will improve the availability of this information and develop an effective way to ensure judges have this information when they need it to support their decision making on the best treatment options for specific child offenders.

Child, Youth and Family maintain a national database of residential rehabilitative programmes. However, most programmes and interventions are localised, non-residential and accessed as part of an FGC Plan.

**Recommendation 11:**

*Requiring all rehabilitation programmes receiving state funding to provide an evaluation of the programme’s effectiveness (including cultural perspectives). Taking into account the size of the contracts or programmes may require the support of the relevant funding agency to conduct a robust evaluation.*

**Response:** This Government supports a focus on identifying the effectiveness of interventions for child offenders. Child offenders whose offending is persistent, or serious enough, to warrant formal intervention form a small proportion of youth justice work. For example in 2011 only 337, out of 7423 FGCs convened for reasons of offending, concerned child offenders. The small number, geographical spread and age of child offenders means that it is difficult to measure statistically the effectiveness of child offending programmes by specific providers. However, child offenders have high levels of care and protection needs, which are generally met through individualised plans agreed at an FGC. These plans are designed to strengthen the family’s ability to prevent reoffending and help their child get back on track.

A programme of work being led by the Office of the Chief Social Worker is seeking to improve FGC practice, including those convened for reasons of child offending, to ensure better outcomes for children and their families. Child, Youth and Family will be able to monitor the improvements to outcomes for children following the FGC Plans interventions.

Some child offenders, particularly those meeting the revised thresholds for Youth Court intervention\(^6\) will be accessing the rehabilitation programmes available under the Fresh Start reforms. This includes mentoring, alcohol and drug, and parenting orders. The Ministry of Social Development’s Centre for Social Research and Evaluation has a programme of work that includes research into the effectiveness of a range of initiatives funded by the Government since 2008, including the Fresh Start reforms. Where such programmes are accessed by children as well as young

---

\(^6\) Set out in the Children, Young Persons, and Their Families (Youth Courts Jurisdiction and Orders) Amendment Act 2010 and discussed further in section four (recommendations 26-31).
offenders (aged 14 to 17 years), research findings will be separated out to establish whether such programmes are any less, or more, effective for children. The small numbers of child offenders will limit the ability to make statistically significant conclusions about interventions with them.

Where any new programmes are developed specifically for child offenders the Government is committed to these being based on effective practice research evidence, including cultural perspectives, so that the value for money of any new programmes can be monitored.

**Recommendation 12:**

Conducting a review to gauge the recidivism rates of child offenders who have taken part in rehabilitation programmes, to assess the effectiveness of the various schemes.

**Response:** The Government is committed to identifying the effectiveness of interventions on reoffending. The Ministry of Social Development through the Centre for Social Research and Evaluation has tracked recidivism rates for 2008 and 2009 and is doing this for the 2010 and 2011 period. Recidivism by children and young people normally occurs within two years of an intervention and, as such, the effectiveness of rehabilitative programmes and interventions will be undertaken on a two-yearly cycle. Any shorter timeframe may indicate an inaccurate level of effectiveness.

To date the Centre for Social Research and Evaluation has examined the offending patterns for 205 children who attended an FGC in 2008 or 2009 due to the history or nature of their offending. Offending patterns were examined for the two years before and after the FGC. An FGC plan can include a range of interventions. Most often it involves case management and sometimes more structured programmes.

It is proposed to repeat this exercise regularly to monitor the offending patterns before and after the FGC and the FGC Plan. This exercise will be repeated using data for 2010 and 2011 FGC attendees at the end of 2013. The results of this analysis will help Child, Youth and Family to monitor the impact of both legislative change and changes to service delivery. This will ensure that the impact of any such changes are understood and delivering the improvements in recidivism sought by the reforms.

The Government will also consider how work on achieving the Better Public Services key result area to reduce youth crime by 5 per cent could include child offenders. Currently justice and social sector agencies are collaborating on a new suite of youth justice performance measures. To reduce youth and adult crime agencies need to work effectively with children who re-offend.

**Recommendation 13:**

*Intervention proportionate to the risk a child’s environment presents to his or her development and the seriousness of his or her situation, which may or may not be indicated by the seriousness of his or her offending; and examining the risk in a comprehensive assessment.*

**Response:** The Government agrees that effective targeting of intervention is important. Most children who offend do so only once and never come to the attention of Police again. This is why the YORST tool is used following a second offence or incident (such as truancy or Section 48 of the Act). YORST is designed to screen the
needs of a child or young person identified as offending or at risk of offending. In many cases the issues identified by a YORST assessment are addressed by Police making referrals to agencies and their youth development programmes.

Where a decision is made to refer to an FGC, information contained in the YORST is passed on to Child, Youth and Family. Child, Youth and Family have access to a range of specialised screening tools such as the TRAX wellbeing assessment, the Substances and Choices Scale (SACS) tool which provides adolescent alcohol or drug screening and measures outcomes. The issues identified in assessments are used to identify the most appropriate intervention required.

**Recommendation 14:**

That Child, Youth and Family review the offending history of a selected group of offending young people and track their outcomes to get an indication of the success of the interventions they have received and of Child, Youth and Family’s case management, and to determine areas for a responsible review of practice and policy.

**Response:** Since the Committee met, the Ministry of Social Development has continued to work with Police to share data and improve tracking of children and young people receiving youth justice interventions. The Lifetime Offender Seriousness Tool (LOST) and Police occurrence data is being used to report on re-offending outcomes including changes in the frequency and seriousness of offending and post-intervention imprisonment rates.

This information has been used to benchmark historic re-offending data for child offenders and high-end orders such as Supervision with Residence, Supervision with Activity and Supervision orders made during 2008 and 2009. This will enable comparisons to be made with new programmes and orders introduced under the Fresh Start package in 2010. The initial child offender group being analysed are 205 children with FGCs convened under section 247(a) of the Act in 2008 or 2009. However, it is too early to provide complete and comprehensive data or to make judgements on the impact and effectiveness of interventions.

To enhance and further support work with children who offend, Child, Youth and Family has developed a Child Offender Checklist and an Assessment Planning Intervention Review table. A set of practice triggers are also in development to support case work with child offenders. These triggers will guide decision making and assist case planning by social workers. They are an enhancement to Child, Youth and Family practice frameworks and operate in conjunction with the principles of the Act. The practice triggers will be used by social workers, supervisors and FGC coordinators.

**Recommendation 15:**

Ensuring progress is made as soon as possible on sharing information between Child, Youth and Family, the New Zealand Police, the Ministry of Justice, the Ministry of Health, and the Ministry of Education to track the outcomes of those in Child, Youth and Family care.

**Response:** The Government is committed to collecting robust information on outcomes to help enhance the effectiveness of child offender interventions across government. This is outlined in response to recommendation four which is also about

---

7 See recommendation two for more information on YORST.
information sharing. Development of a fusion centre focused on cross-agency information sharing is currently under discussion.

Police appreciate the use of good intelligence and analysis in informing decision making. Police is also currently undertaking an upgrade of its data system to improve reporting. In the long term the ability to analyse information regarding child and youth offending and victimisation will be improved.

Part Two: Areas for further work on rehabilitation effectiveness

As part of the Youth Crime Action Plan, it is proposed that further work be undertaken to:

- examine how the care and protection and youth justice services can be connected to better support children who offend
- focus on evaluation of the effectiveness rehabilitation programmes for children,
- monitor the impact of rehabilitation on the recidivism of child offenders.

The care and protection referral process

The Committee’s report highlighted the need to ensure the timeliness of interventions in order to intervene early in the life of a problem. It recommended simplifying how the Children, Youth Persons, and Their Families Act addresses child offenders, and enhancing assessment and provision of support services.

In response to the recommendations there will be a focus on improving referral practices between agencies with the goal of speeding up referral processes while focusing on better addressing the needs of child offenders.

Recommendation 16:

Considering simplifying the legislation governing child offenders to make it easier for practitioners to apply.

Response: A number of submitters raised concerns about the legislation that governs child offenders. An example used by many submitters was that accessing information about child offender processes in the Act is overly complex due to references being located in many places rather than clustered together. While some professionals are familiar with parts of the Act focused on child offenders, many are less familiar because the small number of child offenders means they rarely use these provisions.

The Government considers there is a need for training and practice guidance on using the child offender provisions within the Act to be provided by agencies to practitioners. Consideration will be given to updating the Child Offender Manual to assist practitioners in the application of the Act. A revision of how child offender provisions in the Act could be grouped together will be considered the next time the Act is revised.
**Recommendation 17:**

*Requiring all children referred into the care and protection system to undergo health and education assessments automatically.*

**Response:** Recognising the need for health and education assessments, the Government provided $15.3 million over four years in Budget 2011 for Gateway Assessments that build a complete picture of the health and education needs of child or young offenders in the care and protection system. By December 2012, these assessments will be available to children and young people entering care, those already in care and when requested, to support an FGC. Not all children referred to Child, Youth and Family require this level of specialist assessment. Information from the assessments is used to access the right health and educational services.

Further care and protection needs and risk assessments are being developed by the Office of the Chief Social Worker and are scheduled for introduction in December 2012. This will include assessments of the child's education engagement and achievement, and physical and mental health needs.

**Recommendation 18:**

*Ensuring child offenders identified as having mental health issues or drug and alcohol problems are given a high priority for care.*

**Response:** In Budget 2011, the Government committed $14.5 million funding over four years for Child, Youth and Family to purchase mental health services that are over and above existing Child Adolescent Mental Health Service provision, and other specialist mental health services. This Intensive Clinical Support Service is focused on 0-17 year olds with referrals made jointly by Child, Youth and Family and Child and Adolescent Mental Health Services. It uses a new wrap-around team care approach in the child's own home for children and young people with serious mental health problems and complex social needs. This service fills in gaps in services and ensures children in care, including for justice reasons, receive the mental health support they need.

New on-going funding of $2 million annually was provided in budget 2012 to expand youth (including older children) alcohol and other drug counselling. One of the reasons for this investment is the link between alcohol abuse and offending. The impact of these investments will be monitored.

Through the TRAX comprehensive assessment of wellbeing and criminogenic need and SACs alcohol and drug assessment tools, Child, Youth and Family youth justice coordinators and social workers make initial screenings and refer children for specialised assessment and support in the health system.

**Recommendation 19:**

*Considering ways of improving the Family Court process to prioritise child offending cases.*

**Response:** Current practices within the Family Court place priority on the most serious matters that are before the Court, including child offending cases. These cases are monitored through judicial conferences as well as registrars’ lists to ensure they proceed in a timely way. However, the progress of a case can be dependent on the timing of events outside the Court’s control, for example, the holding of an FGC or obtaining a specialist report.
While there are no specific proposals relating to child offenders arising out of the review of the Family Court, a number of the Review’s proposals should benefit these cases. For example, improvements by the Government to Family Court processes will reduce delay, which will mean that judges are able to consider child offender cases at an earlier stage.

**Recommendation 20:**
Streamlining all aspects of the care and protection system and referral process to ensure child offenders are dealt with soon after the offending.

**Response:** The Government agrees with a focus on early intervention. Responses by frontline Police, Police Youth Aid and child case managers often form the first points of intervention in dealing with child offenders. They work to divert children and young people away from the formal justice system wherever possible.

More serious cases which form a much smaller number of interventions are governed by statutory timeframes and require a greater cross-agency approach. Where delays occur they are usually due to additional background information being required for FGC or Court process. For example, it can take six weeks to get a psychiatric assessment.

Child, Youth and Family are focused on ensuring all cases receive timely responses. Timeliness is supported by agency best practice policies and models.

The Youth Crime Action Plan and White Paper on Vulnerable Children will address intervention and referral points and timely processes.

**Recommendation 21:**
Requiring departments involved in care and protection proceedings to ensure that delays are never caused by administrative shortcomings or operational contingencies, but only to facilitate best practice and to promote the best outcome for the young person at the centre of proceedings.

**Response:** The Government supports the intent of this recommendation to provide timely best practice services. At times avoidable delays have occurred. Departments have increased their focus on ensuring the timeliness of interventions and timely provision of information that other agencies require in order to intervene. As part of the Youth Crime Action Plan improved processes for service delivery will be examined.

**Recommendation 22:**
Requiring that case files be reviewed on completion to determine whether deadlines were met and resolutions of family group conferences and Court hearings were realised; the reasons and justifications for any delay; and how the process could be improved to minimise delays in comparable circumstances.

**Response:** The Government supports a cross-agency review of cases where thematic issues are identified and addressed, as opposed to individual cases being audited. We know reviewing case files can be very valuable in understanding how practice can be improved. Individual agencies carry out case reviews.

For example, Child, Youth and Family social work supervisors and practice leaders perform case reviews using self-assessment framework guidelines where the quality of practice is examined against a set of standards for each priority area. Based on
the assessment, Child, Youth and Family sites rate their own practice quality, giving local insight into the areas they are good at and those requiring more focus. This in turn informs their year by year action plan and efforts to adopt best practice.

The numbers of child offenders are reasonably small with 337 children in 2011 participating in an FGC due to their offending. This group is generally afforded priority because of the nature of concerns. Given these small numbers this work could be operationalised with practice leaders and senior advisors as part of their regular case review work through Child, Youth and Family’s quality assessment tool.

Court hearings are directed to achieving resolution of cases. The Family Court directs action to be carried out within specified timeframes by agencies and professionals in conjunction with the parties. The Court schedules hearings on the basis that these actions will occur as directed. Should this not occur, the hearing will usually be adjourned until all directions are complied with. This can lead to delays in the timeliness of resolving cases.

Currently, the Family Court’s ability to record and report the reasons for an adjournment and instances of non-compliance with the court’s directions is limited. If this ability were to be enhanced, it would be necessary to clarify the outcomes sought before investigating options as to how to meet them.

The Quality Assurance Team in the Office of the Chief Social Worker will consider including this recommendation as a descriptor in their work programme with the self-assessment and action plan to prevent delays relaying information to the Family Court.

**Recommendation 23:**

*Taking steps to ensure that changes of case officer are rare and reasonable, and that due consideration is given to a case officer retaining responsibility for any child or young person who is the subject of proceedings, regardless of a change in position, if continuity of responsibility is in the best interest of that child or young person and retaining the file would not impinge unduly on the efficiency of the department.*

**Response:** Child, Youth and Family have best practice policies and processes in place that wherever practicable support continuity of case management. As part of the development of the Youth Crime Action Plan, Child, Youth and Family are developing a set of internal processes that will support continuity of case management, for example where a youth justice social worker is already working with a young offender and a younger sibling is apprehended, retaining involvement with the family/whānau.

Police Youth Aid workers, Youth Development staff and Police child case managers are also file holders and points of contact for children and their families. Where ever possible this continuity is maintained throughout the engagement process as the strength of a response lies in the strength of the relationship that can form with the child and the family or whānau.

**Recommendation 24:**

*That delays in proceedings and processes be a reportable measure in the annual report of Child, Youth and Family.*

**Response:** Child, Youth and Family currently reports on the percentage of Youth Justice FGCs held within statutory timeframes and that FGC Plans are reviewed on time through the Ministry of Social Development’s annual report. This reporting enables delays to be identified.
The Committee discussed delays in Family Court process. In this setting a number of agencies are involved so gaining a comprehensive picture of delays is much more difficult. Given the importance to the child of timely justice interventions the Government will explore how information on delays (see recommendation 25) is best captured and reported. This will include assessment of cost and benefits of collecting this information.

**Recommendation 25:**

That in cases involving children, the timeframes for action be required to reflect a child’s concept of time.

**Response:** This recommendation is already legislated for in the principles set out by the Act (section 5 f) that decisions affecting a child should, wherever practicable, be made and implemented within a timeframe appropriate to the child’s sense of time.

Police deal with most cases of child offending. Between initial contact and the decision to arrest, the Police have significant discretion in deciding how to proceed with child offenders or those identified as at risk of offending. All decision making and actions are taken by Police include making sure decisions are implemented within timeframes appropriate to the child’s sense of time. Police child case managers work to timeliness guidelines. Police Youth Development Operational Guidelines provide quality standards of best practice case management including timeliness.

Timely processes for the 300-400 children involved in FGCs due to offending are also important. The Office of the Chief Social Worker’s review of FGC practices report notes that the key to effective FGC work is the preparation done prior to the FGC. This involves working with the family and gathering assessment information from partner agencies, to ensure an effective and agreed Plan results from the FGC. Child, Youth and Family will respond to the findings of the Office of the Chief Social Worker review which will cover child offender FGCs.

The perception of delay between the point of apprehension and the judge having visibility of the case can be created by the FGC preparation process. However, from a child’s perspective many things may be happening in the intervening period to address their needs. The Internal Child, Youth and Family processes (recommendation 23) will improve continuity of responses where a child or family is already known to Child, Youth and Family.

**Part Three: Areas for further work regarding the care and protection referral process**

As part of the Youth Crime Action Plan, it is proposed that further work be undertaken to:

- consider how processes can reflect a child’s concept of timeliness with a focus on avoiding delays at each point following the offending including diversion, family group conferences, court, and completion of specialist reports.
The effectiveness of the care and protection model

The recommendations in this section are focused on expanding the role and power of the Family Court in relation to child offenders. They include giving the Court more powers and greater ability to hold agencies involved in proceedings to account. There is also a recommendation to review the care and protection model that forms the basis for current practice with child offenders.

The Act gives the Youth Court and the Family Court different roles and powers in relation to child and youth offenders. The Family Court can work with child offenders within their family context through care and protection orders, while the Youth Court has powers that are more prescriptive and time-limited which is suitable for youth offenders. The interests of the child are of paramount importance in the Family Court. This is not the case in the Youth Court, which must balance the young person's needs while also holding them accountable, and recognising the interests of victims.

The Child, Young Persons, and Their Families (Youth Courts Jurisdictions and Orders) Amendment Act 2010 that took effect after the Inquiry commenced created a dual track so that high-end child offender cases can be heard before the Youth Court. There are three instances where the Youth Court has jurisdiction over children:

- where the child is over the age of 10 years, and the offence is murder or manslaughter
- where the child is aged 12 and 13 years, and the offence is one (other than murder or manslaughter) for which the maximum penalty available is or includes imprisonment for life or at least 14 years
- where the child is aged 12 and 13 years and is a previous offender under section 272(1)(a) of the Act and the offence is one (other than murder or manslaughter) for which the maximum penalty available is or includes imprisonment for at least 10 years but less than 14.

These reforms have reduced the need for some of the recommendations made by the Select Committee.

**Recommendation 26:** Considering allowing cases before the Family Court to be transferred to the Youth Court if the child becomes old enough during the proceedings to be dealt with by the Youth Court, or if the child commits subsequent offences which fall into the Youth Court's jurisdiction.

**Response:** For a child to reach the Family Court for offending he or she must have met a clear threshold of needing care and protection. The Family Court is best placed to respond to care and protection issues. However, we recognise in the current system responses to child offenders can be protracted and may not reflect the child’s concept of time. Work will be undertaken to improve the timeliness of responses to child offenders, this will include a consideration of the FGC and Family Court processes with a view to having matters in the Family Court resolved in a timely manner.

The second matter raised by the Committee is where a young person is involved in concurrent processes within the youth and child offender jurisdictions. This situation
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8 Proceedings may be commenced as either an application for a declaration that the child is in need of care or protection in the Family Court or by proceedings under the Summary Proceedings Act 1957 in the Youth Court.
is not ideal. This can occur when a young person reoffends while having historic matters open within the Family Court. Ways to potentially ‘join up’ these process to enhance responses to this offending will be explored.

Currently the Youth Court can deal with the most serious and repeat child offenders. The Fresh Start youth justice reforms that came into effect on 1 October 2010 allowed 12 and 13 year old very serious offenders or serious repeat offenders to have their cases considered in the Youth Court. These 12 and 13 year olds, subject to many checks and balances, can receive Youth Court orders and programmes.

**Recommendation 27:**

*Considering requiring more responsibility from agencies involved in Family Court proceedings.*

**Response:** The Family Court’s involvement with government and community agencies is one of the significant strengths of the Family Court system. Agencies working together to respond to child offenders are much more likely to yield results. This requires effective involvement from agencies. The FGC review also identified that a legal and policy framework supporting interagency accountability and responsibility for vulnerable children is needed.

The issue of ensuring cross-agency responses to child and youth offending will be considered further within the Youth Crime Action Plan. This work will not be limited to the responsibility and involvement of agencies in Family Court proceedings (although it must be noted that children appearing in the Family Court are likely to have the most complex needs), but will consider how agencies can provide effective intervention and support for child offenders and their family and whānau when appropriate.

A key area for development as part of the Youth Crime Action Plan is to ensure that appropriate cross-agency support and services are available early and when a child offends (see responses to recommendations 1, 5, 22 and 30).

**Recommendation 28:**

*Considering giving the Family Court greater powers to compel parents to attend court hearings involving their children.*

**Response:** The Government considers that there are adequate policies in place to compel parents to attend court. We already have a statutory obligation and commitment to ensure that a child’s family and whānau participates in the decisions affecting that child. Where appropriate, relationships with a child’s family and whānau are maintained and strengthened as set out in section 5(a) of the Act. The Family Court can currently access orders that require parents or guardians to attend counselling or ordering parents before the court within two years of the first hearing so that further action can be taken, as set out in section 83.

We know it is positive when parents or carers are involved in court processes. Child offenders will have the best outcome when their family and whānau are effectively engaged in the entire intervention. However, for some child offenders having a parent present at court may be detrimental to their welfare and care and protection needs. Creating orders compelling parents to attend may inappropriately penalise parents who are unable, as opposed to unwilling, to attend or to support their child.

Furthermore, the drive to compel parents may impact adversely on the relationships that agencies are trying to form with children and their families to find solutions. In these situation there is little value compelling parents before court.
Recommendation 29:
Giving the Family Court similar powers to make supervision orders to those of the Youth Court.

Response: The Government agrees that some serious repeat child offenders are best dealt with using Youth Court orders. Provision was made in the Fresh Start reforms to allow cases involving very serious and repeat serious 12 and 13 year old child offenders to be heard in the Youth Court. There are many checks and balances to this process before child offenders can be seen in the Youth Court, ensuring this provision is only used when necessary.

In addition to this, the Family Court can apply a number of orders to child offenders, including services orders (which direct a child to participate in a service), support orders (which require that a child take part in educational, recreational, instructional, cultural, work or sporting programme), admonishing, assessment, and non-association orders.

However, it is acknowledged that child offenders often have complex needs and we will review how current Family Court orders are being used and their effectiveness. We will also consider the impact of the expansion of the ability of the Youth Court to respond to very serious or serious repeat offending by 12 and 13 year olds. If the review identifies the need for further types of orders within the Family Court this will be considered, bearing in mind the separate roles and objectives of the Family Court and Youth Court.

Recommendation 30:
Undertaking a more thorough, detailed review of the care and protection model to ensure intervention is early and effective.

Response: The Government is committed to ensuring intervention is early and effective. We support this part of the recommendation. This is reflected in the response to many of the Committee’s recommendations. Effective early intervention will also be addressed by the Youth Crime Action Plan and the White Paper on Vulnerable Children. The FGC review will enhance the implementation of child offender FGCs that operate within the care and protection model. The parts of the Act focused on child offenders enable an early intervention focus.

Given the wider work on vulnerable children which has the potential to reframe the response with this group it is not considered appropriate to review the care and protection model at this time.

Recommendation 31: Considering introducing a new oversight and accountability order in the Family Court.

Response: Giving the Family Court oversight and accountability orders would be a significant shift from current practice. Children and their families receive support through Police child case managers, Police Youth Aid and Youth Development. Child, Youth and Family use FGC plans to hold children to account and address care and protection needs (see recommendation 8 response). The intention is to focus interventions at these early stages rather than escalating the issue to the Family Court.

The Government does not believe a new oversight and accountability order is required within the Family Court, but we will consider this as part of the development
of the Youth Crime Action Plan. This Plan and The White Paper on Vulnerable Children are considering when and what form interventions with vulnerable children should take.

| Part Four: Areas for further work regarding the effectiveness of the care and protection model |
| As part of the Youth Crime Action Plan, it is proposed that further work be undertaken to: |
| • examine whether the Fresh Start reforms, including the ability to have a dual pathway for 12 and 13 serious and repeat offenders, provides adequate scope to manage high-end child offenders. |
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GOVERNMENT RESPONSE TO
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INTRODUCTION

1 The Government has carefully considered the Social Services Committee’s report on Petition 2008/121 of Graeme Axford, which requests that the House of Representatives establish an independent complaints system for Child, Youth and Family separate from the Ministry of Social Development.

2 The Government welcomes the Committee’s report, which highlights the interest from sectors of the community about the way in which Child, Youth and Family considers and responds to complaints about its services. The Government responds to the report in accordance with Standing Order 249.

3 The Government accepts the Committee’s recommendations. It has directed officials working on the Green and White Papers for Vulnerable Children to investigate whether, as part of that work, there is a need to review the complaints mechanism for Child, Youth and Family. Consideration of this issue will be conducted in tandem with other policy development work.

4 The Government is taking a planned long-term approach that started with the Green Paper to address the fundamental question of how New Zealand can achieve better lives and better outcomes for our vulnerable children. A White Paper for Vulnerable Children will be released later this year.

5 The Government has directed the Ministry of Social Development to develop and implement a process to monitor complainants’ satisfaction with the Chief Executive’s Advisory Panel process, and this was achieved in November 2011.

RECOMMENDATIONS AND GOVERNMENT RESPONSE

Background

6 The Child, Youth and Family complaints process is a two step process that seeks to resolve complaints locally wherever possible. The first step is for a complaint to be considered by Child, Youth and Family. If complainants are not satisfied with the service they receive, Child, Youth and Family has the opportunity to put it right and learn from it. This is typical of complaints processes in service organisations and government agencies generally, and consistent with principles of natural justice.

7 The complaint review is carried out by a staff member who has not previously been involved in the original social work or issue, in order to bring a fresh perspective to bear on the complaint. If the complaint is not resolved by the site office it is referred to senior regional staff to review and to seek resolution with the complainant.

8 If the complaint is still not resolved to the complainant’s satisfaction, they can ask for it to be reviewed by the Panel. The purpose of the Panel is to provide complainants with an impartial review of their issues and concerns, and to recommend steps to the Chief Executive to resolve the complaint. Membership of the Panel is external being comprised of highly
respected members of the community. It has the discretion to determine its own procedure and decide its own jurisdiction.

9 In operation since 2008, the Panel is currently chaired by the former Children's Commissioner, Dr John Angus. It reports to the Chief Executive of the Ministry of Social Development and is administered outside of Child, Youth and Family. Since its establishment the Chief Executive has accepted every recommendation made by the Panel.

10 Complainants also have the right to take their complaint, at any time, to one of the external, independent bodies that are available. These include the Office of the Ombudsmen, Privacy Commissioner, Children's Commissioner, Health and Disability Commissioner, or Social Workers Registration Board.

11 The Social Services Committee considered Petition 2008/121 of Graeme Axford, which requests that the House of Representatives establish an independent complaints system for Child, Youth and Family separate from the Ministry of Social Development.

12 The Social Services Committee received a written submission from the Ministry of Social Development on Petition 2008/121 and heard oral evidence from Ministry officials on 7 September 2011.

13 The Social Services Committee presented its report on the petition to the House of Representatives on 30 September 2011. In its report the Committee made the following comments.

"In our view, establishing a completely independent complaints mechanism would improve the external perception of the review process. As the advisory panel is already impartial, we believe it would be advantageous to demonstrate its independence by separating it from the ministry."

14 The Committee noted that information on complainant satisfaction was not gathered and said that, in its view, "... currently, people whose complaints reach the Chief Executive's Advisory Panel have to be persistent to resolve their issues."

Recommendation 1

15 In its report the Social Services Committee recommended to the Government that it:

"investigate establishing an independent complaints mechanism for Child, Youth and Family which could be separate from the Ministry of Social Development".

Response

16 The Committee's report has raised a number of important issues about how people can best resolve their disputes with Child, Youth and Family. The Government has directed officials working on the Green and White Papers for Vulnerable Children to investigate whether, as part of that work, there is a need to review the complaints mechanism for Child, Youth and Family. Consideration of this issue will be conducted in tandem with other policy work development. A decision about commissioning an independent review will be taken following the White Paper process, should evidence support this course of action.

Recommendation 2

17 In its report the Social Services Committee recommended to the Government that it:
"investigate establishing a mechanism to monitor complainants' satisfaction with the complaints process in the Ministry of Social Development and Child, Youth and Family".

Response

18 The Government has directed the Ministry of Social Development to develop and implement a process to monitor complainants' satisfaction with the Advisory Panel to the Chief Executive process. The new process came into effect in November 2011. Complainants are given a standard form after they appear before the Panel and asked to rate their satisfaction across five factors on a scale 1 to 5. They are also invited to make any comments they wish. Feedback to date has been positive with an average rating of 4.5.

Conclusion

19 The Government is aware of the interest from sectors of the community about the way in which Child, Youth and Family considers and responds to complaints about its services. Some submitters on the Green Paper for Vulnerable Children have commented on the Child, Youth and Family complaints process. Consideration of whether there is a need to review the complaints mechanism for Child, Youth and Family is appropriate as part of this policy development work. Improvements to the way in which complainants' satisfaction with the Advisory Panel to the Chief Executive have already been developed and implemented.

20 The Government would like to thank the Social Services Committee and the petitioner for highlighting a number of important issues about the complaints process.
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Introduction

The Government has carefully considered the Standing Orders Committee’s report on the review of Standing Orders and its recommendations to the Government.

The Government responds to the report in accordance with Standing Order 249.

Recommendations and Government response

**Recommendation 1:** The Standing Orders Committee recommends to the Government that the legislation to replace the Civil List Act 1979 include a provision to apply salary deductions to members who are suspended from the service of the House.

**Response:** In December 2010, the Minister Responsible for the Law Commission presented to the House the Law Commission’s Report 119 **Review of the Civil List Act 1979 – Members of Parliament and Ministers.** The report recommended that Parts 3 and 4 of the Civil List Act, relating to remuneration and support for members of Parliament and the Executive, and annuities for former Prime Ministers and their spouses, should be repealed and replaced by a new statute. The Members of Parliament (Remuneration and Services) Bill (the Bill) was introduced on 5 October 2011.

Among other things, the Bill modernises and modifies the law relating to the salaries and allowances of members of Parliament. It significantly increases the amount that may be deducted from an MP’s salary where an MP is absent without good reason. Currently the amount that can be deducted is $10 for every sitting day in excess of 14 on which a member was absent during a session of Parliament (except for specified reasons). The Bill provides that if an MP is absent for more than nine sitting days in a calendar year, other than in accordance with the rules of the House, the amount that may be deducted for each subsequent sitting day of absence is 0.2 per cent of the gross yearly base salary of an MP.

The recommendation of the Standing Orders Committee relating to salary deductions for members who are suspended can be considered as part of the select committee consideration of the relevant provisions of the Members of Parliament (Remuneration and Services) Bill.

**Recommendation 2:** The Standing Orders Committee recommends to the Government that legislation be introduced to amend the Legislature Act 1908 to provide that –

- the live broadcast of Parliament’s proceedings, including select committee hearings, is protected by absolute privilege;

- delayed broadcasts or re-broadcasts of Parliament’s proceedings, including select committee hearings, that are made by order or under the authority of the House of Representatives are protected by absolute privilege;

- a fair and accurate report of the proceedings in the House, or summary using extracts of proceedings in the House, by any person is protected by qualified privilege;
the broadcast and other publication of extracts of Parliament’s proceedings, including select committee hearings, that are not made by order or under the authority of the House of Representatives are protected by qualified privilege, in a manner consistent with the provisions of the Defamation Act 1992;

○ a member of Parliament, or any other person participating directly in or reporting on parliamentary proceedings, who makes an oral or written statement that affirms or adopts what he or she or another person has said in the House or its committees, will not be liable to criminal or civil proceedings.

Response: The changes recommended to the Government to amend the Legislature Act relate to covering gaps in the legislative framework for the protection of the broadcasting and reporting of proceedings in Parliament. The recommendations also are intended to address possible constraints on freedom of speech in the House or its committees arising from “effective repetition” outside the House or its committees.

The Government has consulted with the Clerk of the House and has been made aware of several wider issues concerning the meaning of “proceedings in Parliament” currently under review, including an inquiry before the Privileges Committee and the Law Commission’s review of the Official Information Act 1982. Parliamentary privilege is a complex issue and the Government considers that any changes to the Legislature Act should not be made in a piecemeal way. Issues concerning the broadcasting of proceedings in Parliament and freedom of speech in the House would best be considered in the context of a wider examination of parliamentary privilege issues.

The Government will ask officials to consult with the Clerk of the House once the current reviews are completed and report back to it on the appropriate form that the reforms should take.

Recommendation 3: The Standing Orders Committee recommends to the Government that Cabinet guidelines be amended to require that analysis of Bill of Rights and other constitutional matters be included and given prominence in regulatory impact statements supporting the introduction of bills, and to require Bill of Rights reporting on substantive Supplementary Order Papers.

Response: The Government is supportive of proposals that aim to enhance the consideration of human rights and constitutional issues in the policy development and legislative process. However, the Government does not consider that the regulatory impact statement is the best vehicle for highlighting human rights or constitutional matters. While departments should identify obvious human rights and constitutional matters in a regulatory impact statement where these matters are directly relevant to the key policy choices to be made, the regulatory impact statement is prepared too early in the legislative development process for all such impacts to be reliably identified. The explanatory note of Bills is possibly a better vehicle.

The Ministry of Justice’s current role of providing discretionary advice on Supplementary Order Papers ensures substantial issues are identified, and avoids a process that would capture less significant issues.

The Government will therefore consider how Bill of Rights and other constitutional matters could be highlighted in the explanatory notes of Bills and substantive Supplementary Order Papers, as part of the development of a revised Regulatory Standards Bill in accordance with the current Confidence and Supply Agreement with ACT New Zealand.
**Recommendation 4:** The Standing Orders Committee recommends to the Government that future Proclamations summoning Parliament appoint the place of meeting as “in the parliamentary precincts in the City of Wellington”, rather than specifying Parliament House.

**Response:** The Government has implemented this recommendation. The Governor-General’s proclamation of 14 December 2011 summoned the 50th Parliament to meet “in the parliamentary precincts in the City of Wellington”.
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Background

The 2011/12 inter-parliamentary relations programme provided for the New Zealand Parliament to attend the 21st Conference of Speakers and Presiding Officers in Port of Spain, Trinidad and Tobago. Speakers of the House of Representatives have regularly attended these conferences because of the unique professional development opportunity they offer. Speakers from most Commonwealth countries are present, providing the opportunity for wide-ranging discussion and the exchange of many different views on the role and responsibilities of Presiding Officers.

The conference is held every two years, usually in January. In alternate years the conference standing committee meets to confirm the venue and agenda for the next conference. The 2011 meeting in the Isle of Man was attended by Hon Harry Jenkins, Speaker of the Australian House of Representatives, representing the Australia/New Zealand region.

Introduction

The 21st Conference of Speakers and Presiding Officers of the Commonwealth was hosted by the Parliament of the Republic of Trinidad and Tobago from 7 to 12 January 2012. It was attended by Speakers from 41 of the 53 Commonwealth countries. I attended as a conference delegate and as an ex officio member of the conference standing committee, recognising that the New Zealand Parliament will host the next conference in 2014, and assume the chairpersonship of the standing committee for the 2013 meeting in Namibia. In the official delegation to the conference were Mary Harris, Clerk of the House of Representatives, and Beryl Bright, Senior Private Secretary to the Speaker. My wife joined the delegation for the official opening of the conference, and took part in the conference spouses’ programme.

A copy of the conference programme is attached as Appendix A.

Official opening of conference

The conference opening commenced with speeches of welcome from Hon Wade Mark, Speaker of the House of Representatives, Parliament of the Republic of Trinidad and Tobago, His Excellency Professor George Maxwell Richards, President of the Republic of Trinidad and Tobago, Hon Winston Dookeran, Acting Prime Minister of the Republic of Trinidad and Tobago, and Hon Dr Keith Rowley, Leader of the Opposition. Senator Hon
Timothy Hamel-Smith, President of the Senate, Parliament of the Republic of Trinidad and Tobago, gave the vote of thanks.

Hon Wade Mark formally welcomed delegates to the conference, noting that it was the second time in 14 years that the Republic of Trinidad and Tobago had hosted the conference, but that this 21st conference had special significance for the Republic. It marks 50 years of bicameralism and the golden jubilee of independence. The conference is being held at a time when conventional notions of democracy are being re-scripted, aided by the increased access to new communications technologies, and globalisation. Hon Wade Mark noted that the conference programme has been designed to address these concerns and harness collective energies to build more relevant and inclusive democracies throughout the Commonwealth, which ensure transparency and accountability are never compromised.

He invited delegates to enjoy the fine array of Trinidad and Tobago cuisine, the infectious music, the island fashion, as well as the historical sites forged out of the Republic’s colonial past.

His Excellency Professor George Maxwell Richards, the President of Trinidad and Tobago, declared the conference open and added his welcome to delegates. He noted that the topics established for the conference will go a long way to help fulfilling the objectives of the conference:

- the maintenance, fostering and encouraging of impartiality and fairness on the part of Speakers and Presiding Officers; and
- the promotion of knowledge and understanding of parliamentary democracy and the development of parliamentary institutions.

The President reflected on the importance of the institution of Parliament, providing a setting in which countries learn to govern themselves, rather than descending into the disorder of decision-making by whim and fancy. He noted the role of Presiding Officers, who, in a world of constant change, must be careful not to have a mindset that makes no room for innovation, while having a proper regard for tradition and established practice. In encouraging the preservation of the finer skills of parliamentary practice, he gave the example of Presiding Officers discouraging members from making their contribution to debates by the reading of speeches of prepared texts.

Hon Winston Dookeran, Acting Prime Minister of the Republic of Trinidad and Tobago, also welcomed delegates. He noted his country’s pride at the strength and resilience of its democracy and that democratic values are deeply embedded in the citizenry. He conveyed a message from the Prime Minister, Hon Kamla Persad-Bissessar, that the conference’s deliberations would “explore creative ways to reignite the pristine reputation of the institution of Parliament and deepen the link between Parliament and the people”.

He reflected on a “marked decline of deference towards all institutions, but most notably constitutional bodies”, and called for reconnection between Parliament and the people. He noted also that citizens are demanding greater participation in the democratic process. Parliament must be regarded as “an energised forum in which the people are present and their views are articulated. Parliaments have a unique responsibility to reconcile the
conflicting interests and expectations of different groups and communities through the
democratic means of dialogue and compromise”. He pointed to the need for wide-
ranging outreach activities to take Parliament to the people, by utilising technology through
the means of the internet and social media, and the need for insightful leadership from
Speakers and Presiding Officers.

Hon Dr Keith Rowley, Leader of the Opposition, also extended a warm welcome to
delegates. He spoke of the pride Trinidad and Tobago takes in maintaining a functioning
Parliament and its membership of the Commonwealth. He saw parliamentary democracy
as a representation of an expectation of a quality of life and that it is Speakers who ensure
that parliaments function as the engine of democracy.

The conference was extremely timely, he said, insofar as the deliberation will contribute to
a better appreciation of the role of the institution of Parliament, and reflected on how
fortunate members of the Commonwealth are when contrasted with other nations who are
striving, some for the first time, to achieve what we take for granted.

In giving the vote of thanks, Hon Timothy Hamel-Smith, President of the Senate,
Parliament of the Republic of Trinidad and Tobago, thanked the President, the Acting
Prime Minister and the Leader of the Opposition for their presence and words of advice.
He acknowledged the work of the Conference Secretariat and recognised the Artistic
Director and Carnival Bandleader for the welcoming ambience and “exposition of
Trinbagonian culture and effervescence” that greeted delegates.

In concluding, he thanked delegates for making the commitment necessary to ensure the
21st Conference is a success and wished them a productive conference.

Conference proceedings

The proceedings of the conference were divided into four working sessions, one each on:

- role of parliamentary diplomacy in the era of globalisation
- executive accountability: oversight role of Parliament
- emerging new challenges for Speakers: multi-party chambers and minority or
coalition governments
- parliamentary service and its management: strengthening the independence of
Parliament.

Role of parliamentary diplomacy in the era of globalisation

This working session was chaired by the President of the Senate of the Bahamas, Senator
Hon Lynn Holowesko. Hon Smt Meira Kumar, Speaker of the Lok Sabha, Parliament of
India, made the lead presentation. She began by reflecting that “the world has
metamorphosed into a global village with interdependence and interconnectedness as its
hallmarks” and expressed the view that parliaments have a pivotal role to play in the sphere
of foreign policy in this globalised era, critically in promoting international cooperation and
democratic values. International relations are no longer confined to traditional diplomacy,
which was once the domain of the Executive. Globalisation has transformed the
expectations of the masses. The focus now is on quality of life in tune with global standards, creating an expectation that parliaments have a broader understanding of global concerns.

Parliamentary diplomacy, Smt Kumar said, has evolved as an extremely effective and dynamic channel for fostering goodwill and understanding amongst nations by advancing people-to-people contacts. It encourages a consensual approach to resolving contentious issues. It is an invaluable platform for experience sharing, in particular, in relation to goals for the strengthening of democratic institutions and promoting inter-parliamentary cooperation.

As a Presiding Officer, Smt Kumar said she maintains an extensive network of foreign relations. In leading delegations, she vigorously puts forward the stance of her country in international fora and has widened the sphere of inter-parliamentary relations. She saw delegations with representation from various political parties adding value through reflecting the divergent views in Parliament and bringing flexibility to the solution of often apparently insurmountable problems.

Smt Kumar pointed to the key role that inter-parliamentary organisations play in bringing parliamentarians together. Their merit lies in their capacity to generate goodwill – surpassing the divisions of development, regional disparities or ethnic or cultural differences. They often prove to be the precursors of formal agreements.

India’s efforts to promote parliamentary democracy are not confined to multilateral level alone. Bilateral visits of parliamentary delegations to and from India are the bedrock of parliamentary exchanges. India has 78 parliamentary friendship groups focused on regular interaction with parliaments of other countries.

In closing, Smt Kumar commented that she was “convinced that the global decision making process would not be sufficiently representative of the on-the-ground realities if it were devoid of the contribution of parliamentarians. The stage is set for intensifying parliamentary diplomacy for the common interests of mankind.”

Discussion focused on ideas for themed workshops and conferences to look at interlinked global problems that are not specific to countries or regions, – issues of climate change, terrorism and HIV/AIDS – and the need to be conscious of the distinct role that parliaments play in contradistinction with the role of the Executive. Issues of accountability and cost were raised along with the need to explain that while parliamentary diplomacy may be soft diplomacy this does not mean it is not effective. Interest was expressed in developing the role of parliamentary friendship groups and the part they can play in parliamentary diplomacy and the key role of the Speaker in conducting parliamentary diplomacy without disturbing the fine balance of a country’s foreign policy. The growing focus on international decision making and standard setting was also raised. It was agreed that familiarisation with international issues helps parliamentarians in the formulation of national legislation in accordance with international standards.
Executive accountability: oversight role of Parliament

This working session was chaired by Hon Dr Fehmida Mirzar, Speaker of the National Assembly of Pakistan. I had the honour of making one of the lead presentations along with Hon Michael Birt, Bailiff and President of the States of Jersey.

Mr Birt began by asking the question: how effectively are parliaments fulfilling the role of holding governments to account for their policies and actions. He examined how successful scrutiny can occur in the context where governments must maintain the confidence of their Houses. He noted that the Commonwealth principles on accountability state: “parliamentary procedures should provide adequate mechanisms to enforce accountability of the Executive to Parliament”. He focused on the need for an appropriate committee structure adequately resourced and with the power to summon witnesses, including ministers, and the need for governments to be required to give responses to committee reports.

He noted criticism of committee scrutiny on the basis that too much time is spent on topics that simply reflect the personal political agendas of committee members, rather than reviews of government policy, and that scrutiny reports are not sufficiently evidence based. Such criticism he felt allowed governments to take committee reports less seriously and be less willing to engage with committees.

He looked at ways in which to get ministers to respond to committee recommendations in a meaningful and timely way, for committees to follow up their recommendations, and mechanisms to allocate parliamentary time to the consideration of committee recommendations.

In my presentation I addressed legislative accountability and the package of reforms adopted by the House to enhance the open and transparent operation of the House and good quality legislative scrutiny.

I spoke of the growing use of urgency simply to progress the Government’s legislative programme, rather than to pass urgent measures, and its impact on the House’s business. In so doing, I addressed the work of the Standing Orders Committee in finding ways to enable the Government to advance its legislative programme, but at the same time ensuring its legislative proposals are properly scrutinised.

I also covered the new arrangements for extended sittings of the House and the developing role of the Business Committee in planning the business of the House in a more transparent way. The procedures balance the Government’s need to make progress and proper scrutiny of legislation, particularly in select committees where public input is received.

My paper is appended as Appendix B.

Discussion covered the influence of political parties on the effectiveness of parliamentary scrutiny and whether a system that separates the Executive from Parliament may not be more effective. Nigeria has moved from the Westminster system of responsible government to a presidential system and, in Cameroon, when a member becomes a Minister he or she must resign his or her seat. Other delegates spoke of political parties expelling properly elected members and those members losing their seats.
The proper funding of Parliament was also canvassed and its influence on parliamentary effectiveness. Suggestions were made for a budget fixed as a proportion of a government’s total budget. Other scrutiny activities were also covered: question time, and special procedures for the scrutiny of international treaties, and government loan activities.

**Emerging new challenges for Speakers: multi-party chambers and minority or coalition governments**

This working session was chaired by Hon Andrew Scheer, Speaker of the Canadian House of Commons. The presenters for the session were Hon Wade Mark, Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Parliament of the Republic of the Trinidad and Tobago, and Hon Dr Fehmida Mirza, Speaker of the National Assembly of Pakistan.

Hon Wade Mark began his address by reflecting on the growth in the last decade of a proliferation of political coalitions or multi-party systems around the world. Of the approximately 193 sovereign states, some 99 have coalition governments. He saw them representing a vision of hope inspired by the perception that such a government may be more democratic since it represents a broader spectrum of public opinion. In multi-ethnic, multi-party societies, such as Trinidad and Tobago, coalitions can be viewed as highly desirable.

Coalitions and multi-party systems bring with them parliamentary challenges, particularly, if they begin to fragment. Hon Wade Mark examined the role of the Speaker in creating a conducive environment for parliamentary proceedings. He spoke of “presiding with equity”. The Speaker must be seen to be independent from party influences in the conduct of proceedings of the House as well as the administration of parliamentary services, but is expected to facilitate members in both multi-party and two-party systems.

He also spoke of the demands by citizens for higher levels of representation, equity, transparency and accountability of parliamentary institutions and reflected on the role of the Speaker in ensuring these expectations are realised.

The second presenter, Hon Dr Mirza, also reflected that multi-party coalitions and minority governments are not smooth sailing for Presiding Officers. She too saw impartiality as the most important feature of the Chair.

She reflected on presidential systems within the Commonwealth where the Speaker is usually required to toe the party line and in such cases can at best be “fair” but certainly not impartial. Even in systems of responsible parliamentary democracy, it is not always possible to keep the Speaker completely out of politics. In her own country, like other candidates, she has to get a party ticket and remain loyal to her basic party membership. She saw it as important for Speakers to be elected unopposed and for consideration to be given to guaranteeing Speakers a respectable and secure political future, and enlarging the political scope of the Speaker’s office by placing more authority in the Chair.

The Speaker draws his or her powers from the House and is “both master and servant of the House”, she said. If the Speaker conducts him or herself with the utmost impartiality and fairness, the House will be on his or her side. The rights of minorities and special interest groups must be protected, but at the same time the cooperation of the Opposition and Treasury benches is required. Hon Dr Mirza felt the guiding principle remains very clear: “let the minority have its say, but ensure that the majority gets it’s way”. In Pakistan,
a Business Advisory Committee headed by the Speaker has become a viable means for ensuring the smooth functioning of the House.

Following nine years of military dictatorship in Pakistan, the free democratic will of the people has been expressed in the emergence of a multi-party House and the formation of a coalition government. As a symbol of this change the House elected a woman Speaker for the first time in the history of the entire Muslim world. New benchmarks for democracy are being established in Pakistan and as part of these Hon Dr Mirza indicated she does not attend party meetings and functions.

Discussion focused on the challenges of coalition and minority government, political party membership and the Speaker’s responsibilities to his or her party and constituents, and the different situations Speakers face in terms of voting. Both the Speaker of the Lok Sabha and I spoke of what impartiality means in practice. We both agreed that because we come from parties in Government we demonstrate our impartiality by being a “little partial to the Opposition party”.

I also spoke of the challenge for Speakers of Houses with coalition or minority governments, of trying to bring the policy negotiations into the open, making them matters for discussion in the House rather than occurring largely behind closed doors. I drew attention to the role of the Speaker in chairing the Business Committee, which provides a forum for more transparent discussion of the arrangement of the House’s business.

**Parliamentary service and its management strengthening the independence of Parliament**

This working session was chaired by the Speaker of the National Assembly of Lesotho, Ntlhoi Motsami. Hon Noel Kinsella, Speaker of the Canadian Senate made the lead presentation.

Hon Noel Kinsella referred to the Latimer House Principles, which include provision for both ethical governance and for accountability mechanisms for democratic institutions and looked at the measures that could be brought to bear to implement them for legislatures. Public sector benchmarks have been established to ensure value for money, performance, and oversight of financial management, and these can easily be adapted for parliaments. However, Parliament ought not to be subject to the scrutiny afforded to government departments by the Executive, but this is not a licence for parliamentarians to act unreasonably.

Parliamentary independence must be tempered with a mindfulness of the public expectation of reasonableness and accountability. Proactive public reporting and disclosure measures by parliamentary institutions help strengthen public confidence. He saw this as new and uncharted territory and that opportunities to discuss these issues such as the present one were vitally important for information sharing in this area.

Hon Noel Kinsella also reflected that given the relatively high turnover of public office holders, it is really important to have a strong and stable parliamentary service that is able to provide the continuity and corporate memory required to successfully support

---

legislatures. He stressed the support necessary for parliamentarians to carry out their roles as legislators and scrutinisers of government activity, the two broad areas outlined in the Latimer House principles.

Discussion covered the autonomy of Parliament and how this is protected. Delegates raised the need to have a parliamentary service commission that is autonomous, but also to be clear about where the responsibility resides and whether this is ultimately with the Speaker. The importance of having independence in the appointment of parliamentary staff was also raised, but a note of caution was sounded about the possibility of disjoint relationships between professionals in the parliamentary service and the parliamentarians themselves. Delegates expressed a need to ensure capacity building both for parliamentary staff and for parliamentarians.

The workshop discussions were reported to a plenary session of the conference on the following day.

**Special plenary session**

A further special plenary session was held on the subject of reconnecting Parliament with the public – the role of Speakers and Presiding Officers. I chaired this session as an interactive discussion of the issues, following a presentation by Senator Hon Timothy Hamel-Smith, President of the Senate of the Parliament of the Republic of Trinidad and Tobago. Hon Timothy Hamel-Smith saw Parliament providing the opportunity for the voices of citizens to be heard in the policy-making process. He asked whether the goal of achieving a participatory democracy is fulfilled merely by citizens voting for their representatives or should Presiding Officers seek to influence the structures and operating methods and work of Parliament so as to better enable citizens to participate.

He saw a danger that parliaments may become irrelevant unless they find ways to draw citizens into the parliamentary process. The Parliament website is the tool for an interface platform that permits citizens to be heard. He spoke of a portal that enables citizens to identify topics they would like debated, the questions they want answered, to indicate their support for measures and to put forward their concerns and any proposed modifications.

Presiding Officers must take a leading role if apathy towards and negative perception of Parliament are to be reversed. He noted that the need to engage with young people is well accepted, but that there is evidence that while they want to be part of the political process it is not necessarily through formal and traditional channels. He and the Speaker are using an outreach programme for schools to start with young people to improve the perception of Parliament.

Another initiative the Trinidad and Tobago Parliament has adopted is called “Bill Essentials”, which provides the public with a synopsis of the latest legislation being considered by the Houses, written in an easy to understand format, with notes of the important issues to be considered. The Parliament had taken the opportunity of its celebration of 50 years of bicameralism to educate citizens and raise awareness of Parliament as an institution.

As the Chairperson of the plenary session, I invited delegates to speak about the public perception of Parliament as an institution and the ways identified to build greater respect through the use of technology, outreach and initiatives such as “Bill Essentials”.
Rt Hon Baroness D'Souza, Lord Speaker of the House of Lords, United Kingdom Parliament, spoke of her job being to protect and promote the reputation of the House of Lords through school programmes and school visits, the Lords of the Bog.net blog, Twitter and YouTube, and “Parliament Week”. She emphasised the need to be aware of speaking to the unconverted rather than the converted, particularly using electronic media to reach those that have little or no experience of Parliament.

Other delegates spoke of youth assemblies and school visits having a spin-off effect with parents. Benefit was seen in integrating members into school programmes. Delegates raised the provision of material about Parliament to schools to supplement member engagement, and the use of Parliament television channels for outreach.

Interactive Parliament websites and portals were also discussed to help encourage public participation. Problems with managing the volume of communication and spam were raised. Moderators are necessary, but smart utilisation of modern technology was seen as crucial to communicating Parliament in the future. “Telephone Town Hall” sessions were also discussed, where the public can be connected to members and ask questions of them.

The televising of question time and its wide audience was discussed in considering public respect for the institution of Parliament. Is it creating the right image? Has the House become more theatrics than substantive policy debate? Delegates saw Speakers playing a role in improving the quality of debate and question time. I commented on my efforts to have more genuine questions that ministers actually answer instead of resorting to political statements aimed at the questioner. My endeavours are to encourage a House where debate is robust, passionate and noisy, but mostly good humoured, and the public response is favourable.

In closing it was suggested that the next standing committee meeting explore video conferencing for communication between Speakers and Presiding Officers.

**Business session**

The business session dealt with four issues:

- confirmation of the hosting of the 2013 Standing Committee meeting and the 2014 Conference
- hosting of the 2015 Standing Committee meeting
- hosting of the 2016 Conference

**Confirmation of hosting of 2013 Standing Committee meeting and 2014 Conference**

The conference confirmed that the next meeting of the standing committee will be held in Namibia in January 2013, subject to confirmation from the Namibian Parliament. The venue for the 2014 Conference will be New Zealand and the conference will be held in the third week of January 2014.
Hosting of 2015 Standing Committee meeting

The conference agreed that the States of Jersey will host the standing committee meeting in January 2015.

Hosting of 2016 Conference

The conference agreed that Malaysia host the conference in the second week of January 2016.

Election of standing committee

I nominated Hon John Hogg, President of the Senate of the Commonwealth Parliament of Australian to represent the Australia/New Zealand region on the standing committee for the period 2012–2014. Hon John Hogg was duly elected.

As the host nation for the 2014 Conference, New Zealand assumes the chairpersonship of the standing committee. As the new Chairperson and on behalf of the delegates, I thanked the Parliament of the Republic of Trinidad and Tobago for hosting the 21st Conference and the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the President of the Senate for their chairing of the conference.

I extended a warm welcome to delegates to the 22nd Conference in New Zealand.

Conclusion

This was my second conference. I found the discussion valuable and was particularly pleased to be able to stimulate considerable discussion while chairing the special plenary session on reconnecting Parliament with the people. This was a new development that worked well and is a model that could well be utilised for the business sessions for the next conference in New Zealand.

Opportunities for the professional development of Presiding Officers on a Commonwealth-wide basis are rare. I was able to make new contacts and enjoyed interacting with so many fellow Speakers. It is interesting to find that many of the issues we have to deal with in the New Zealand Parliament are often the same as those facing other Speakers around the world.

I extend my appreciation to the host and Chairperson of the Conference, Hon Wade Mark, Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Parliament of the Republic of Trinidad and Tobago. The hospitality and entertainment we received made our visit a memorable one, capped off by a visit to Tobago with its unique heritage and breathtaking beauty.
Appendix A

21st Conference of Speakers and Presiding Officers of the Commonwealth Programme

Saturday, January 7, 2012

Meeting of the Standing Committee

Monday, January 9, 2012

Opening Ceremony

Opening Plenary
(1) Presentation of the draft agenda for the 21st Conference
(2) Election of two Vice-Chairpersons
(3) Nomination procedure for the 2012–2014 Standing Committee
(4) Items stemming from the Standing Committee meeting (TBC)

Workshop discussions (Speakers to decide which of the following two workshops they will participate in)

Topic 1 – The role of parliamentary diplomacy in the era of globalisation
• The Commonwealth as a forum
• Role of Speaker as the official representative of the Parliament in relation to the Parliaments of the world
• Role and responsibilities of the members of Parliament in strengthening the role of Parliament in world affairs / international matters

Topic 2 – Executive accountability: oversight role of Parliament
• Role of parliamentary committees in making the Executive accountable to Parliament
• Resources (procedural and other) available to parliamentarians
• Ensuring transparency and accountability
• Ensuring the implementation of assurances made by Ministers to Parliament

Topic 3 – Emerging new challenges for Speakers: multi-party chambers and minority or coalition governments
• Adequately accommodating parties
• Creating a conducive environment
• Role of the Speaker in advancing House Business
• Performing presiding function with equity

Topic 4 – Parliamentary Service and its management: strengthening the independence of Parliament
• Functional and financial independence (Latimer House principles)
• Capacity building (eg training and research facilities and programmes)
• Powers of the Speaker in the administration and the management of Parliament

Regional caucus meetings

**Tuesday, January 10, 2012**

Plenary sessions on workshop topics

Final plenary session

(1) Venue for 2014 Standing Committee meeting
(2) Venue for 2015 Standing Committee meeting
(3) Items stemming from the Standing Committee meeting (TBC)
(4) Election of 2012–2014 Standing Committee membership
(5) Closing remarks
Legislative accountability: Getting the balance right – the availability of House time for the Government’s legislative programme, Dr The Rt Hon Lockwood Smith, Speaker of the House of Representatives, Parliament of New Zealand

The limited time available for the House to conduct its business places pressure on the Government’s legislative programme. While this tension can provide a safeguard against unfettered legislative activity, governments in New Zealand over many years have sought to supplement the House’s regular sitting hours by taking urgency to progress their legislative programmes, rather than solely for the passage of particular bills that genuinely need to be fast-tracked.

The use of urgency has attracted considerable negative publicity, particularly where it allows select committee consideration to be by-passed. Its impact is potentially to suspend other House business, including question time and members’ business, remove stand down periods between the various stages of the legislative process, and to remove select committee consideration. In examining the concerns raised, the Standing Orders Committee in its review of the Standing Orders in the 49th Parliament had regard to the open and transparent operation of the House and good quality legislative scrutiny – in other words legislative accountability.

It sought to find ways to make government decisions on the legislative process more open and accessible, and for the House’s procedures to work in a way that reflected well on the institution of Parliament – for the House to be following a well established and deliberate set of rules in its law making, breaking from these only in exceptional circumstances.

This paper addresses the package of reforms the Standing Orders Committee recommended in it review of the Standing Orders, the balance necessary to achieve endorsement by the House, and the impact on the role of the Speaker.

Reviews of Standing Orders

The Standing Orders Committee reviews the Standing Orders during each Parliament. These reviews help ensure the ongoing relevancy of Parliament. They allow the House’s procedures to be adjusted to ensure:

- quality law making
- parliamentary scrutiny that enhances government outcomes

2 Urgency is a procedure available to the Government (see Standing Orders 55 and 56) whereby it can, on motion without notice, extend a sitting for the purpose of advancing Government business. There are virtually no limits on the business. It may include the introduction and passing of bills, or the passing through the remaining stages of bills. The House sits from 9:00 am until midnight each sitting day until the business is concluded or midnight on Saturday is reached. A bill introduced and taken through all stages under urgency does not go to a select committee for consideration.

3 Standing Order 7
• proper opportunity for members to represent their constituencies, both regional and sectoral, and that these interests are balanced with the public interest

• the Government can advance its programme, and maintain the confidence of the House.

Revised Standing Orders were developed during a review conducted by the Standing Orders Committee (the Committee) in 2011. The Speaker chairs the Committee and presents the Committee’s report to the House. 4 The revised Standing Orders, recommended by the Committee, were adopted by the House with effect from 21 October 2011, ready for the opening of the 50th Parliament following the general election on 26 November 2011.

**Standing Orders - principles of good law making**

The Standing Orders are akin to constitutional rules. They reflect the exclusive right of the House to control its own proceedings. The House’s privileges are part of the general law. 5 The Standing Orders are the House’s own code of practice, which sets out the procedures to be followed. As constitutional rules they have to balance the Government’s need to progress its policy with effective scrutiny of legislative and budget proposals. The Standing Orders establish hurdles over which government proposals must pass:

• debates to agree the first, second, and third readings of bills

• time delays for progressing from one stage to the next to allow proper consideration by members

• opportunities for public participation through submissions to select committees

• a select committee stage and an unlimited committee of the whole House stage where members may propose amendments.

The Standing Orders also set limits so as to ensure progress can be made:

• first, second and third reading debates have limited numbers of speeches (12) and limits on speaking times (10 minutes)

• closures may be moved in the committee of the whole House

• amendments that have more than a minor impact on the Government’s fiscal aggregates may be vetoed by a Minister.

In so doing, the Standing Orders balance the Government’s need to progress its legislation against effective scrutiny by Opposition parties. The rights of the Opposition are protected, without making it impossible for the Government to progress its legislative proposals.

The Standing Orders Committee takes this balance into account when reviewing Standing Orders. It does not tinker with the rules. Every change has implications that have to be weighed up carefully. The Committee seeks to come up with a package that will have overwhelming support. It has been criticised for this approach because it is seen as


5 Section 242 of the Legislature Act 1908
inherently conservative. However, the Committee remains firmly of the view that constitutional rules should not be changed lightly. To get the necessary support for a package of changes there has to be give and take. The Government may not always fully support all changes, but can see merit from an Opposition perspective. It is recognised that there will always be something of a conflict for governments in an effective Parliament.

Public submissions on Standing Orders

The Standing Orders Committee called for submissions from members and the public on its review of the Standing Orders. From the evidence that the Committee received, two major themes emerged:

• Government’s need for more House time to advance its policy platform with less frequent resort to urgency

• need to improve the quality of legislative scrutiny, with time for informed and open policy consideration and the observance of fundamental rights and freedoms.

Submitters drew particular attention to the use of urgency by successive governments to supplement the amount of House time available for them to implement their policies. They considered the use of urgency to meet the shortfall in sitting hours to be undesirable.

Standing Orders Committee approach

The Standing Orders Committee’s approach to addressing these themes was to:

• examine ways to use the existing sitting pattern more effectively, while providing opportunities for members to debate matters that are important to them

• provide incentives for negotiating the management of House business through the Business Committee.

The Committee produced a package of reforms that provide extra sitting time for government business, with the aim of using urgency only where legislation actually needs to be fast-tracked, and encourage more effective management of the business of the House through negotiation in the Business Committee. It balanced these with proposals that require instructions to reduce the time for the consideration of bills in select committees to be debated in the House, provide a focus on debating matters of importance to members in the committee of the whole House, along with recommendations to the Government aimed at enhancing scrutiny of legislative proposals before bills are introduced.

In recommending extended sitting hours within the normal House sitting pattern, rather than simply additional hours, the Standing Orders Committee sought to balance all the roles of members. As well as their roles as legislators and scrutinisers of government activity, members face demands as Ministers, party members, and representatives of their constituents and sectoral interest groups. These latter responsibilities, while not as fundamental, all require the time of members, time away from the capital, Wellington.

---

6 The submissions received by the Standing Orders Committee on its review are available on the New Zealand Parliament website at http://www.parliament.nz/en-NZ/PB/SC/Documents/Evidence/

7 The Business Committee is chaired by the Speaker and has membership from every party in the House. It makes its decisions on the basis of unanimity or near unanimity, determined by the Speaker. Standing Order 77 sets out the Business Committee’s main functions.
The Standing Orders Committee also had regard for long standing criticism of the New Zealand Parliament for legislating too much. A previous Prime Minister and academic, Rt Hon Sir Geoffrey Palmer, famously described it in 1979 as the “fastest lawmaker in the west”.8 Governments have frequently sought to use legislation to demonstrate they are responding to public concerns, where legislation in terms of additional powers or protections for citizens is not strictly required. To this end, the Standing Orders Committee’s recommendations sought to ensure that all legislative proposals are properly scrutinised for compliance with Cabinet guidelines9 and, in particular, with New Zealand’s fundamental rights and freedoms, as expressed in the New Zealand Bill of Rights Act 1990, before they come before the House, and that this scrutiny is made available to the House.

The proposals to provide extra time for government business and to encourage the Government to achieve more open and transparent management of its House business through the Business Committee are discussed further below. This is followed by examination of the Standing Orders Committee’s balancing proposals aimed at enhancing legislative scrutiny and outcomes.

**Extended sittings**

The Standing Orders Committee’s recommendation for extended sittings10 enables the House to sit on Wednesday and Thursday mornings to advance government business on the Order Paper, provided the Government has given the Business Committee notice in the week before. This is not urgency by another name. Only the stage notified on the Order Paper may be taken during a sitting extended in this way. Urgency is still available to the Government to progress urgent business. However, a Minister moving urgency must now inform the House with some particularity of the circumstances that warrant the claim for urgency.11

This requirement should provide greater transparency about the need to fast track particular bills. At the same time there is an incentive to manage non-urgent government business stage by stage through extended sittings, the Government having given notice to the Business Committee in the week prior, making the timing apparent to members and the public well in advance.

**Incentives for negotiation in Business Committee**

The Business Committee is a formal forum for considering the management of House business. Notice may be required for proposals and both the notice and the Business Committee’s determination published, making the process a great deal more open and transparent than the inter-party negotiations behind closed doors that have characterised the management of the Government’s business in the past.12 Where the Government

---

8 Geoffrey Palmer Unbridled Power: An Interpretation of New Zealand’s Constitution and Government, Oxford University Press, Wellington, 1979, p 70
10 Standing Order 54
11 Standing Order 55(3)
12 Since the introduction of MMP, minority Governments have been the norm in New Zealand, governing with the support of smaller parties. These smaller parties have on occasions exercised a degree of restraint on the use of urgency, withdrawing or negotiating their support for government urgency motions. However, this restraint has been patchy and commentators do not consider it an effective accountability mechanism.
proposes to set aside the House’s rules, if it cannot persuade the Business Committee of
the merits of its arguments for so doing, it may now have to debate them in the House,
enhancing accountability.

The Standing Orders Committee, in its recommendations, set out to promote constructive
engagement through the Business Committee, where all parties are represented. While the
Government’s ability to order its business remains largely intact, there are greater incentives
for the Government to go to the Business Committee and negotiate the passage of its bills.

The Business Committee now has greater powers to determine extra sitting hours for
government business, and also to take a greater role in determining the length, nature and
timing of debates in the House, in particular in the committee of the whole House. It can
determine that the House sit on a Thursday evening and Friday morning and may also
allow more than one stage to be taken during an extended sitting. It may determine bills
with related subject matter to be cognate, thus potentially allowing debates at their first,
second and third readings to be taken together. It can give select committees the power to
meet during the sittings of the House and set the reporting dates for business referred to
them from the House.

However, the Government cannot railroad its proposals through the Business Committee.
It must build the support of other parties, for there are certain safeguards built into the
Business Committee’s operations. It is chaired by the Speaker, and makes its decision not
by majority but by unanimity or near unanimity as determined by the Speaker. To make
Business Committee determinations more transparent, they must now be published on the
Parliament website once confirmed. Formal notice to the Business Committee from the
Government of extended sittings and committee stages will also be published in this way.

Incentives for better legislative outcomes

The committee of the whole House stage is currently the only unlimited stage of a bill’s
passage through the House. Each part of a bill is considered in sequence and members
may table amendments for consideration. In order to reduce the number of debateable
questions, Ministers frequently instructed Parliamentary Counsel to draft bills in as few
parts as possible, the consequence of which was often large two-part bills, rather than a
logical grouping and arrangement of the legislative provisions.

Now with the Business Committee able to shape the committee of the whole House
debate, it is envisaged that Ministers might approach the Business Committee at an early
stage, even before a bill is introduced, to get agreement around the debateable questions.
Debate might be focused on the major issues, rather than the parts of the bill. It could be
shaped to ensure the issues are debated, rather than machinery provisions, and allows for
the putting forward of alternative propositions. This way a Minister has some certainty and
bills can be drafted to promote the accessibility of the law, rather than so as to minimise
debate.

13 Standing Order 266
14 See http://www.parliament.nz/en-NZ/PB/SC/Details/Business/f/8/2/00SCBU_Determinations20111221_1-
Determinations-of-the-Business-Committee.htm
Protecting effective select committee scrutiny

Select committee consideration is critical to the proper scrutiny of legislation. In a unicameral Parliament, such as New Zealand’s, it plays an especially important role providing the opportunity for in-depth scrutiny of legislative proposals. It allows the public to participate and influence the legislative process. Participants need time to consider and prepare their submissions. The Standing Orders provide as a standard that select committees have six months to consider and make their reports on bills. To this end the Standing Orders Committee recommended changes aimed at ensuring committees have adequate meeting time during this period and governments are discouraged from restricting the time available to them to consider legislation.

Instructions to select committees reducing the time for the consideration of bills to four months or less or seeking to give a select committee additional powers to meet at times not otherwise available to it are now debateable. The Government must be open and transparent in its proposals for the consideration of its legislation and weigh up the use of precious House time to debate instructions. Select committees may not meet during extended sittings of the House on Wednesday or Thursday mornings, unless the Business Committee determines accordingly. Here the Government must offset progress in the House against progress in select committees, unless it has been able to negotiate a compromise in the Business Committee.

Bill of Rights scrutiny

Many submissions to the Standing Orders Committee review raised the need to ensure fundamental rights and constitutional principles are given proper consideration in the legislative process. While the Attorney-General is required by law to report to the House on any inconsistencies with the rights and freedoms contained in the New Zealand Bill of Rights Act 1990 in bills on introduction, submitters took the view that the Government should be required to account for inconsistencies at any stage of a bill’s passage. The Committee made recommendations aimed at improving scrutiny both prior to the introduction of a bill and at select committee.

It recommended to the Government that the Regulatory Impact Statement, which accompanies a bill’s introduction, give more prominence to Bill of Rights and other constitutional issues and that Cabinet guidelines require Bill of Rights reporting on substantive amendments proposed at the committee of the whole House stage of a bill. It recommended also that select committees receive briefings on these reports from government officials and that select committees also invite public submissions on these issues.

Scrutiny of substantive amendments at committee of whole House stage

Substantive amendments at the committee of the whole House stage are another serious impediment to good legislative scrutiny. They can be introduced as late as the day of the committee stage and will not have had the benefit of select committee consideration. Here

15 Standing Order 291
16 New Zealand Bill of Rights Act 1990, section 7 and Standing Order 262
the Standing Orders Committee drew attention to the power of the Business Committee to determine that a select committee consider such an amendment where a bill has already been reported to the House by the select committee.18 Rather than having to use time on the floor of the House moving an instruction, Ministers are encouraged to go to the Business Committee and negotiate consideration of amendments by a select committee, as a potential trade-off against time in the committee of the whole House.

**Arrangement of committee of whole House**

The committee of the whole House stage now allows a broader debate. Debate is focused on the major provisions (each part) rather than the detail of individual clauses. It allows members who have not spoken in the limited first or second reading debates to participate and for alternative propositions to be raised in a public forum. It is the point where the House’s full proportionality is brought to bear on the text of the bill.

In its review, the Standing Orders Committee sought to promote constructive negotiations in the Business Committee about the arrangement of the debate in the committee of the whole House. It also agreed changes aimed at giving greater notice of committee stages so as to encourage earlier circulation of proposed amendments. Where practicable the Government must advise the Business Committee of the committee stages of bills to be taken in the next week.19 A schedule of proposed amendments will be published to help inform members for the debate. The Chairpersons of committees will have the power to group amendments that form alternative propositions and select amendments where there are similar amendments at the same place in a bill. The aim being to maximise debate on issues of significance to members, rather than spending time discussing and voting on every individual amendment proposed.

**Conclusions**

The package of reforms recommended to the House by the Standing Orders Committee in its recent review included other changes, many of a more technical nature. The changes to provide extra time for government business and mechanisms to encourage more open and transparent management of the House’s business, balanced against protections for select committee scrutiny are the most significant changes made to the Standing Orders since the adoption of new Standing Orders to accommodate the move to a proportional electoral system20 in 1996. There has, however, been criticism that these changes are too timid.

Critics consider that by not recommending specific limits on aspects of the use of urgency, the Standing Orders Committee has not done enough to change the long standing use of urgency by governments simply to progress their business.21 They believe the use of urgency will continue to be viewed by the public, regardless of whether it is justified or not, as the Government ramming legislation through Parliament without regard to the House’s own rules. A wide-ranging review of parliamentary time was put forward to the Standing Orders Committee as the way of addressing what critics saw as the comparatively low

18 Standing Order 186(3)
19 Standing Order 297(3)
20 Mixed Member Proportional System (MMP)
21 Urgency was first provided for in the Standing Orders in 1903 and has been a feature of parliamentary procedure since that time.
number of House sitting days that require significant augmentation through the use of urgency.

Submitters to the Standing Orders Committee also recommended that the Speaker be given the role of approving urgency where its use would by-pass select committee consideration, in much the same manner as the Speaker approves the use of extraordinary urgency. The Committee did not agree. It considered the decision to by-pass select committee consideration a political one that would unnecessarily draw the Speaker into the politics. Its preference was to make changes that provide incentives to use extended sitting hours rather than urgency, and penalise the Government in terms of taking time in the House to debate instructions to select committees that significantly shorten the time available to them to consider bills.

Concerns over lack of legislative capacity have existed over a number of years. Submitters to the Standing Orders Committee drew particular attention to the consequences for technical, non-controversial legislation to remedy existing problems or otherwise maintain and enhance the legislative infrastructure. Not surprisingly, governments give priority to major policy reforms in their legislative programmes and as a result non-controversial legislation is often not progressed. The Committee took the view that now there is a very good chance that negotiations in the Business Committee will result in this type of legislation progressing through the use of extended sittings.

The remedies put forward to the Committee were to increase the regular sitting hours of the House and to provide for the committee of the whole House stage to be taken off the floor of the House and for it to sit concurrently with the House. Standing Orders Committees have addressed such proposals before.

Balancing the pressure on members’ time is an important consideration. This Standing Orders Committee preferred to see extensions to the current sitting pattern and better management of House business rather than more regular sitting days. Two extended sittings over Thursday evenings and Friday mornings will equate to a whole extra sitting week in terms of hours for the Government. The Committee considered a Main Committee, akin to that in place in the Australian House of Representatives, an expensive option in the current fiscal climate, and acknowledged the difficulties it would place on small parties in terms of presence in the House and the committee, – a real difficulty in the 50th Parliament where there are four parties with fewer than six members.

Time will tell whether this carefully balanced approach is successful in achieving more openness and transparency in the legislative process and greater government accountability where it is proposed that the House’s legislative procedures be set aside and bills fast-tracked. Much will depend on the way in which the Business Committee works in the new Parliament to manage the business of the House. The Speaker as the chair of the Committee has a large part to play in this. The Chairperson must create an environment in the Business Committee where the Government feels confident to bring forward proposals for the management of its business. In determining such proposals, it is the Chairperson who has the challenge of judging whether, on the basis of party membership in the House, a sufficient degree of support has been reached for the Chair to be satisfied of the fairness.

Standing Order 57 requires the Speaker to agree that the business justifies the taking of extraordinary urgency, which allows the House to continue to sit beyond midnight.
of a proposal to all parties. In so doing, the Speaker has a growing role in ensuring an open and transparent legislative process, a role that must achieve a balance between effective Opposition scrutiny of legislative proposals and reasonable progress for the Government’s legislative programme.
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Report by the New Zealand delegation to the 126th Inter-Parliamentary Union Assembly
Kampala, Uganda
31 March to 5 April 2012

Attending the 126th Inter-Parliamentary Union Assembly in Kampala, Uganda the New Zealand delegation comprised:

- Hon Tau Henare, delegation leader
- Louisa Wall, MP
- Jan Logie, MP
- Wendy Hart, delegation secretary.

The delegation was in Uganda from 28 March to 5 April 2012.

Introduction to Inter-Parliamentary Union

The Inter-Parliamentary Union (IPU) is the international organisation of parliaments of sovereign states. It is a centre for dialogue and parliamentary diplomacy among legislators representing every political system and all the main political leanings in the world.

Through resolutions and reports, the IPU expresses its views and the positions of the world parliamentary community on issues of international interest, and makes recommendations for parliamentary action. The IPU is developing a closer working relationship with the United Nations system, providing a parliamentary dimension to the United Nations.

One-hundred-and-sixty-two national parliaments are currently members of the IPU. A list of members is attached as Appendix 1. Ten regional parliamentary assemblies are associate members. Most members are affiliated to one or more of the six geopolitical groups that are currently active in the IPU.

The IPU is financed mainly by its members out of public funds. Its budget for 2011 totalled 18,086 million Swiss francs. The New Zealand Parliament’s assessed contribution to the IPU budget for 2011 was 66,000 Swiss francs.

While the twice-yearly assemblies are the major focus for New Zealand parliamentarians, the IPU is more than a forum for parliamentary dialogue. The IPU is constantly active in its work to promote democracy throughout the world. Its main areas of activity are:

- representative democracy
- international peace and security
• sustainable development
• human rights and humanitarian law
• women in politics
• education, science, and culture.

Assemblies
The IPU meets twice each year, for a three-day assembly usually held in Geneva in October and a six-to-seven-day assembly immediately prior to Easter, hosted by a member country. The Easter assembly comprises meetings of the following parts of the IPU:

• plenary session of the assembly, attended by all delegates, which has a general debate on a particular theme, debates an emergency item, and holds panel discussions on particular subjects
• Governing Council, which is the policy-making body of the IPU, and consists of two or three delegates from each member country
• ad hoc committees established by the Governing Council
• standing committees, which debate and draft resolutions on chosen topics
• six geopolitical groups.

The agenda of the 126th IPU Assembly is attached as Appendix 2.
Our delegation attended the following sessions:
• Governing Council
• plenary debate
• panel discussion on the role parliamentarians could play in tackling malnutrition in young children
• panel discussion on disaster risk reduction and sustainable development
• panel discussion on making the law work for the response to AIDS: zero new infections, zero discrimination, and zero AIDS-related deaths
• open briefing of the International Humanitarian Law Committee
• workshop on parliamentary oversight of development finance: the case of World Bank and IMF loans
• launch of the Global Parliamentary Report
• open debate with the Executive Directors of UNICEF and the United Nations Population Fund (UNFPA)
• standing committee on peace and security
• standing committee on sustainable development, finance, and trade
• standing committee on democracy and human rights
• Asia-Pacific Group
Twelve-Plus Group

meeting of women parliamentarians.

The results of the assembly meetings are available at http://www.ipu.org/conf-e/126agnd.htm.

Governing Council

The Governing Council met twice during the assembly and dealt with the following matters:

- membership of the IPU
- activities of the Executive Committee
- cooperation with the United Nations
- IPU reform
- reports of subsidiary bodies
- finances of the IPU.

Membership of IPU

The Governing Council readmitted the Parliament of Haiti. It also granted Associate Member status to the Economic and Monetary Community of Central Africa (CEMAC), readmitted the Parliament of Myanmar, and admitted the Parliament of South Sudan as a new Member.

The Governing Council approved requests for observer status from the Global Fund to Fight AIDS, Tuberculosis and Malaria and the World Scout Parliamentary Union (WSPU).

Cooperation with United Nations

The Governing Council noted the preparations under way for the debate that would take place in late May in the United Nations General Assembly on interaction between the United Nations, national parliaments, and the IPU. We were informed of the content of the draft resolution to be considered by UN Member States for adoption and were encouraged to follow the process closely and consult with our foreign ministries to seek their formal sponsorship of a strong resolution. We understand the resolution recommends a more structured parliamentary component to the work of the United Nations.

The Governing Council also took note of the activities undertaken in cooperation with the United Nations system since the 125th IPU Assembly. We were also informed of the growing interaction between the IPU and the Bretton Woods Institutions – the International Monetary Fund and the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development (World Bank Group).
**Action by the IPU to strengthen democracy and parliamentary institutions**

**Launch of Global Parliamentary Report**

We attended the launch of the *Global Parliamentary Report*, a joint work by the IPU and the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), which represents both organisations’ attempts to strengthen parliaments and promote democracy throughout the world.

The report examines the various initiatives being undertaken worldwide to engage and inform the public on parliamentary activities. These include the use of interactive websites, open days, and social media. This truly global report has contributions from 125 parliaments and more than 600 individual members of parliament.

We heard how the report will assist parliaments and politicians to better understand and respond to the pressures they face, particularly under greater public scrutiny. We support the recommendations contained in the report – that parliaments must engage with their citizens, stay closely attuned to their needs and expectations, and make every effort to meet them. Speeches given by the New Zealand delegates in the general debate stressed these same points.

**Plenary sessions**

The plenary sessions were held on five days of the assembly. The agenda for the plenary sessions consisted of the following topics:

- election of the president of the assembly
- general debate on the theme of “Parliament and the people: bridging the gap”
- selection of emergency item
- adoption of resolutions of the standing committees and on the emergency item
- approval of topics for discussion at the next assembly in October.

Hon Tau Henare and Louisa Wall spoke in the general debate and talked about the status of indigenous and marginalised peoples and the need for parliamentarians to critically review the ongoing ramifications of colonisation. The texts of the speeches are attached as Appendix 3.

**Emergency item**

At each assembly a topic is selected for emergency consideration and a resolution is adopted on the topic. Topics for the emergency item are proposed by member countries, and if more than one topic is proposed the plenary session adopts one of them by consensus or vote.

Seven requests for the inclusion of an emergency item had been initially received. Subsequently, the delegations of Canada, Egypt, France, the United Arab Emirates, and the United Kingdom decided to present a joint proposal on “Inter-Parliamentary Union initiative for an immediate halt to the bloodshed and human rights violations in Syria, and
the need to ensure access to humanitarian aid for all persons in need and to support implementation of all relevant Arab League and United Nations resolutions and peace efforts”. In view of the importance of the joint proposal, the delegation of Argentina decided to withdraw its proposal before the agenda item was raised in the assembly. That had left two proposals to be considered by the assembly. After taking the floor, the delegation of the Islamic Republic of Iran withdrew its proposal in favour of the joint one, which was adopted by acclamation and added to the agenda.

The assembly adopted a resolution on this item, which is available at http://www.ipu.org/conf-e/126/Res-emrg.htm.

The resolution expressed the solidarity and sympathy of the IPU members for the Syrian. We called for an immediate end to the violence and abuses in Syria and expressed full support for international and regional efforts to find a peaceful solution to the crisis. The resolution also urged parliaments to provide all necessary humanitarian assistance to those affected by the violence. The resolution also called for an inclusive political process addressing the legitimate democratic aspirations of the Syrian people to begin. The pivotal role that the IPU could play in assisting emerging democracies, fostering political reconciliation and in upholding the principles of representative democracy and human rights was noted.

**Standing committees**

The IPU has three standing committees, which considered the following topics:

- Promoting and practising good governance as a means of advancing peace and security: Drawing lessons from recent events in the Middle East and North Africa
- Redistribution of power, not just wealth: Ownership of the international agendas
- Access to health as a basic right: The role of parliaments in addressing key challenges to securing the health of women and children.

The three topics were the subject of panel discussions at the assembly in Geneva last October, and these led to reports and draft resolutions that formed the basis for discussion at this assembly.

New Zealand was represented on all three committees. Hon Tau Henare attended the first committee, Jan Logie attended the second, and Louisa Wall attended the third. We proposed successful amendments to the resolution of the third standing committee, adopted unanimously in the general assembly, to ensure that the needs of indigenous women and children are recognised appropriately.

All three standing committees prepared resolutions that were adopted by the assembly. The resolutions are available at http://www.ipu.org/conf-e/126agnd.htm.

**Meeting of women parliamentarians**

The meeting of women parliamentarians took place on the Saturday before the plenary debate commenced. It was attended by approximately 90 women. The meeting provides an opportunity for women parliamentarians to network and share their experiences, although
it is not exclusively for women and male delegates are invited to attend. Louisa Wall and
Jan Logie participated in the meeting.

The meeting considered, from a gender perspective, the subject items debated by the
second and third standing committees:

- Redistribution of power, not just wealth: Ownership of the international agendas
  (second standing committee)
- Access to health as a basic right: The role of parliaments in addressing key challenges
to securing the health of women and children (third standing committee)

The participants divided into two discussion groups, one for each subject item. In its
report, each group proposed a series of amendments to the resolutions of the second and
third standing committees respectively. Most of the amendments proposed were adopted,
including those proposed by New Zealand.

The meeting of women parliamentarians also considered the topic “Mentorship:
Supporting the next generation of women MPs”. While we appreciate the mechanisms
proposed to support young women, we were concerned by the idea that young women
needed this extra help to acquire the knowledge and skills needed for political action and to
gain self-confidence – qualities apparently considered to be innate in young men. We
encourage an approach that would empower young women in political life and
acknowledge their strengths, rather than perpetuating the attitudes that continue to hamper
women’s participation in politics.

Geopolitical groups

Most members of the IPU are members of one or more of the six geopolitical groups that
operate within the IPU structure. These groups are: Africa, Arab, Asia-Pacific, Eurasia,
Latin-America and the Caribbean, and the Twelve-Plus. New Zealand belongs to the Asia-
Pacific and Twelve-Plus groups. Membership of the groups is attached as Appendix 4. The
Asia-Pacific group met once during the assembly and the Twelve-Plus group met on most
days of the assembly.

The geopolitical groups play an important role in the functioning of the IPU. The IPU
rules provide that each group can nominate its own candidates for committee vacancies to
ensure an equitable geopolitical representation on IPU committees. Each group decides its
own working methods to facilitate its participation in the assemblies. The groups meet to
discuss and, as much as possible, agree on a common approach to matters on the agenda,
although the groups cannot compel their members to vote in a particular way.

The New Zealand delegation was instrumental in proposing the actions to be taken by the
Twelve-Plus group to urge a commitment to the safeguarding of human rights for all
citizens, regardless of sexual orientation and gender identity. The Twelve-Plus group wrote
to both the Speaker of the Ugandan Parliament and the leaders of political parties, urging
them to dispense with proposed legislation that would discriminate against its homosexual
citizens. We wanted to stand shoulder to shoulder with our fellow parliamentarians in
fighting inequality, poverty, and discrimination on any grounds, and we respectfully
implored parliamentarians in Uganda to extend human rights protections to all citizens.
The text of these letters is attached as Appendix 5.
**Bilateral meetings**

The New Zealand delegation met with Darfo Ramon Vivas and Victoria Mata, Members of the National Assembly of Venezuela, to share experiences and discuss tangible ways to increase the political participation of indigenous peoples.

We were heartened to hear how the participation of indigenous peoples is being safeguarded in many of the parliaments of South America. Venezuela shares with us many aspects of our colonial history and our journey towards reconciliation and redress.

We spoke with Venezuela about the use of education, technology, and broadcasting to challenge ignorance in the community at large and to protect and enhance indigenous language, histories, and culture.

We also met with the Norwegian delegation, led by Ingrid Heggø, to discuss the Sámi peoples of Norway.

**Forum for indigenous peoples at future assemblies**

We note an acute need within the IPU for a forum dedicated to the effective participation of indigenous peoples in parliamentary decision-making and a number of delegations we spoke with indicated their support for such an initiative. Such a forum would be a solid step towards involving more indigenous parliamentarians in the IPU and, in turn, a greater prioritisation of their issues on the political agenda. We encourage the New Zealand delegation to the 127th Assembly to continue this dialogue.

**Other activities**

**Field visits on child-related issues**

Delegates were given the opportunity to participate in field visits focusing on the theme of tackling malnutrition, discussed in the sessions of the 126th IPU Assembly. The IPU and UNICEF co-organised field visits on 2 April to three health-care establishments that looked after children suffering from malnutrition. They were located in Kampala, Wakiso, and Kisenyi. Louisa Wall said she was disturbed by malnutrition in a country with access to good, healthy food. At the core of these issues, she said, is poverty and how we use the resources in our countries to meet such need.

**Field visits on prevention of mother-to-child transmission of HIV**

In cooperation with UNAIDS and the Ugandan Ministry of Health, the IPU organised a field visit for members of parliament on Uganda’s response in the area of prevention of mother-to-child transmission of HIV. The visit included two sites, Makerere University-Johns Hopkins Uganda (MU-JHU) Research Collaboration and the AIDS Support Organisation (TASO). Speaking on the visit to the clinic, Jan Logie implored parliamentarians to not allow the fight against HIV/AIDS to fall down the agenda and to work with non-governmental organisations to ensure the health and wellbeing of all citizens.
Nuclear disarmament

Hon Tau Henare attended a lunch meeting held by Parliamentarians for Nuclear Non-proliferation and Disarmament (PNND), which has observer status at the IPU. Around 70 delegates from various countries also attended the meeting.

Meeting with non-governmental organisations

Members of the New Zealand delegation met with the following non-governmental organisations:

- Human Rights Awareness and Promotion Forum Uganda
- Uganda Civil Social Coalition of Human Rights and Constitutional Law
- Freedom and Roam Uganda
- Reproductive Health Uganda.

All four agencies’ work provides services, support, and advocacy and information about sexual health and wellbeing to Ugandan communities, including lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, and intersex communities. The key focus of these meetings was to obtain a better picture and understanding of the issues facing these communities in Uganda, including the impact of legislation criminalising citizens based on their sexual relationships and gender identity. These meetings contributed to the development of the letters from the Twelve-Plus group to the Speaker of the Ugandan Parliament and the leaders of political parties concerning proposed legislation that would discriminate against its homosexual citizens.

Participation by Pacific nations

For many decades the IPU was dominated by its European members, and it is pleasing that it has developed into an organisation that is participated in by nations from all geopolitical regions of the world. This has been facilitated by the development of internal geopolitical groups. However, we wish to draw attention to the difficulty for representatives of smaller Pacific nations to attend and that they are unlikely to be accompanied by support staff.

We acknowledge that it is expensive to attend IPU Assemblies. We had discussions with Moses Manwau, the sole delegate from Papua New Guinea, who provided an insight into the difficulties faced by a member attending who may not have the benefit of support staff or previous experience. It is clear that the IPU does not offer any practical support for smaller nations that wish to participate. We consider that both the IPU and the New Zealand Parliament should investigate whether they are able to offer any financial assistance to such nations to enable them to send a delegation.

Participation by Pacific women

Our meeting with Papua New Guinea also highlighted the acute absence of women parliamentarians, from Pacific parliaments. We note that the Papua New Guinea Parliament has one only woman member and a recent landmark Bill to safeguard parliamentary seats for women was negatived.
The IPU’s statutes stipulate that parliaments that have women members must include at least one woman in their delegations to IPU Assemblies. This requirement is taken seriously by the IPU; delegations that do not consist of both men and women have their votes on the Governing Council cut from three to two. If a country persists in sending a single-gender delegation to three assemblies in a row, its votes are permanently reduced. A delegation that is not gender-balanced loses one vote in the Governing Council and two votes in the assembly. Papua New Guinea was amongst the four delegations subject to sanctions for being represented exclusively by the same sex three times in a row.

**Continuity**

The only permanent New Zealand delegate to the IPU for the duration of the Parliament is the delegation leader and it is likely that future delegation members will have a different set of issues they wish to bring to the IPU’s table. At the 126th Assembly, we promoted the inclusion of a number of issues at the IPU’s future assemblies and these included: indigenous rights, sexual orientation and gender rights, and women’s political representation in the Pacific. We would hope that the ground gained on these issues is not lost between delegations.

For example, we submitted a subject item for consideration by the third standing committee at the 128th Assembly in 2013 and an accompanying application for co-rapporteur: “Sexual orientation and gender identity rights: the role of Parliamentarians in affirming these rights in legislation”. We submitted that the subject was topical given that anti-homosexual legislation has been proposed in a member parliament of the IPU. We also saw this subject as a response to the report of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights: *Discriminatory laws and practices and acts of violence against individuals based on their sexual orientation and gender identity* released on 15 December 2011. Although the item was not adopted at the 126th Assembly, as the issue remains current, we would hope that future delegations continue to promote a similar theme for inclusion on the IPU agenda.

We are therefore pleased that a New Zealand IPU Group has been convened to discuss issues between assemblies. We believe that this group will clarify the priorities and mandate for future delegations and would mitigate continuity risks between delegations. The New Zealand IPU Group will look at ways in which a “parliamentary mandate” could be discussed and agreed prior to New Zealand attending the assemblies in order to ensure a common position of the New Zealand Parliament on issues of international interest. One of the ideas we will be examining is a time dedicated to debate issues of importance to New Zealand and the Pacific region that may be discussed at these key inter-parliamentary fora.

**Future meetings**

The 127th assembly of the IPU will take place in Quebec City from 21 to 26 October 2012. It will be followed by the 128th assembly, which will take place in Quito, Ecuador from 22 to 27 March 2013.

Hon Tau Henare
Delegation leader
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Membership of IPU (as at 1 May 2012)
The Inter-Parliamentary Union has 162 members and 10 Associate Members.

Member Parliaments
Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan
Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belarus, Belgium, Benin, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi
Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d’Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic
Democratic Republic of the Congo, Democratic People’s Republic of Korea, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic
Ecuador, Equatorial Guinea, Egypt, El Salvador, Estonia, Ethiopia
Finland, France
Gabon, Gambia, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea-Bissau
Haiti, Hungary, Honduras
Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy
Japan, Jordan
Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan
Lao People’s Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg
Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar
Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway
Oman
Pakistan, Palau, Palestine, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal
Qatar
Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Rwanda

Samoa, San Marino, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Africa, South Sudan, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic

Tajikistan, Thailand, Timor-Leste, The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey

Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay

Venezuela, Viet Nam

Yemen

Zambia, Zimbabwe

**Associate Members**

Andean Parliament

Central American Parliament

East African Legislative Assembly

European Parliament

Inter-Parliamentary Committee of the West African Economic and Monetary Union

Latin American Parliament

Parliament of the Economic Community of West African States

Parliament of the Economic and Monetary Community of Central Africa

Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe

Transitional Arab Parliament
Appendix 2

Agenda of 126th IPU Assembly

Item 1  election of the President and Vice-Presidents of the 126th Assembly

Item 2  consideration of possible requests for the inclusion of an emergency item in the Assembly agenda

Item 3  general debate on the political, economic and social situation in the world with the overall theme of: Parliaments and the people

Item 4  promoting and practising good governance as a means of advancing peace and security: Drawing lessons from recent events in the Middle East and North Africa (first standing committee on peace and international security)

Item 5  redistribution of power, not just wealth: Ownership of the international agendas (second standing committee on sustainable development, finance and trade)

Item 6  access to health as a basic right: The role of parliaments in addressing key challenges to securing the health of women and children (third standing committee on democracy and human rights)

Item 7  approval of the subject items for the 126th assembly and appointment of rapporteurs
Speeches delivered by Hon Tau Henare and Louisa Wall MP to the IPU Assembly General Assembly

Speech by Hon Tau Henare

E te hou kainga, te tangata whenua o tenei whenua

Tena koutou katoa

The theme of our hui is “Parliaments and the Peoples: Bridging the gap”. How do we bridge the gap? How do we bring parliaments to the people? Do the people want us to bring parliament to them? Or are they satisfied that every three, four or five years they get an opportunity to choose?

I am the Chairperson of the Māori Affairs Committee, and it is part of our make-up to take our business on the road as often as is possible. We believe that it is imperative that people in our communities are more than just voting fodder – that they participate in democracy and the democratic processes.

Mr Chair, I would like to make a point on the issue of the treatment of indigenous peoples around the world. It is appalling that we continue to ignore the plight of some of the most disadvantaged in our communities. I believe that the greatest crime perpetuated on indigenous peoples has been, and continues to be, their de-culturalisation, which has seen language, culture and way of being taken away. The expectation that they should somehow “morph” into the coloniser’s identity is an attack on the human rights of indigenous peoples.

We must do more to enhance and empower indigenous peoples’ cultural identities. The reason (my belief) that so many of my indigenous cousins from around the world appear in all the “bad” statistics is that they have been de-culturalised. I implore the Inter-Parliamentary Union to seriously look at finding ways to support the issue of indigenous people and the protection of their cultural identity world-wide.

Finally, Mr Chair, there are many things that unite us as parliamentarians and as members of humankind. Surely we can use these common denominators as the things that bind us rather than things that set us apart. We should act as adults rather than children. May I conclude by sending my best wishes to the young people in Libya, Tunisia, Egypt and Syria who are truly acting in the best interests of democracy.
Speech by Louisa Wall MP

Madame Speaker, fellow delegates and Inter-Parliamentary Union participants

E nga mana, e nga reo, e nga hau e wha, nga tangata whenua o Uganda tena koutou, tena kotou katoa.

I greet you as leaders in your countries, from the four corners of the world. I greet the people of Uganda, greetings to your ancestors, in the language of Uganda, Mbalamusizza, greetings to us all.

I am a current expression of first sovereign indigenous people from Aotearoa New Zealand, a small country of 4.3 million people in the South Pacific, colonised by the British in 1840 and still part of the Commonwealth.

The mixing of the blood of the tangata whenua, the original people of the land, and in my case the Iwi, the tribes of Ngāti Tuwharetoa me Waikato, and the coloniser peoples, in my case the Walls were from Northern Ireland who arrived in 1862, has occurred in varying degrees to the point where there is no “full-blooded” tangata whenua left. All New Zealand citizens are uri tangata, descendants of the land Aotearoa New Zealand as compared to the status of the tangata whenua as New Zealand’s first sovereign peoples.

New Zealand has a Treaty with its first sovereign indigenous people and we are in a Treaty settlement process, our “truth and reconciliation” process where we are attempting to redress for historical grievances to create a form of resolution and a pathway forward, given the issues of lands and capital assets, and our first sovereign identities including language and culture that were taken from tangata whenua by the British coloniser. I am involved with this process as a member of the Māori Affairs Select Committee of the New Zealand Parliament and this area of Treaty settlements is one where there is cross-party consensus.

I am a member of Parliament for the people of Manurewa, South Auckland, a community where 75 percent of the school-aged children are tangata whenua or uri, descendants of other Pacific Island nations, predominantly from Samoa and Tonga. I take this opportunity to acknowledge the recent passing of His Royal Highness King Tupou V of Tonga – malo e lelei, kia kaha, be strong the people of Tonga.

When I contemplate the theme “Parliaments and the people: bridging the gap” I think about creating legislation that supports the people in their ability to live their lives in a manner that affirms who they are and enables them to lead a safe, healthy and loving life.

So the law, for me as a member of Parliament, needs to respect the right for people to be who they are, the right of first sovereigns to live the way they were born, to be treated with dignity and respect in the full expression of what this identity is – we are all seeds of our ancestors, their mauri or life force driving us to use the power that we have as members of Parliament to use the tools that we have available to us for collective public good.

Laws should always benefit the lives of the people it most affects; to make them happier, healthier and stronger. Laws should not enhance the status of the powerful over the powerless or create in society those who are worthy of inclusion and highlight and name those who are undeserving.

Those who are most vulnerable do not choose marginalised identities, why would you choose a life of suppression, marginalisation and persecution? We are all born free and it is
society that limits our ability to be free and governments who do so by the legislation they propagate and support.

Human rights are rights that we have as human beings to be who and what we are. They are universally accepted and recognised as morally correct, just or honourable and must protect the rights of our citizens, specifically those facing discrimination and living in marginalised communities.

To quote former South African President Mandela, “It always seems impossible until it is done”.

We, as members of Parliament, have so much to do and this work begins in our homelands first and foremost. We need to inspire and support each other in this work because it takes great leadership to question the current order, especially when you may be part of the ruling class or elite within your own society.

It is here, at assemblies of the IPU, that we need to be critical, not of each other but of our histories, including the role of colonisation, and as part of the colonisation agenda that continues today, the role of religious institutions in this colonisation process, and how these histories and experiences impact on our lives, how we see the world and the legacy we leave for future generations.

Mukama abakume – blessings of God to us all.

No reira, kua mutu taku Korero. Therefore, that concludes my dialogue.

Tena koutou, tena koutou, tena tatau katoa.
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Membership of geopolitical groups

**African Group (45 members)**

Algeria, Angola
Benin, Botswana, Burkina Faso, Burundi
Cameroon, Cape Verde, Chad, Congo, Côte d'Ivoire
Democratic Republic of the Congo, Djibouti
Egypt, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia
Gabon, Gambia, Ghana, Guinea-Bissau
Kenya
Lesotho, Libya
Mali, Malawi, Mauritania, Mauritius, Morocco, Mozambique
Namibia, Niger, Nigeria
Rwanda
Sao Tome and Principe, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, South Africa, Sudan
Togo, Tunisia
Uganda, United Republic of Tanzania
Zambia, Zimbabwe

**Arab Group (19 members)**

Algeria
Bahrain
Egypt
Iraq
Jordan
Kuwait
Lebanon, Libya
Mauritania, Morocco
Oman
Palestine
Qatar
Saudi Arabia, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic
Tunisia
United Arab Emirates
Yemen

**Asia-Pacific Group (29 members)**

Afghanistan, Australia
Bangladesh
Cambodia, Canada, China
Democratic People’s Republic of Korea
India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of)
Japan
Lao People’s Democratic Republic
Malaysia, Maldives, Micronesia (Federated States of), Mongolia
Nepal, New Zealand
Pakistan, Palau, Papua New Guinea, Philippines
Republic of Korea
Samoa, Singapore, Sri Lanka
Thailand, Timor-Leste
Viet Nam

**Eurasia Group (7 members)**

Armenia
Belarus
Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan
Republic of Moldova, Russian Federation
Tajikistan

**Group of Latin-America and the Caribbean (21 members)**

Argentina
Bolivia, Brazil
Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba
Dominican Republic
Ecuador, El Salvador
Guatemala
Honduras
Mexico
Nicaragua
Panama, Paraguay, Peru
Suriname
Trinidad and Tobago
Uruguay
Venezuela

**Twelve-Plus Group (46 members)**

Albania, Andorra, Australia, Austria
Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria
Canada, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic
Denmark
Estonia
Finland, France
Georgia, Germany, Greece
Hungary
Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy
Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg
Malta, Monaco, Montenegro
Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway
Poland, Portugal
Romania
San Marino, Serbia, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland
The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey
United Kingdom

**Observers:** Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe, European Parliament

**Unaffiliated (2)**

Azerbaijan
Ukraine
Appendix 5: Letters from Twelve-Plus group

Mr Otunnu
Leader of the Ugandan People’s Congress
Uganda House
Plot 10 Kampala Rd
P O Box 9306
Kampala
UGANDA

05 April 2012

Dear Mr Otunnu,

We would like to acknowledge and thank the Parliament of Uganda for hosting this 126th Assembly of the Inter-Parliamentary Union and also extend our heartfelt thanks to the people of Uganda for your wonderful hospitality and contribution to this Assembly.

As guests in your country, as members of the Twelve Plus Group representing parliaments from 46 countries affiliates to the Inter-Parliamentary Union, we wish to take this opportunity to communicate with you as the leader of your political party.

As fellow parliamentarians we ask you as the leader of your political party to use all possible actions and mechanisms to ensure the Arthi Homosexuality Bill proposed as a private member’s bill by Mr David Bahati, is defeated.

We note that the Constitution of the Republic of Uganda includes these words from Chapter 4 Human Rights and Freedoms:

“21. (1) All persons are equal before and under the law in all spheres of political, economic, social and cultural life and in every other respect and shall enjoy equal protection of the law.”

1 Albania, Andorra, Austria, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Monaco, Montenegro, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Romania, San Marino, Serbia, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey, United Kingdom.

Secretariat des 12+ (F)
Groupe français de l’UIP - Palais du Luxembourg - 75331 Paris cedex 06 - France
Tel: (+33) 1 43 14 36 12 - (+33) 1 43 14 36 10 - (+33) 1 43 14 37 99
Fax: (+33) 1 43 14 37 00 - Courriel: secretariat12plus@ipu.int
Président: Robert-Denis Del Picchia - Chef du Secrétariat: Philippe Bourasse
This vision is congruent with IPU Article One, para 2 (c), which calls for the IPU to “Contribute to the defence and promotion of human rights, which are universal in scope and respect for which is an essential factor of Parliamentary democracy and development”.

On this 50th anniversary of independence in Uganda, we acknowledge that as leaders we are often challenged by the tension between the will of the majority and the needs of minorities and the most vulnerable.

We take inspiration from the Ugandan parliament’s commitment to minorities and human rights through the provision of special conditions to ensure the participation of women, and people with disabilities within your parliament. This is clearly an example of your country’s commitment to safeguarding human rights principles over the rule of the majority. Many of us can learn from this. We respectfully encourage and call upon you to extend this principle to the protection of sexual minorities in their self-determination.

We urge you to work to ensure sexual orientation and gender identity rights in Uganda and that you and the parliamentarians in your party vote against the progression of the Anti Homosexuality Bill when it is next debated so it does not become law in Uganda.

Yours sincerely,

[Signature]

President of the IPU Twelve Plus Group
Mr Robert-Denis del Picchia
Mr Hussein
Leader of the Justice Forum
P O Box 3999
Kampala
UGANDA

03 April 2012

Dear Mr Hussein,

We would like to acknowledge and thank the Parliament of Uganda for hosting this 126th Assembly of the Inter-Parliamentary Union and also extend our heartfelt thanks to the people of Uganda for your wonderful hospitality and contribution to this Assembly.

As guests in your country, as members of the Twelve Plus Group representing parliaments from 46 countries¹, affiliated to the Inter-Parliamentary Union, we wish to take this opportunity to communicate with you as the leader of your political party.

As fellow parliamentarians we ask you as the leader of your political party to use all possible actions and mechanisms to ensure the Anti Homosexuality Bill proposed as a private member’s bill by Mr David Bahati, is defeated.

We note that the Constitution of the Republic of Uganda includes these words from Chapter 4 Human Rights and Freedoms:

“21. (1) All persons are equal before and under the law in all spheres of political, economic, social and cultural life and in every other respect and shall enjoy equal protection of the law”

¹ Albania, Andorra, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Monaco, Montenegro, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Romania, San Marino, Serbia, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey, United Kingdom.
This vision is congruent with IPU Article One, para 2 (c), which calls for the IPU to “Contribute to the defence and promotion of human rights, which are universal in scope and respect for which is an essential factor of Parliamentary democracy and development”.

On this 50th anniversary of independence in Uganda, we acknowledge that as leaders we are often challenged by the tension between the will of the majority and the needs of minorities and the most vulnerable.

We take inspiration from the Ugandan parliament’s commitment to minorities and human rights through the provision of special conditions to ensure the participation of women, and people with disabilities within your parliament. This is clearly an example of your country’s commitment to safeguarding human rights principles over the rule of the majority. Many of us can learn from this. We respectfully encourage and call upon you to extend this principle to the protection of sexual minorities in their self-determination.

We urge you to work to ensure sexual orientation and gender identity rights in Uganda and that you and the parliamentarians in your party vote against the progression of the Anti Homosexuality Bill when it is next debated so it does not become law in Uganda.

Yours sincerely,

[Signature]

President of the IPU Twelve Plus Group
Mr Robert-Denis del Picchia
His Excellency Mr Museveni
Leader of the National Resistance Movement
Plot 10, Kyadondo Rd
Kampala
UGANDA

05 April 2012

Dear Mr Museveni,

We would like to acknowledge and thank you for hosting this 126th Assembly of the Inter-Parliamentary Union, and for opening the Assembly in your role as President. We also extend our heartfelt thanks to you and the people of Uganda for your wonderful hospitality and contribution to this Assembly.

As guests in your country, as members of the Twelve Plus Group representing parliaments from 46 countries, affiliated to the Inter-Parliamentary Union, we wish to take this opportunity to communicate with you as the Leader of the National Resistance Movement of Uganda specifically.

As fellow parliamentarians we ask you as the Leader of the National Resistance Movement to use your authority as the leader of your political party to effect the withdrawal of the Anti Homosexuality Bill proposed as a private member’s bill by Mr. David Bahati, a member of your party, on the basis that it conflicts with your party’s constitution, the IPU’s mission and vision and our shared commitment to affirming universal human rights.

We recognise that, as President, you cannot intervene in your Parliament’s consideration of a private member’s bill given the constitution of Uganda. Our request does not compromise this role.

We note however that the constitution of the National Resistance Movement, as amended 19 November 2005 includes these words:

---

1 Albania, Andorra, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Monaco, Montenegro, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Romania, San Marino, Serbia, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey, United Kingdom.
---
"Whereas the National Resistance Movement restored political stability, respect for human rights, national unity, peace, security, law and order, Constitutionalism and the rule of law."

This vision is congruent with IPU Article One, para 2 (c), which calls for the IPU to “Contribute to the defence and promotion of human rights, which are universal in scope and respect for which is an essential factor of Parliamentary democracy and development”.

It is clear in your opening speech and indeed, the constitution of your party, that democracy is treasured by yourself and all Ugandan people, as it is by us all. On this 50th anniversary of independence in Uganda, we acknowledge that as leaders we are often challenged by the tension between the will of the majority and the needs of minorities and the most vulnerable.

We take inspiration from your leadership and the Ugandan Government’s commitment to minorities and human rights through the provision of special conditions to ensure the participation of women, and people with disabilities within your parliament. This is clearly an example of your commitment to safeguarding human rights principles over the rule of the majority. Many of us can learn from this. We respectfully encourage and call upon you to extend this principle to the protection of sexual minorities in their self-determination.

Mr Museveni, your leadership of your party has led Uganda to a place of continued growth and prosperity. We urge you to work to ensure sexual orientation and gender identity rights, and that the Anti Homosexuality Bill is withdrawn completely, rather than amended in any way. Only in an equal society can we realise the possibility of universal prosperity that you envisaged in your speech at the Inter-Parliamentary Union’s opening ceremony.

Yours sincerely,

[Signature]

President of the IPU Twelve Plus Group
Mr Robert-Denis del Picchia
Mr Norbert Mao
Leader of the Democratic Party
Plot 3 William Street
P O Box 7098
Kampala
UGANDA

05 April 2012

Dear Mr Norbert Mao,

We would like to acknowledge and thank the Parliament of Uganda for hosting this 126th Assembly of the Inter-Parliamentary Union and also extend our heartfelt thanks to the people of Uganda for your wonderful hospitality and contribution to this Assembly.

As guests in your country, as members of the Twelve Plus Group representing parliaments from 46 countries¹, affiliated to the Inter-Parliamentary Union, we wish to take this opportunity to communicate with you as the leader of your political party.

As fellow parliamentarians we ask you as the leader of your political party to use all possible actions and mechanisms to ensure the Anti Homosexuality Bill proposed as a private member’s bill by Mr David Bahati, is defeated.

We note that the Constitution of the Republic of Uganda includes these words from Chapter 4 Human Rights and Freedoms:

“21. (1) All persons are equal before and under the law in all spheres of political, economic, social and cultural life and in every other respect and shall enjoy equal protection of the law.”

¹ Albania, Andorra, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Monaco, Montenegro, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Romania, San Marino, Serbia, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey, United Kingdom.

Secrétariat des 12+ (F)
Groupe français de l’UDP - Palais du Luxembourg - 75391 Paris cedex 06 - France
Tel: (+33) 1 42 34 30 12 + (+33) 1 42 34 34 01 - (+33) 1 42 34 27 81
Fax: (+33) 1 42 34 37 99 - Courriel: secrétariat12plus@senat.fr
Président: Robert-Denis del Picchia - Chef du Secrétariat: Philippe Bourassé
This vision is congruent with IPU Article One, para 2 (c), which calls for the IPU to “Contribute to the defence and promotion of human rights, which are universal in scope and respect for which is an essential factor of Parliamentary democracy and development”.

On this 50th anniversary of independence in Uganda, we acknowledge that as leaders we are often challenged by the tension between the will of the majority and the needs of minorities and the most vulnerable.

We take inspiration from the Ugandan parliament’s commitment to minorities and human rights through the provision of special conditions to ensure the participation of women, and people with disabilities within your parliament. This is clearly an example of your country’s commitment to safeguarding human rights principles over the rule of the majority. Many of us can learn from this. We respectfully encourage and call upon you to extend this principle to the protection of sexual minorities in their self-determination.

We urge you to work to ensure sexual orientation and gender identity rights in Uganda and that you and the parliamentarians in your party vote against the progression of the Anti Homosexuality Bill when it is next debated so it does not become law in Uganda.

Yours sincerely,

[Signature]

President of the IPU Twelve Plus Group
Mr Robert-Denis del Picchio
Rt Hon Rebecca Alitwala Kadaga  
Speaker of the Parliament of Uganda  
Plot 16 – 18 Parliamentary Avenue  
Kampala  
Uganda  
10 avril 2012

Dear Madam Speaker,

We write to you as representatives of the Twelve Plus geopolitical group¹ of the IPU, here in Kampala for the 126th Assembly of the Inter-Parliamentary Union. We feel we must express our collective concern at the renewed attempt by David Bahati to pass his Anti Homosexuality private member’s bill through your Parliament.

We appreciate that there is a dominant African culture and approach to sexual activity which differ from the prevailing cultures in each of our respective countries, but we feel we must let you know what a very negative view will be taken of Uganda’s approach to human rights in democracies such as ours which are committed to equal rights for all adults whatever their sexual preference if Mr Bahati succeeds with his bill.

All members of the Inter-Parliamentary Union subscribe to the IPU statutes, of which Article One, paragraph 2 (c) commits them to:

“Contribute to the defence and promotion of human rights, which are universal in scope and respect for which is an essential factor of parliamentary democracy and development.”

As friends of Uganda we want to stand shoulder-to-shoulder with you in fighting inequality, poverty and discrimination, and at the same time encourage Western countries to continue to invest, and further develop aid programmes and tourism.

We are aware that one argument adduced in favour Mr Bahati’s bill is that it is based on laws passed by Britain in colonial times. We would respectfully point out that sexual acts between

¹ The Twelve Plus Group is composed of the Parliaments of following countries : Albania, Andorra, Australia, Austria, Belarus, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Monaco, Montenegro, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Romania, San Marino, Serbia, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey, United Kingdom.
two adult males in private were legalised in England and Wales in 1967 – 45 years ago. As far as the threat of the death penalty is concerned, that was dropped by Britain for this activity in 1861. Virtually every member of the Twelve Plus can say the same, and none of us practises the death penalty for any offence.

We would make one further point. It is wholly untrue to suggest that those opposed to this bill are motivated by a desire to “promote” homosexuality. Nothing could be further from the truth. We passionately defend the rights of all societies to protect their culture and their way of life, so long as the exercise of those rights neither persecutes nor harms any section of their community.

We very much hope that you will do all in your power to prevent this private member’s bill from making progress in your parliament to ensure that human rights protections apply to all citizens regardless of race, gender, age, culture, religion, ability, sexual orientation and gender identity.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

President of the IPU Twelve Plus Group
Mr Robert-Denis del Picchia
Dr Kizza Besigye
Chairman of the Forum for Democratic Change
Plot 9 Entebbe Rd
Najjanankumbi
P O Box 26928
Kampala
UGANDA

05 April 2012

Dear Dr Kizza Besigye,

We would like to acknowledge and thank the Parliament of Uganda for hosting this 126th Assembly of the Inter-Parliamentary Union and also extend our heartfelt thanks to the people of Uganda for your wonderful hospitality and contribution to this Assembly.

As guests in your country, as members of the Twelve Plus Group representing parliaments from 46 countries, affiliated to the Inter-Parliamentary Union, we wish to take this opportunity to communicate with you as the leader of your political party.

As fellow parliamentarians we ask you as the leader of your political party to use all possible actions and mechanisms to ensure the Anti Homosexuality Bill proposed as a private member’s bill by Mr David Bahati, is defeated.

We note that the Constitution of the Republic of Uganda includes these words from Chapter 4 Human Rights and Freedoms:

“31. (1) All persons are equal before and under the law in all spheres of political, economic, social and cultural life and in every other respect and shall enjoy equal protection of the law.”

1 Albania, Andorra, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Monaco, Montenegro, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Romania, San Marino, Serbia, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey, United Kingdom.
This vision is congruent with IPU Article One, para 2 (c), which calls for the IPU to “Contribute to the defence and promotion of human rights, which are universal in scope and respect for which is an essential factor of Parliamentary democracy and development”.

On this 50th anniversary of independence in Uganda, we acknowledge that as leaders we are often challenged by the tension between the will of the majority and the needs of minorities and the most vulnerable.

We take inspiration from the Ugandan parliament’s commitment to minorities and human rights through the provision of special conditions to ensure the participation of women, and people with disabilities within your parliament. This is clearly an example of your country’s commitment to safeguarding human rights principles over the rule of the majority. Many of us can learn from this. We respectfully encourage and call upon you to extend this principle to the protection of sexual minorities in their self-determination.

We urge you to work to ensure sexual orientation and gender identity rights in Uganda and that you and the parliamentarians in your party vote against the progression of the Anti Homosexuality Bill when it is next debated so it does not become law in Uganda.

Yours sincerely,

[Signature]

President of the IPU Twelve Plus Group
Mr Robert-Denis del Picchia
Mr Ken Lukyanazi  
Leader of the Conservative Party  
P O Box 3143 & 1604  
Kampala  
UGANDA  

03 April 2012  

Dear Mr Ken Lukyanazi,  

We would like to acknowledge and thank the Parliament of Uganda for hosting this 126th Assembly of the Inter-Parliamentary Union and also extend our heartfelt thanks to the people of Uganda for your wonderful hospitality and contribution to this Assembly.  

As guests in your country, as members of the Twelve Plus Group representing parliaments from 46 countries¹, affiliated to the Inter-Parliamentary Union, we wish to take this opportunity to communicate with you as the leader of your political party.  

As fellow parliamentarians we ask you as the leader of your political party to use all possible actions and mechanisms to ensure the Anti Homosexuality Bill proposed as a private member’s bill by Mr David Bahati, is defeated.  

We note that the Constitution of the Republic of Uganda includes these words from Chapter 4 Human Rights and Freedoms:  

“21. (1) All persons are equal before and under the law in all spheres of political, economic, social and cultural life and in every other respect and shall enjoy equal protection of the law”  

¹ Albania, Andorra, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Monaco, Montenegro, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Romania, San Marino, Serbia, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey, United Kingdom.
This vision is congruent with IPU Article One, para 2 (c), which calls for the IPU to "Contribute to the defence and promotion of human rights, which are universal in scope and respect for which is an essential factor of Parliamentary democracy and development".

On this 50th anniversary of independence in Uganda, we acknowledge that as leaders we are often challenged by the tension between the will of the majority and the needs of minorities and the most vulnerable.

We take inspiration from the Ugandan parliament’s commitment to minorities and human rights through the provision of special conditions to ensure the participation of women, and people with disabilities within your parliament. This is clearly an example of your country’s commitment to safeguarding human rights principles over the rule of the majority. Many of us can learn from this. We respectfully encourage and call upon you to extend this principle to the protection of sexual minorities in their self-determination.

We urge you to work to ensure sexual orientation and gender identity rights in Uganda and that you and the parliamentarians in your party vote against the progression of the Anti Homosexuality Bill when it is next debated so it does not become law in Uganda.

Yours sincerely,

[Signature]

President of the IPU Twelve Plus Group
Mr Robert-Denis del Picchia
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1-14 July 2012

Introduction and objectives

The Speaker’s Delegation is part of the Inter-parliamentary Relations Programme and aims to promote New Zealand’s interests overseas through visits by parliamentarians. This year the traditional Speaker’s Delegation visited the United Kingdom, Croatia, and Belgium. The visit presented an opportunity to strengthen New Zealand’s economic links with engagement at the legislative level. I also saw value in exposing New Zealand parliamentarians to the challenges faced by the European Union in the current world financial climate, and consequently exploring how New Zealand can maintain and build good engagement with both ‘old’ and ‘new’ Europe.

The visit also allowed us to help promote business, agricultural, and research links, and our visit generated strong interest from the 3 countries. The New Zealand Parliament is of great interest internationally for its open legislative system, its active select committees, and the way in which minority governments have worked. The visit allowed us to share information about these strengths.

I was pleased to lead such an engaged delegation. It included Darien Fenton MP, Junior Whip from the Labour Party, Melissa Lee MP, Parliamentary Private Secretary for Ethnic Affairs from the National Party, Gareth Hughes MP, Musterer from the Green Party, and Denis O’Rourke MP from the New Zealand First Party. The membership of the delegation is attached as Appendix 1. A media release about the visit is attached as Appendix 3.

The visit programme, which is set out as Appendix 2, was intensive, and provided for excellent meetings and engagement with people from the parliamentary, executive, and private sectors. It was carefully planned in consultation with the Europe Division of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade.

The delegation would like to acknowledge the Ministry’s assistance, and the advice and support from our High Commission in London, provided by High Commissioner Derek Leask and his team; Ambassador Trevor Matheson and his staff in Rome (accredited to Croatia), and the New Zealand Honorary Consul to Croatia Nikola Jelinčić; and Deputy Head of Mission Paul Ash and the staff at the New Zealand Embassy in Brussels.

We would also like to thank the diplomatic missions in Wellington and especially HE Ms Vicki Treadell, British High Commissioner; Mr Michalis Rokas, Chargé d’Affaires Delegation of the European Union to New Zealand; and Mr Anthony Covic, Croatian Consul-General to New Zealand, for their assistance.
United Kingdom

Background on the United Kingdom Parliament

The United Kingdom Parliament has 2 houses, the House of Commons and the House of Lords.

House of Commons

The current House of Commons has 650 members, elected for a 5-year term. Legislation passed last year altered the parliamentary term from a maximum of 5 years to a fixed 5-year term and reduced the number of MPs, following the next election in May 2015, to 600.

The most recent election was held in May 2010.

Members are elected by simple majority vote from single-member constituencies.

Voters and candidates must be aged 18 years or over and be British, Irish or qualifying Commonwealth citizens.

Leadership

The Speaker is elected by and from among the members. The present Speaker is John Bercow.

On election, a new Speaker must resign from their party and remain separate from political issues even in retirement. The Speaker maintains their role as a constituency MP, and at a general election stands in their constituency as ‘the Speaker seeking re-election’. They are generally unopposed by the major political parties.

Legislative process

Bills, other than money bills, may be introduced in either House. In the House of Commons, the first reading takes place without debate. Following the second reading, a bill is usually referred to a public bill committee, but sometimes to a committee of the whole House, to be examined in detail. The bill returns to the floor of the House of Commons for its report stage, which is followed by the third reading.

The procedure in the House of Lords is similar, but with the committee stage occurring in the Chamber or in Grand Committee. Both Houses must agree on the final version of a bill, which may necessitate back and forth discussion between the 2 Houses, before the bill can receive Royal assent. Money bills are introduced in the House of Commons, must pass through the House of Lords quickly, and can gain Royal assent without the Lords’ approval.

Committees

Select committees, one for each government department and its associated bodies, examine departmental spending, policies, and administration. Some, for example the Public Accounts Committee, cross departmental boundaries.

General committees take several forms. Public bill committees are set up to consider individual bills. A second reading committee will occasionally substitute for the second reading debate of a non-controversial bill. Delegated legislation committees consider statutory instruments and European committees consider selected European Union (EU) documents in detail.
Parties
The 3 major parties in the House of Commons as at 30 March 2012 are:

Conservative  305  
Labour       253  
Liberal Democrat      57

The number of women members is  145 (22%).

House of Lords
The House of Lords currently has 818 members.

The majority of the Lords are appointed by the Queen on the recommendation of the Prime Minister or of the House of Lords Appointments Commission.

- Life peers are appointed for their lifetime only.
- 26 Church of England archbishops and bishops sit in the House.
- 92 hereditary peers remain until the next stage of the House of Lords reform.

The Lord Speaker is elected by and from among the members. The Lord Speaker chairs debates, but does not call members to speak or the House to order, or rule on points of order. The current Lord Speaker is Baroness D’Souza.

Committees
Select committees conduct inquiries and report on issues within their specific area. There are currently 5 major select committees, focusing on the European Union, science and technology, communications, the constitution, and economic affairs.

Grand committees consider bills that have not been committed to a committee of the whole House. The proceedings are identical, except that motions must be passed unanimously. Any member of the House of Lords may attend a grand committee.

Visit programme
We began our time in London by conducting a wreath laying ceremony at the New Zealand Memorial located in Hyde Park Corner. Prior to the ceremony, a briefing was provided to the delegation on the history of the memorial and its use during the annual Anzac day commemorations. The memorial commemorates the enduring bonds between New Zealand and the United Kingdom, and our shared sacrifice during times of war. It is a symbol both of our common heritage and of New Zealand’s distinct identity. This event was organised by Lt Col Nick Gillard, Military Advisor, New Zealand Defence Force, and I was very honoured to be asked to lay a wreath on behalf of New Zealand. This visit also provided an opportunity for us to view the newly opened World War 2 Bomber Command memorial.

In the evening, we were hosted at the New Zealand High Commission. This was an excellent opportunity to meet some of our United Kingdom counterparts. Main guests included the Speaker of the House of Commons, the Rt Hon John Bercow MP, and members of the Australia/New Zealand All-Party Parliamentary Group, including Lord (Timothy) Boswell of Aynho, Lord (Donald) Curry of Kirkharle, Rt Hon the Lord Alf Morris of Manchester, and Austin Mitchell MP. Other guests included Andrew Tuggey,
Director, Commonwealth and International Relations CPA (UK) and Peter Wilson, Director, Asia Pacific, Foreign and Commonwealth Office.

The evening provided an opportunity for both sides to discuss issues relating to the workings of the United Kingdom and New Zealand parliaments. Of particular interest to the United Kingdom side was how New Zealand’s ‘Question Time’ operated, including the role of supplementary questions; how, under an MMP system, the Speaker moderated who should ask questions; and, recent reforms that had been undertaken by the New Zealand Parliament including the select committee process. I also took this opportunity to issue an invitation to Speaker Bercow that he lead a United Kingdom parliamentary delegation on a visit to New Zealand.

The next day saw us visit the parliamentary complex at Westminster, beginning with an overview of the United Kingdom’s parliamentary system delivered by Crispin Poyser, Clerk of the Overseas Office, House of Commons. We then moved on to a meeting with the Speaker of the House of Commons, the Rt Hon John Bercow MP, and I was privileged to sit in on the Speaker’s daily briefing session while the rest of the delegation received a tour of the Members’ Centre at Portcullis House.

A lunch meeting was held with Lindsay Hoyle MP, Chairman of Ways and Means, and Deputy Speaker, House of Commons, and Andrew Kennon, Clerk of Committees, House of Commons. We then observed the proceedings of the House from the gallery, mainly featuring questions to the Secretary of State for Justice. This was a fascinating glimpse into the institution on which our own Parliament is modelled, and was thoroughly enjoyed by the delegation.

The day was rounded out by meetings with John Whittingdale MP, Chair of the Culture, Media and Sport Committee, and Paul Evans, Clerk of the Table Office. Our meeting with John Whittingdale MP focused on the Leveson Inquiry and how it might affect how the press, police and politicians interact and work with each other. The inquiry is in 2 parts. The first is to inquire into the culture, practices, and ethics of the press. This includes contacts and the relationships between national newspapers and politicians, and the conduct of each. The second part is to inquire into the extent of unlawful or improper conduct within News International and other newspaper organisations, and the police investigation of wrongdoing at News International.

This was a stimulating discussion that threw up some interesting questions around the extent of public knowledge and understanding of the relationship between the media and politicians, the source of the relationship and the use made of it; the benefits and risks to the public interest arising from relationships between senior politicians and the media; the role of a free press in holding politicians and the powerful to account; whether political journalism has moved from reporting to seeking to make or influence political events; the nature of media influence on public policy in general; the influence of the media in the content and timing of a party’s media policies; whether there is evidence of media influence on public and political appointments; and, whether politicians can feel intimidated by the media in a way that could inhibit them from acting to ensure that the media’s conduct, practices and ethics are serving the public interest. There are implications for democracy should press freedoms be somewhat curtailed, and the findings of the inquiry will no doubt have repercussions for media and politicians across the world.

Discussions with the Clerk of the Table Office, Paul Evans, centred on the workings of the Backbench Business Committee and Question Time in the House. This committee meets
35 days a year and the Chair is elected by the whole House. The committee decides on
subjects for debate based on criteria that include topicality, cross-party support, and
whether the topic will not be debated by any other means.

Wednesday 4 July began with a tour of Parliament, followed by an update on recent
changes at Westminster by Liam Laurence Smyth, Clerk of the Journals. This was
interesting as we got to hear more about the recent media stoushes involving things such as
Members’ expenses and what was termed “parliamentary gossip”. The United Kingdom
has more restrictive policies around freedom of information than New Zealand, but it was
noted that any refusal to release information often results in media becoming even more
attracted to particular issues. We also discussed the work of the Independent Parliamentary
Standards Authority that sets parliamentary salaries, the level of expenses Members are
entitled to and who administers payment of these, as well as the question of reform of the
House of Lords and in turn a possible reform of the House of Commons. A Joint
Committee set up to consider the House of Lords Reform Draft Bill published last year
presented its report in April. The draft bill proposes a mostly or wholly elected 300-
member House, with a third of the membership being renewed at each general election.
Members would be elected from multi-member districts by Single Transferrable Vote.
Whilst the Government believes that the House of Lords’ status and existing constitutional
relationship with the House of Commons would not change, the Joint Committee is firmly
of the opinion that a wholly or partially elected House of Lords would seek to use its
powers more assertively, to an extent that cannot be predicted.

I then had a private meeting with the Rt Hon Sir Alan Haselhurst MP, Chair of the United
Kingdom Branch of the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association (CPA) and Chair of the
CPA International Executive Committee. The CPA is an international community of
parliaments and legislatures working together to deepen the Commonwealth’s knowledge
and understanding of and commitment to democratic governance. The CPA seeks to build
an informed parliamentary community and to enhance cooperation between its parliaments
and legislatures through professional development seminars, workshops and exchanges,
conference networking, and technical assistance to individual parliaments. Sir Alan was
elected into his role in 2011 and it was a great pleasure to be able to talk with him about the
organisation and New Zealand’s role within it. New Zealand provides the secretariat for
the CPA Pacific Region and the New Zealand branch provides opportunities for New
Zealand parliamentarians to engage in this significant international organisation, contribute
to debate on matters of international importance, and ensure that matters of importance to
New Zealand and the Pacific Region are included on the CPA’s agenda. The rest of the
dlegation then joined us for lunch where discussions continued.

Our next meeting was with Graham Allen MP, Chair, and members of the Political and
Constitutional Reform Committee, House of Commons. Our discussions with the
committee included an overview of the reforms undertaken by New Zealand in the 1950s
when we removed our Upper House, as well as more recent reforms like the Select
Committee process and the introduction of Mixed Member Proportional representation
(MMP). There was much interest from the committee around the resourcing of List
Members and also our handling of Members expenses. We also touched on freedom of
information and New Zealand’s Official Information Act.

Our final meeting in London was with the Lord Speaker, Baroness D’Souza. It was a great
pleasure to talk with the Lord Speaker around upcoming Commonwealth events such as
the Commonwealth Speakers and Presiding Officers Conference (New Zealand will host
this event in 2014) and the Commonwealth Heads of Government Meeting. We also touched on MMP and the House of Lords Reform bill. Baroness D’Souza favours incremental reform and thinks that the Bill as it currently stands is perhaps too bold. However, she expressed that the worst outcome would be no reform at all.

**Croatia**

**Background on the Parliament of Croatia**

The Parliament of Croatia (Hrvatski Sabor) has 151 members, elected for a term of 4 years. The most recent election was held in December 2011.

One hundred and forty members are elected by proportional representation from 10 territorial constituencies, each returning 14 members, and 3 members by Croatian citizens residing abroad. Parties may present lists independently or in coalition with other parties. Independent candidates must also form a list. Lists must gain at least 5% of the vote in a constituency to be eligible for seats in that constituency. Eight members are elected by simple majority vote by national minorities in 6 separate nationwide groupings. Voters and candidates must be citizens aged 18 years or over. The Speaker is elected by the members.

**Legislative process**

The Government, parliamentary committees, and members may sponsor a bill. On introduction, a bill is assigned to a committee for consideration. In addition, the Legislation Committee will report on its constitutional compliance and the Finance and Central Budget Committee on whether any financial obligations it may create can be met. After the committees have reported, the bill receives its first reading. If it is accepted, within 6 months the sponsor will prepare a final draft, based on Parliament’s conclusions, for the second reading. The final vote on a bill may take place after the second reading or, if it is heavily amended at that stage, after a third reading.

**Committees**

The majority of the 29 standing committees are subject committees, with the power to consider legislation, monitor the implementation of policy, and hold hearings on petitions and proposals submitted to Parliament by citizens. Most of these committees have a membership of 13, and sometimes also 6 additional non-voting members appointed from the ranks of public officials, scholars and professionals, or other specified groupings or named bodies. Special committees may be set up for a designated purpose.

**Parliamentary groups**

Parliamentary groups must have at least 3 members, and may comprise one or more political parties or independent members. Currently, there are 9 parliamentary groups and 13 political parties in Parliament.

The 3 largest parties are:

- Social Democratic Party 60
- Croatian Democratic Union 44
- Croatian Peoples Party 14

The number of women members is 35 (23%).
Visit programme

We began our programme in Zagreb, receiving a warm welcome by Josip Leko, First Deputy Speaker of the Parliament of Croatia. Deputy Speaker Leko stepped in to fill the absence of Boris Šprem, the Speaker of the Parliament of Croatia, who was ill at the time of our visit and has since sadly passed away.

Deputy Speaker Leko described Croatia as “a young country but an old nation” currently in a state of ongoing economic and political transition. During the first decade of Croatia’s independence, it had followed a largely presidential system in which the president appointed the government and held all executive powers. Following a series of referendums, the country’s constitution was amended in 2001 with the introduction of a 151-member unicameral chamber of representatives, executive powers passed to the elected Government, and the role of president reduced to that of a figurehead.

Following a joint press statement, the Deputy Speaker hosted us for lunch. We then moved on to calls with the President of the Republic, Prof Ivo Josipović, the Minister of Foreign and European Affairs, Vesna Pusić, and Nadan Vidošević, President of the Croatian Chamber of the Economy.

Our visit to Croatia coincided with the 20th anniversary of the country’s independence and the establishment of bilateral relations, and this was not lost on our Croatian hosts. Prof Josipović described the state of bilateral relations with New Zealand as “excellent” and that our peacekeeping efforts in the Balkans following the conflict there in the 1990s would never be forgotten. I noted the strong and continuing contribution that Dalmatian immigrants had made to New Zealand’s development since the 1850s, especially in the area of viticulture. I also took the opportunity to thank Croatia for its support of New Zealand’s bid for a seat on the United Nations Security Council. The President’s sentiments were reiterated by Minister Pusić, who described our relationship as “special, warm and close”.

It was clear from our meetings that Croatia is proud of its democratic achievements in the past 2 decades, and indeed its march to membership of the European Union (EU). While this had not always been an easy process, Minister Pusić believed that the country had used the accession process wisely, learning from mistakes and heeding advice. Croatia remains on track to join the EU on 1 July 2013, with 10 out of 27 EU states having ratified Croatia’s accession as at 5 July 2012. Mr Vidošević stressed the importance of joining the EU for Croatia’s long-term economic interests, not only in terms of increasing Croatia’s competitiveness, but also in terms of receiving approximately €2 billion in annual aid transfers.

We left Zagreb on Saturday 7 July, firstly to undertake a tour of food and pharmaceutical processor, Podravka Inc. Podravka is a highly innovative and respected model of efficient, environmentally conscious food production. Given New Zealand’s strong agricultural history and potential in this area, it was a valuable visit for the delegation to make. After a tour of the factory, we met with the President of the Management Board of Podravka, Zvonimir Mršić. Mr Mršić told us that his company was not afraid of EU competition and had made structural and other changes to become more competitive with the 2013 entry date in mind. He did express some concern with Podravka’s reliance on sourcing around 30% of its ingredients and products from other Balkan countries, some of which might struggle to meet EU entry requirements after Croatia becomes an EU member. Podravka’s other challenge will be in developing economies of scale to compete with much larger multinationals, and while they have a sales office in Sydney, they lack exposure in the rest
of the Asia-Pacific region. I indicated that New Zealand could be an attractive base for exporting to the region, as we have an expanding network of free trade agreements with Asian economies, as well as some similarly sized food and beverage companies that could be interested in joint ventures. This was met positively, and the New Zealand Ambassador undertook to follow this up with New Zealand Trade and Enterprise.

We then travelled to Dubrovnik and had afternoon meetings with Andro Vlahušić, Mayor of the City of Dubrovnik and Nikola Dobroslavic, Prefect of Dubrovnik-Neretva County.

Mayor Vlahušić gave us an overview of the history of the city and expressed his hope that accession to the EU would further boost Dubrovnik’s tourism sector. I pointed out the opportunities for joint Croatia/New Zealand ventures in this regard, and again commented on the rich contribution that people of Dalmatian descent have made to New Zealand.

Our meeting with the Prefect of Dubrovnik-Neretva County elaborated on the economy of the region and issues it was facing in the medium to longer term, including education, healthcare, road, and spatial planning. While the region’s economy is predominantly engaged in tourism, there are also significant agricultural (mainly viticulture) and fishery sectors. Environmental protection is afforded a high priority, and it is fair to say that the city of Dubrovnik and its surrounds are stunning. However, there is increasing awareness that to maintain this there will need to be careful and considered growth in tourism, especially growth in the number of cruise liner visits to the region (currently around 1 million visitors from this industry per annum).

On our final night in Croatia we were hosted by Mate Jujnović and his wife Bozenac. The Jujnovićs lived in New Zealand for many years and, after running a successful business in New Zealand, decided to return to Croatia to invest in its future. It was very interesting to hear their views on the challenges of doing business in Croatia and how the Dalmatian-New Zealand diaspora could assist to overcome these challenges, along with thoughts on how closer economic relations between New Zealand and Croatia can be developed. The New Zealand Ambassador undertook to follow up directly with Mr Jujnović on these matters. The evening and its discussions were a very pleasant way to conclude the Croatian part of our visit.

Belgium

Background on the European Parliament

The European Parliament has 754 members representing the 27 member states of the European Union. Germany has the largest representation with 99 MEPs; Estonia, Cyprus and Malta each have 6 MEPs. Elections are held every 5 years. The most recent election was in June 2009.

Powers

Parliament jointly exercises legislative power and budgetary authority with the European Council, in which ministers from each member state adopt laws and coordinate policies. It elects the President of the European Commission, the EU’s executive body representing its interests as a whole, and, en bloc, the commissioners. It has the power to censure the Commission. Parliament’s consent is required for a state’s admission to or withdrawal from the European Union. Its consent is also required for agreements, other than those relating to the common foreign and security policy, between the EU and other countries or international organisations.
Election of members
All members are elected by proportional representation, but the systems used vary among the member states. In most states the country constitutes a single electorate, but some have regional electorates.

The minimum voting age is 18 in all states except Austria, where it is 16. All candidates must be EU citizens. Other candidate requirements vary among the states, for example, the minimum age ranges from 18 in many countries to 25 in Cyprus and Italy.

Leadership
The President of the Parliament is elected by and from among the members for a term of 2½ years. The current President is Martin Schulz.

Legislative process
The Commission submits a proposal to Parliament and to the Council. The first reading in Parliament entails examination of the proposal by a committee, followed by plenary consideration of the committee’s report. At this stage, national parliaments may give an opinion on whether a proposal complies with the principles of subsidiarity and proportionality, that is, that the objective cannot be sufficiently achieved by the member states and that the proposed action does not go beyond what is necessary to achieve the objective. If the Council agrees with the outcome of the first reading in Parliament, the legislative text is adopted. In the case of disagreement, a second reading takes place. The Council presents its position to Parliament, which may approve, amend, or reject it. Rejection at this stage is final. If Parliament approves the Council’s position, or the Council accepts Parliament’s amended version of it, the text is adopted. If the Council does not accept an amended version, a Conciliation Committee, comprising members of both institutions, is convened for a third reading stage. If the Committee can agree on a joint text that is then approved by both institutions, the text is adopted.

Committees
There are 20 standing committees, each with its own secretariat. They have between 24 and 76 members, elected for 2½-year terms. The committees draw up, amend and adopt legislative proposals and ‘own initiative’ reports. There is provision to establish special committees. A committee of inquiry may be set up at the request of a quarter of the MEPs to investigate allegations of contravention or maladministration of EU law. Parliament voted in May 2012 in favour of a proposal that would strengthen the powers of committees of inquiry.

Location
Parliament has its seat in Strasbourg, where the monthly plenary sessions are held. Committee meetings and additional plenary sessions are held in Brussels. The Secretariat is located in Luxembourg. Twice in recent votes on Parliament’s budget, MEPs have pointed to the savings that could be made if Parliament ceased to meet in Strasbourg.

Languages
All parliamentary documents are published in all 23 official languages and every member has the right to speak in the official language of their choice.
**Political groups**

A political group must have at least 25 members, representing at least one quarter of the member states. Independent members are known as non-attached members.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Political group</th>
<th>Members</th>
<th>Countries</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group of the European People’s Party (Christian Democrats)</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group of the Progressive Alliance of Socialists and Democrats in the European Parliament</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group of the Alliance of Liberals and Democrats for Europe</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group of the Greens/European Free Alliance</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European Conservatives and Reformists Group</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Europe of Freedom and Democracy Group</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confederal Group of the European United Left – Nordic Green Left</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-attached members</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The number of women MEPs is 35%.

**Background on the European Commission**

**Composition**

As currently constituted, the Commission comprises 27 commissioners, one from each member state, who are appointed for 5-year terms. Commissioners are assigned responsibility for specific policy areas by the President of the Commission, who is José Manuel Barroso. There are 8 Vice-Presidents, one of whom is the High Representative of the Union for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy.

From November 2014, the number of commissioners, including the President and the High Representative, will be equal to two thirds of the number of member states, unless a unanimous decision of the European Council alters this number. Commissioners will be chosen on a strictly rotational basis.

**Appointment and dismissal of the Commission**

The President of the Commission is elected by the European Parliament on a proposal from the European Council. The European Council, with the agreement of the President of the Commission, appoints the High Representative of the Union for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy. The Commission as a whole, including the President and the High Representative, is subject to a vote of consent by the European Parliament. If approved, the Commission is appointed by the European Council. The Commission is responsible to the European Parliament, which has sole power to dismiss it, although the President may request the resignation of individual commissioners, other than the High Representative.
Work of the Commission

- **Legislation** – The Commission has the right of initiative. Proposed new laws are drafted by the Commission’s departments. If at least 14 of the 27 commissioners agree with a draft, it is sent to the Council and to Parliament.

- **Budget** – Together with the Council and Parliament, the Commission sets broad long-term spending priorities for the EU in the EU ‘financial framework’. It also draws up an annual budget for approval by Parliament and the Council, and supervises how funding is spent.

- **Enforcing laws** – As ‘guardian of the Treaties’, the Commission monitors the application of EU law in member states. If it thinks a government is failing to apply EU law, it first makes an official request for the problem to be corrected. As a last resort, the Commission can refer an issue to the Court of Justice, which can impose penalties. The Court’s decisions are binding on EU countries and institutions.

- **International representation** – The Commission speaks on behalf of all EU members in international bodies such as the World Trade Organization. It also negotiates international agreements for the EU.

Organisation of the Commission

The Commission’s staff are organised into 33 departments, known as Directorates-General, and 11 services.

Visit programme

After a day in transit, we arrived in our final destination of Brussels. This was a chance for us to meet with representatives of both the European Parliament and the European Commission, as well as to pay our respects to the New Zealanders who fell in the fields of Flanders during World War 1.

We started with a briefing at the New Zealand High Commission from Chargé d’Affaires Paul Ash on the European Parliament and Commission and the Common Agricultural Policy before moving on to a meeting with the President and Speaker of the Belgian Senate, Sabine de Bethune. We were given a tour of both chambers of the Belgian Parliament by the President and acting Vice-President Armand De Decker (himself a former Speaker of the Senate and Minister for Development Cooperation). We then discussed Belgium’s on-going Parliamentary reform process, as well as the Eurozone crisis and Belgium’s role within it. President de Bethune explained that the ongoing negotiations within the Eurozone around possible EU treaty amendments implied a role for the Senate given its joint mandate (with the Chamber of Representatives) for foreign affairs, including any matters to do with Belgian treaty obligations. She commented that around 70% of the Senate’s current work was related to implementing EU treaties into Belgian law. Belgium is very much in favour of “more Europe”, and despite the difficulties of the last few years, the EU has pulled together well to try to navigate through the crisis. I agreed with this assessment, particularly noting the EU’s contribution to peace and stability in Europe after the ravages of 2 world wars.

We then attended a working lunch at the High Commissioner’s residence to receive a more in depth briefing on the Eurozone. In attendance were Dr Nikolaos Chrysoloras, journalist, the Brussels-based economics correspondent for the largest Greek daily Kathimerini, and Katarina Penna, previously a senior advisor to former Greek Prime Minister Georgios Papandreou. Both gave a frank assessment of the situation, commenting that the situation will get worse before it improves. They did note that of the 3 most affected southern European countries (Greece, Spain, and Italy), only the Italians could realistically break
from the Eurozone and viably exist independently. In this regard, their assessment was that any talk of breaking away by Greece and Spain was not a serious threat. The Italian elections in 2013 could well be a turning point in the fate of the European “experiment”. We also discussed the unwelcome rise of xenophobia, which has crept into the political debate around Europe, noting that while still very much a sentiment voiced by the minority, it is something that needs to be addressed and contained.

From lunch we moved on to attend and observe meetings at the European Parliament, the first of which was the Agricultural and Rural Development Parliamentary Committee meeting, where discussions on the reform of the Common Agricultural Policy (CAP) were taking place. We then had the opportunity to sit in on the Committee on Foreign Affairs’ meeting. Both provided a valuable glimpse into the workings of the EU.

Dinner that evening was hosted by Georgios Papastamkos, Vice President of the European Parliament. The event was well attended by other MEPs, and the Vice President commented on the increasing strength of the relationship between New Zealand and the EU. He spoke of developments beyond trade, noting in particular cooperation on environmental issues and science and research linkages, all well supported by New Zealand’s diplomatic presence in Brussels.

More engagements at the European Parliament followed on July 10, including a special session with the Delegation for Relations with Australia and New Zealand, which had visited New Zealand in May 2012. This was a very useful session in which all the delegation members were able to engage in wide-ranging discussions with their MEP counterparts on a number of areas of interest, including the Eurozone, the Anti-counterfeiting Trade Agreement, the Multi-Annual Financial Framework, and the Framework Agreement.

Our last day was one of commemoration for the New Zealanders who gave their lives fighting in West Flanders during World War 1. It was also timely given the approach of Centenary events due to take place in 2014, and in which New Zealand will play a significant role.

We visited a number of sights, including a visit to the town of Mesen and the Messines Ridge (Mesen shares close ties with Featherston, and there is a memorial to fallen New Zealanders located at Messines Ridge), the Passchendaele Museum located in Zonnebeke (twinned with the Waimakariri District), and the “In Flanders Fields” museum in Ieper (Ypres). We were hosted for dinner by Mr Luc Dehaene, Mayor of Ieper, Mr Ian Hussein, Director of Northwest Europe of the Commonwealth War Graves Commission, and Mr Mathieu Motrie, Vice Chairman of the Last Post Association. Dinner was followed by attending a moving rendition of ‘The Last Post’ at the Menin Gate. This ceremony has been carried out almost continuously since 1928 under the Menin Gate with the exception of the period of the town’s occupation during World War 2. I was again honoured to be invited by the Last Post Association to read the Ode of Remembrance and to lay a wreath on behalf of the Government and people of New Zealand.

**Conclusions**

The visit of the Speaker’s Delegation to the United Kingdom, Croatia, and Belgium was successful and achieved its objectives, which included strengthening the relationships between our Parliament and the legislatures of the 3 countries we visited, and advancing New Zealand’s interests, especially the promotion of our agriculture and dairy sectors.

The United Kingdom is and will continue to be an important ally for New Zealand. The warmth with which we were received was a reflection of the close ties we share with the
United Kingdom and its legislature. We will continue to engage with the CPA, and I hope to see this organisation continue its good work in promoting parliamentary democracy and providing professional development opportunities for its members.

We were also able to sow the seed for closer relationships with Croatia, which could lead to a visa waiver policy and increased business linkages between the 2 countries. I hope that this idea is followed up further, and that we continue to ensure that exchanges take place between parliamentarians from New Zealand and the Croatian Parliament through either bilateral visits or engagement at multilateral fora such as the Inter-Parliamentary Union assemblies.

Our time in Belgium provided a sobering but timely insight into the challenges facing the Eurozone, but also the increasing number of areas in which New Zealand can offer expertise and cooperation to the EU. Our relationship with this important political entity will continue through our biennial exchange programme and by the continuing good work of our diplomats posted in Brussels.

Dr The Rt Hon Lockwood Smith
Speaker
Appendix 1-Members of the Delegation

Dr The Rt Hon Lockwood Smith MP, Speaker and Leader of the Delegation
Darien Fenton MP, Junior Whip, Labour Party
Melissa Lee MP, Parliamentary Private Secretary for Ethnic Affairs, National Party
Gareth Hughes MP, Musterer, Green Party
Denis O’Rourke MP, New Zealand First Party.
Kirstin Harvey, Secretary to the Delegation
Beryl Bright, Senior Private Secretary to the Speaker
Appendix 2-Tour itinerary

Tuesday 2 July-London
- Delegation arrives London
- Visit to the NZ Memorial in Hyde Park, Mr Speaker to lay a wreath
- Dinner hosted by the NZ High Commission

Tuesday 3 July-London
- Meeting with Crispin Poyser, Clerk of the Overseas Office, House of Commons “Introduction to the UK Parliament”
- Meeting with John Bercow MP, Speaker of the House of Commons
- Lunch hosted by Lindsay Hoyle MP, Chairman of Ways and Means and Deputy Speaker, House of Commons
- Observe Speaker’s procession followed by a visit to the gallery of the House of Commons to observe proceedings: Questions to the Secretary of State for Justice
- Possible Culture, Media and Sport Committee meeting

Wednesday 4 July-London
- Meeting with Dr Sue Griffiths, Clerk, Table Office “Backbench Business Committee”
- Lunch hosted by Sir Alan Haselhurst MP and Andrew Tuggey, Director Commonwealth and International Relations and Secretary, CPA UK Branch
- Meeting with Graham Allen MP, Chair, and members of the Political and Constitutional Reform Committee
- Meeting with the Speaker of the House of Lords, Baroness D’Souza

Thursday 5 July-London to Zagreb

Friday 6 July-Zagreb
- Meeting with Mr Josip Leko, the first Vice President of the Croatian Parliament and Deputy Speaker
- Press statement by the two Speakers
- Meeting between Mr Speaker and Mr Zoran Milanovic, Prime Minister of the Republic of Croatia
- Meeting between Mr Speaker and Prof. Dr. Sc. Ivo Josipović, President of the Republic of Croatia
- Official lunch hosted by Mr Josip Leko, Deputy Speaker of the Croatian Parliament
- Meeting between Mr Speaker and Mr Nadan Vidosevic, President of the Croatian Chamber of the Economy

Saturday 7 July-Zagreb to Dubrovnik
- Guided tour of Podravka Inc. factory
- Depart Zagreb and arrive Dubrovnik
- Meeting between Mr Speaker and Mr Andro Vlahušić, Mayor of the City of Dubrovnik
- Meeting between Mr Speaker and Mr Nikola Dobroslavic, Prefect of Dubrovnik-Neretva County

Sunday 8 July-Dubrovnik, Vienna and Brussels
- Depart Dubrovnik, transit through Vienna, arrive Brussels

Monday 9 July-Brussels
- Briefing at New Zealand Mission by Chargé d’Affaires
- Briefing on Common Agricultural Policy (CAP)
- Meeting with Speaker of Belgian Senate, Sabine de Bethune
- Eurozone Briefing over lunch hosted at New Zealand Residence by Chargé d’Affaires
  Guest speakers: Dr Nikolaos Chrysoloras, Journalist, Brussels-based Economics Correspondent for the largest Greek daily “Kathimerini” and others
- Meetings at the European Parliament, including:
  - Attend Parliamentary Committee Meetings, including AGRI (Agricultural and Rural Development) Committee Meeting
  - Working dinner hosted by Mr Georgios Papastamkos, Vice President of the European Parliament

Tuesday 10 July-Brussels
- Meetings at European Parliament
- Working lunch hosted by Mrs Mara Bizzotto, Chair of the Delegation for Relations with Australia and New Zealand
- Further meetings in the European Parliament
- Meeting with Mr Martin Schulz, President of the European Parliament

Wednesday 11 July-Ypres (Western Flanders)
- Arrive Mesen, visits to: St Nicholas Church, the New Zealand Memorial, the Messines Ridge British Cemetery
- Depart for Zonnebeke, visit to the Memorial Museum in Passchendaele
- Depart for Ieper, visit to the In Flanders Fields Museum
- The Last Post ceremony under the Menin Gate, Mr Speaker to lay a wreath

Thursday 12 July-Brussels, London and Auckland

Delegation returns to New Zealand via London
Appendix 3-Media release

29 July 2012

Dr The Rt Hon Lockwood Smith, Speaker of the House

Speakers’ delegation visit boosts New Zealand-Europe ties

New Zealand’s political links and historical ties with Europe will be invigorated by the upcoming visit to the continent by a parliamentary delegation, the Speaker, Dr The Rt Hon Lockwood Smith, said today.

“The delegation members will meet with political leaders in Britain, Croatia, and Brussels, reinforcing existing links and sharing thoughts and ideas on the current challenges facing the global economy.

“Our extensive programme is designed to enable our delegation to engage with three key European countries at a time when global events are occurring that will have an impact on New Zealand’s relationship with these countries.

“In Britain, we will be meeting with key parliamentary officials, including the Speakers of the Houses of Commons and Lords, as well as some Members of Parliament. We also hope to have an opportunity to receive an update on Britain’s position on the EU financial situation, and a briefing on the Common Agricultural Policy discussions currently taking place. Both of these issues will have an impact on how New Zealand engages with Britain and the EU into the future.

“Our visit to Croatia will focus on gaining a better understanding of the Croatian Parliament, especially of its current experience of seeking membership to the EU. Among those we will meet are both the Prime Minister and the President of the Republic of Croatia, the Deputy Speaker of the Croatian Parliament, and the Head of the Croatian Chamber of the Economy. We will also have a chance to visit the Prodravka Food Processing factory and accompanying farm. Prodravka is a highly innovative and respected model of what efficient, environmentally conscious food production could look like, so it will be interesting for the delegation to visit, given New Zealand’s strong agricultural history and potential in this area. We will also be making a brief stopover in Dubrovnik to meet with officials there and hopefully to engage with the significant New Zealand/Croatian business community of the Dubrovnik-Neretva region.

“Meetings in Brussels will present an opportunity to engage with both the European Parliament and the Belgian Parliament, and we will be meeting with senior officials from both organisations. We will be having further discussions around the EU Common Agricultural Policy, as well as a comprehensive briefing on the current state of the Eurozone.

“Our time in Belgium will be rounded off by a day of visits to significant World War 1 sites in Western Flanders to pay tribute to the New Zealand soldiers who fought and died in that great conflict. I will take the opportunity to lay a wreath under the Menin Gate during The Last Post ceremony. This will mark the 28,906th time the ceremony has taken place since it started on 2 July 1928. It has been carried out almost continuously since 1928 under the Menin Gate with the exception of the period of the town’s occupation during the World War 2.
“I believe that this visit will strengthen New Zealand’s links to both old allies and new friends in Europe during testing times for the region and indeed the global community,” Dr Smith said.

The delegation, led by Dr Smith, includes Deputy Chair of the Social Services Committee Melissa Lee (National), Junior Whip Darien Fenton (Labour), Musterer Gareth Hughes (Green), and Denis O’Rourke (NZ First). The visit will take place from 1-14 July.
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**Report by the New Zealand Delegation to the 58th Commonwealth Parliamentary Association Conference**  
**Colombo, Sri Lanka**  
**10–15 September 2012**

**Introduction to the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association**

The Commonwealth Parliamentary Association (CPA) is an international community of parliaments and legislatures working together to deepen the Commonwealth’s knowledge and understanding of and commitment to democratic governance.

There are active CPA branches in approximately 175 national, state, provincial, and territorial parliaments and legislatures of all the 54 Commonwealth countries, representing approximately 17,000 parliamentarians. Through these branches, which are organised into nine regions, the CPA seeks to build an informed parliamentary community and to enhance co-operation between its parliaments and legislatures.

The CPA pursues these objectives through professional development seminars, workshops and exchanges, conference networking, technical assistance to individual parliaments and the provision of specialist information.

The CPA provides opportunities for the New Zealand Parliament to engage in a significant international organisation, contribute to debate on matters of international importance, and ensure that matters of importance to New Zealand and the Pacific Region are included on the CPA’s agenda.

**Annual Conference**

The annual CPA Conference is an opportunity for more than 600 members of Parliament, representing the parliaments and legislatures of Commonwealth nations, states, provinces, and territories, to discuss policies on global issues and parliamentary democracy. About 100 parliamentary officials also attend the conference.

The theme of the 58th conference was “Ensuring a Relevant Commonwealth for the Future”. Workshops and plenary sessions linked to this theme focused on issues for youth and future generations, and parliamentary scrutiny and governance within the Commonwealth.

Prior to the official opening of the 58th CPA Conference, meetings of the CPA Executive Committee, the CPA Working Party, the Commonwealth Women Parliamentarians (CWP) Steering Committee and the 32nd Small Branches Conference (made up of the Commonwealth’s smallest jurisdictions) took place. A CWP meeting also took place on 12 September. The CWP was founded by women delegates in 1989 as a forum to discuss how to increase female representation in Parliament and work towards mainstreaming gender considerations in all CPA programmes and has a Steering Committee of 10 members to plan its activities. An account of this year’s CWP activities is on pages 8 to 9.
Regional meetings of CPA branches were also held at the annual conference. Branches are organised into nine regions – Africa; Asia; Australia; British Islands and Mediterranean; Canada; Caribbean; Americas and Atlantic; India; Pacific; and South-East Asia – which meet to discuss matters of regional interest. New Zealand is a member of the Pacific branch and a summary of the Pacific Regional Meeting can be found on pages 9 to 10.

Officers of the Association, the Chairperson of the CWP, and three regional representatives from each region (except Africa, which has six representatives) make up the CPA Executive Committee. The committee, which is responsible for managing the business of the CPA, meets twice a year: before the opening of the annual conference, and mid-year. Regional representatives are appointed to the Executive Committee on a rotational basis. Moana Mackey attended the meeting of the Executive Committee as a Pacific Regional Representative, along with Hon Ludwig Scotty from Nauru and Lord Fakafanua from Tonga.

The CPA Executive Committee set up a Working Group in 2010 to look at all aspects of the CPA to ensure that it continues to be vital and effective. Each region nominated a representative to the Working Group (Africa has two). Moana Mackey was nominated as Chair of the Working Group. The Working Group presented its report to the CPA at this conference. Further details of this report can be found on page 9 and pages 14 to 15.

During the conference, parliamentary officials can attend the Society of the Clerks-at-the-Table meeting, which runs in parallel with the conference. This gives parliamentary officials an opportunity to discuss issues and trends in parliamentary procedure and process across the Commonwealth.

**Delegation members**

The New Zealand delegation to the 58th CPA Conference comprised:

- Hon Annette King MP, leader of the delegation
- Kanwaljit Singh Bakshi MP
- Asenati Lole-Taylor MP
- Suze Jones, secretary to the delegation.

Moana Mackey MP also attended the conference as a representative of the Pacific Region on the CPA Executive Committee and as Chair of the CPA Working Group. Daniel Tasker attended as Acting CPA Pacific Regional Secretary.

**Participation**

The conference included plenary sessions, workshops, regional group meetings, a CWP meeting, and a meeting of the General Assembly of the Association.

Members of the New Zealand delegation attended the following events:

- CWP business meeting
- Opening Plenary: Addresses by the Secretaries-General of the Commonwealth and the CPA
- Pacific Regional Group meeting
• Workshop A: Empowering Future Generations through Access to Health and Education and Vocational Training (Host Branch topic)
• Workshop B: Should the Commonwealth Establish a Commissioner for Democracy, the Rule of Law and Human Rights?
• Workshop C: The Politics of Constitution-Making, the Role of Parliaments in Relation to the People
• Workshop D: Ensuring Adequate Parliamentary Scrutiny of Foreign and Commonwealth Affairs (Small Branches Topic)
• Workshop F: Engaging Political Parties to Improve Gender-responsive Governance (Gender-Related Topic)
• Workshop G: Terrorism – The Threat to Democracy, Peace and Security
• Workshop H: Tackling Youth Unemployment
• 49th Annual Meeting of SOCATT
• General Assembly
• Closing Plenary: The Role of Social Media in Modern-day Politics

New Zealand’s participation in workshops and other sessions is summarised later in this report.

58th CPA Conference opening ceremony

Hon Chamal Rajapaksa MO, Speaker of the Parliament of Sri Lanka and President of the CPA, read a message of good wishes from Her Majesty the Queen, followed by a welcome address looking back at Sri Lanka’s democratic tradition and forward to the conference topics with the hope they would strengthen governance and democracy in the Commonwealth and that the Commonwealth would remain vibrant and relevant in the future.

Rt Hon Sir Alan Haselhurst MP, Chairperson of the CPA Executive Committee, gave a brief address about the renewal and reintegration of the CPA. He also spoke about challenges for democracy, in particular conflict resolution and peace, referencing Sri Lanka’s recent past and the end of 30 years of conflict.

His Excellency Mahinda Rajapaksa, President of Sri Lanka and Vice-President of the CPA, opened the 58th annual conference. He spoke about the fight between democracy and terrorism in Sri Lanka, terrorism’s defeat and the process of reconciliation. Recent elections covered all Sri Lanka and included the franchise of previously displaced people. The President lent his support to the CPA’s efforts to strengthen democracy by informing and educating parliamentarians and parliamentary staff. In particular, he mentioned the use of technology to promote democracy and the importance of addressing gender and women in parliament, reminding delegates that Sri Lanka had elected the world’s first female Prime Minister. He urged delegates to look at the practical effects on the people of their countries when considering the four-year CPA strategic plan at the conference, as well as the interrelationship between peace and development.
Opening Plenary: Addresses by the Secretaries-General of the Commonwealth and Commonwealth Parliamentary Association

Dr William Shijia, CPA Secretary-General, introduced the conference’s principal theme, “Ensuring a Relevant Commonwealth for the Future”. He urged delegates to take full advantage of the opportunity to exchange their regional experience at the conference in order to help overcome problems such as human trafficking, terrorism, women’s issues, and climate change. He emphasised that the CPA should continue its gender programmes to support women’s parliamentary governance and ensure gender equality within the Commonwealth Secretariat and other partners.

The Commonwealth Secretary-General, Hon Kamalesh Sharma, spoke about the importance of the CPA in the global architecture of the Commonwealth, helping to spread the Commonwealth principles of respect for diversity and democracy. He remarked on Sri Lanka’s progress in moving beyond many years of painful and traumatic civil conflict and appreciated the steps being taken to implement the recommendations of the Lessons Learnt and Reconciliation Commission and its national action plan. He also stressed the importance of the relationship between Government and opposition parties, emphasising that this helps create a democratic framework, harmony, and development. The need to build on the richness of diversity and not have differences lead to sterile inaction was noted.

Commonwealth Women Parliamentarians

Asenati Lole-Taylor (far left) with CWP Steering Committee members and the CPA Secretary-General (right front row).

The Commonwealth Women Parliamentarians (CWP) Steering Committee met before the official start of the conference on 8 September. Asenati Lole-Taylor attended as the acting Pacific Representative on the committee and presented the Pacific Region report on CWP activities. The most pressing concern for the Pacific Region was that £7,000 allocated for regional activities had not yet been utilised. The view of the Chairperson was that this
funding had been allocated on a “use it or lose it” basis. However, Asenati Lole-Taylor successfully lobbied for £7,000 to be retained for the Pacific Region, and for a further £5,000 to be added. This funding was confirmed at a special meeting of the Pacific delegations and the Secretary-General of the CPA. The money will be used within the Pacific to further enhance women’s participation in Parliament.

On 12 September Moana Mackey and I also attended the business meeting and CWP session on the topic of “Is there such a thing as a Women’s Agenda in Parliament. If not, why not? If so, what should it be?” Issues discussed included how to increase women’s participation in leadership roles in representative democracies, the need to increase women youth participation, and how to encourage political parties to achieve a women representation figure throughout the Commonwealth of 30 percent. While New Zealand has achieved this rate, no other Pacific country has come close.

Delegates at the CWP meeting did note that one half day was manifestly too short a time to address these issues at the annual CPA Conference, and agreed that at least one full day should be set aside at future conferences.

**Pacific Regional Group meeting**

Regional group meetings were held following the official opening of the conference. The Pacific Regional Group meeting was chaired by Moana Mackey and attended by delegates and staff members from seven Pacific parliaments. In attendance were Hon Annette King, Asenati Lole-Taylor and Kanwaljit Bakshi (New Zealand), Hon Gatoloai‘ana Gidlow, Charlene Malele, Hon Tuileutu Voi, and Hon Laauli Fosi (Samoa), Hon Niki Rattle and Hon Wilki Rasmussen (Cook Islands), Hon Sir Alan Kemakeza (Solomon Islands), Hon Lord Fakafanua (Tonga), Hon Ludwig Scotty and Gabrissa Hartman (Nauru), Sir Kamuta Latasi (Tuvalu) and Hon Taomati T luta, and Eni Tekanene (Kiribati).

New Zealand provides the secretariat for the CPA Pacific Region. The meeting was facilitated by Daniel Tasker, Acting Pacific Regional Secretary.

Hon Ludwig Scotty, Speaker from Nauru, addressed the meeting, giving an update of the recent meeting in Honiara.

Moana Mackey, as Chair, gave a report on the Working Group. The African region is pushing for the CPA’s charitable status to be removed and for the organisation to obtain diplomatic status. This is legally impossible and would require the formation of a new organisation. No funds from the CPA could be transferred to any new body. All attempts to reach a compromise on an audit of the organisation have been unsuccessful. The Secretary-General requested a new vote on the already compromised Recommendation 12 of the Working Group Report – That the CPA would seek external advice on whether current auditing standards are sufficient. This recommendation was removed from the report, which is very disappointing indeed.

Asenati Lole-Taylor reported on the CWP Steering Committee meeting, informing the group that the Pacific Region would retain the £7,000 due to expire, and must decide what to spend it on in the next three to six months.

The Chair gave a report on the Executive Committee meeting. Tension between the Chairperson of the Executive Committee and the Secretary-General seems to be resulting in the obstruction of any proposals stemming from the Chairperson. The amount of money to be spent on work and development programmes has gone down for the second
consecutive year. It was noted that there are two more years to pass under the current Chair and Secretary-General and that some hard questions need to be asked around finances and transparency.

Lord Fakafanua, Speaker from Tonga, commented specifically on the Finance Subcommittee meeting. The Secretary-General was asked for an explanation of his recent visa renewal. This cost upwards of £12,000 and a satisfactory explanation is yet to be forthcoming.

Lord Fakafanua also elaborated on the £6,000 reimbursement being sought by the CPA Secretariat for the Secretary-General’s accommodation in Tonga this year. It has emerged that the Secretariat itself insisted upon a change to a more expensive room upon arrival in Tonga, and that the Tongan Parliament was not informed or consulted of this. Tonga has been forced to pay the money back in instalments. It was resolved that this unsatisfactory situation be raised in a formal letter to the Secretariat and a request made to exempt Tonga from any further payment and to reimburse funds already paid.

Sir Kamuta Latasi, the Speaker from Tuvalu, relayed issues leading up to the annual conference and at time of arrival. Other delegates experienced similar issues – trouble with visas, incorrect registration information, unrealistic and unwarranted demands for cash upon arrival. The Chair noted that similar problems were experienced by Pacific delegations last year, and some branches were told they could not attend due to late payment of subscriptions. However, other countries were able to attend by paying subscriptions on arrival. This is a clear breach of CPA rules regarding subscriptions and attendance at the annual conference. The same situation occurred again in 2012, with the Executive Committee granting exemption to two African countries to attend, but not allowing Bougainville and Papua New Guinea because of late payment of subscriptions. It was resolved that the Acting Regional Secretary arrange a meeting with the Secretary-General to discuss issues of marginalisation and mistreatment arising at the annual conference around fees and registration. The group wished also to request CPA flexibility in applying the 90-day exclusion rule for fees, to be notified well in advance of the annual conference of any additional costs required, and for an explanation of the observer fee and what it is used for.

Pacific Regional branches meeting with Secretary-General

A meeting between six Pacific Regional branches and the Secretary-General was held on 12 September 2012. The above issues were raised and the Secretary-General expressed his sadness that this had occurred in 2012. He indicated that he would welcome a formal communication that he could then respond to in writing. The Secretary-General went on to say that mistreatment was a heavy allegation, but that ultimately he was responsible for the actions of the CPA. He did not understand why money was demanded upon arrival, and said that he intended to follow up with the host branch and respond to the delegation before their departure from Sri Lanka.

The Secretary-General expressed disappointment that the Pacific feels like a second class region within the CPA. In light of this, the Secretary-General intends to establish a unit within the Secretariat specifically dedicated to the Pacific and to resolving issues past, present, and future. He asked Luseane Kupu-Chesham, from the CPA Secretariat, to set up a special file for the Pacific, and for any correspondence to be brought to his immediate attention. The Secretary-General indicated that he will be travelling to the Cook Islands in
November for the CPA Australia New Zealand Regional Conference and would welcome opportunities to visit other islands while in the region.

The Secretary-General confirmed the decision of the CWP Steering Committee that the Pacific Region would retain the £7,000 due to expire and that a further £5,000 would be added to aid representation of women in parliaments in the region.

The meeting ended with the Pacific delegates stressing that they did not hold the Sri Lankan hosts responsible for any mistreatment and found them to be very good hosts. They thanked the Secretary-General for his time and consideration.

Workshop sessions

On 12 September eight workshops were held, giving members a chance to discuss a variety of issues. Each two-and-a-half-hour workshop was addressed by up to four presenters, and had a chairperson. The presentations were followed by contributions from the floor during moderated interactive discussions.


This was the host branch topic. The chairperson and three discussion leaders were from Sri Lanka. Quality of life comparisons were made between countries expressed by life expectancy, infant mortality, literacy, and maternal mortality. The presentations focused on Sri Lanka’s remarkable life quality results achieved despite very low levels of income. Massive state intervention in food distribution and delivery of health care, started in the Second World War and continued thereafter, coupled with universal free education for all up to university level, including books and uniforms, were the key reasons for Sri Lanka’s success. The discussions that followed mainly focused on the exchange of regional
experiences on progresses and challenges on the health, education and vocational training systems.

**Workshop B: Should the Commonwealth Establish a Commissioner for Democracy, the Rule of Law and Human Rights?**

The session was chaired by an MP from Swaziland and the discussion leaders came from Pakistan and the United Kingdom. The speaker from the United Kingdom was strongly in support of establishing a Human Rights Commission within the CPA to ensure human rights, democracy, and the rule of law. He noted that many countries of the Commonwealth do have human rights enshrined in their constitution, and that while many recommendations have been made to appoint a Human Rights Commissioner for the Commonwealth, it has still not been implemented.

An MP from Sri Lanka made a powerful speech, quoting the report of the Eminent Persons Group commissioned in 2009 by the Commonwealth Heads of Government Meeting and tying it neatly to the conference theme of ensuring a relevant Commonwealth for the future: “today, while member state governments carry out appalling human rights abuses, many see a Commonwealth apparently standing blithely by. Without a commitment to see these principles upheld, Commonwealth membership is devalued. A values and principles-based association that does not consistently strive to defend its ideals, and to be defined by them risks appearing to be little more than an imperial relic.”

Some delegates opposed the establishment of a Commissioner, insisting that other organisations in the world, such as the United Nations, already ensure those values for member countries and that setting up a new Human Rights Commissioner for the Commonwealth could cause confusion among those organisations. Other members supported the establishment of a Commission with several members, rather than a single Commissioner.

**Workshop C: The Politics of Constitution-Making, the Role of Parliaments in Relation to the People**

Discussion leaders for this topic included a Nigerian and a Zambian MP. There was a general acceptance during this workshop that Sri Lanka’s parliament is a reflection of its people’s will. According to a Nigerian MP a constitution is the basic and most fundamental law of a nation state. He stated that while the drafting and shepherding of the adoption of a new constitution represents the culmination of a country’s efforts at meaningful transition to democracy, the amendment of an existing one also naturally flows from efforts to deepen democracy. A democratic constitution can no longer be restricted to establishing democratic governance. Rather the effectiveness of a modern constitution depends upon democracy in its process as well as its outcomes. Ownership of constitutional responsibilities is vital to the Commonwealth’s future. There was a general consensus that constitution-making would empower the political arena through inclusivity, participation, diversity, autonomy, transparency, accountability, and legitimacy. Inexperience and poor administration of procedures were raised as contributing factors to negative constitution-making.

**Workshop D: Ensuring Adequate Parliamentary Scrutiny of Foreign and Commonwealth Affairs**

This workshop was chaired by a delegate from New Brunswick (Canada). The other discussion leaders came from Australia, Jersey, Canada, and Jamaica. The majority of
delegates agreed that foreign policy in their country rests either with the executive or with bureaucrats while the role of backbenchers is to ratify all decisions. Delegates also agreed that there is need and scope for all backbenchers to support each other and build on their networks so that in times of difficulty they can co-operate and help each other.

Speakers provided detailed insights into how foreign policy making takes place in their parliamentary system. For instance the Australian discussion leader stated that their robust select committee process for policy making ensures that most policies and programmes are implemented after intense scrutiny and with extreme care. He stated that the Foreign Minister must attend the select committee twice a year in order to share with his parliamentary colleagues Australia’s foreign policy trajectory. He also said that once a year most high commissioners and diplomats present in Australia are invited to attend a select committee meeting in order to understand their respective country’s stand towards Australia and foreign policy in general.

Kanwaljit Singh Bakshi stated that policy making in New Zealand takes place after following a rigorous process of planning and consultation. Consultation is not only between members of Parliament but general members of the public are provided with a full opportunity to submit their inputs to the select committee.

**Workshop E: The Role of Parliamentarians in Conflict Resolution and Peace-building**

No members of the New Zealand delegation were able to attend this workshop.

**Workshop F: Engaging Political Parties to Improve Gender-responsive Governance**

Discussion was led by an Australian MP. The presentation covered the Australian Labor Party’s implementation of affirmative action to increase the number of women candidates selected in winnable or safe seats. She also described the Australian Government’s new 10-year initiative to improve gender equality in the Pacific Region, which includes mentoring and training for women candidates and parliamentarians. The speaker pointed out that gender equality in parliaments is not just to do with fairness. Evidence had shown that every 1% increase in female parliamentary representation raises economic growth by 0.16%.

Support for the CPA directing more attention to the issue of mentoring and supporting underrepresented groups in Commonwealth parliaments was heard. Political parties supporting women’s economic development and mainstreaming gender issues such as childcare and pay parity was also raised.

**Workshop G: Terrorism – The Threat to Democracy, Peace and Security**

Discussion leaders were from Singapore, Uganda, and India. All delegates condemned any form of violence anywhere. Everyone stood in unanimity that use of the bullet is not the solution to any of the complex problems that we face at various levels in the contemporary world. Rather the solution unsurprisingly lies in the ballot. Democracy leads to participation of all individuals, groups, and communities that are part of a nation state, with the ballot empowering each of these individuals.

The New Zealand delegation was particularly moved by words from our Pakistani colleague, who said that there is no country better than Pakistan and its people who understand, and can thereby explain, how important it is to keep peace and stability. He said that Pakistan as a country had suffered gigantic costs not just monetarily but the lack of peace and stability in the country has left it directionless.
Another colleague from Cameroon shared his experience saying that at times certain individuals or groups are categorised as terrorists when they protest against certain policies or programmes. However, it is not surprising that some individuals and groups are considered freedom fighters once war over disagreements in opinion has ended. Many of these terrorists/freedom fighters are now serving as Ministers and members of Parliament in many African parliaments.

Workshop H: Tackling Youth Unemployment

Discussion leaders were from Trinidad and Tobago and the United Kingdom. Presentations focused on issues faced by delegates’ countries. Youth unemployment is an issue throughout the Commonwealth, often at much higher levels than already worrying general high unemployment. Research has highlighted that in South Africa, youth are achieving high academic standards, but are struggling to find employment once qualified. No easy solution presented itself, with delegates agreeing that employment depends on local economic development, which currently is struggling everywhere with the global economic crisis.

Society of Clerks-at-the-Table meeting

Society of Clerks-at-the-Table (SOCATT) in Commonwealth Parliaments was founded in 1932 by Owen Clough, a former Clerk of the Senate of South Africa. SOCATT exists to make the parliamentary practice of various Legislative Chambers of the Commonwealth more accessible to Clerks-at-the-Table, or those with similar duties; and to foster among Officers of Parliament a mutual interest in their duties, rights, and privileges. The SOCATT meeting provides a useful opportunity for the Office of the Clerk to meet with procedural staff from other parliaments with a shared heritage. Suze Jones attended this meeting.

On 12 September, the 49th general meeting started with a presentation on parliamentary developments and topical issues in Sri Lanka. A series of presentations on parliamentary privilege, procedure and practice, and on parliamentary administration and management followed. These presentations were followed by break-out groups to discuss in more detail majority and minority governments, coalitions and procedures, standards, freedom of speech and privilege, and changing administrative methods, information management and outreach.

On 14 September, a profile and work study of the Secretary-General (Clerk) of the Rajya Sabha (the Upper House of the Parliament of India) was presented, followed by a presentation from a representative of the World Bank Institute Parliamentary Programme on capacity building for parliaments by e-learning. Finally, there was a short presentation on the periodical of the society (The Table) and the society’s accounts for 2011. Regional presentations from all CPA regions were also given throughout both days of the meeting.

General Assembly

At 9 am on 14 September the general assembly was held. Unfortunately all of the papers for the General Assembly were only delivered to delegates very late the previous evening. A resolution was agreed that, in future, papers for the General Assembly should be delivered no later than the second day after the opening of the CPA conference.

Reports from the Chairperson, the Treasurer, the Executive Committee, the Small Branches Conference, and the CWP meeting were presented. I insisted upon a correction to the CWP report which had incorrectly stated that the £7,000 due to expire for the
Pacific Region was to be “carried over”. This would be quite contrary to the accounting practices of the CPA. In fact, the money had been agreed to be reallocated. I also stressed that new funding of £100,000 was to be allocated to the CWP and that this should be noted in the report. Both of these points were accepted by the Secretary-General and met with the approval of the General Assembly.

Moana Mackey, as Chairperson, presented the Working Group report, the recommendations having already been accepted by the Executive Committee. She acknowledged the efforts of the Working Group, and the struggle they had to find consensus on the key issue of the status of the CPA, and the search for a compromise that would be non-charitable and non-diplomatic. A great deal of work still needs to be done, but hopefully the CPA will be able to move forward from this highly divisive issue now. She also mentioned how hard it is to review our own organisation from the inside and the need to compare ourselves with like organisations in order to be as efficient and effective as we can. The need for an outside person to review the organisation is clear.

A motion to appoint a non-financial external auditor and appoint an ad hoc committee of review to implement modern accountability procedures for the CPA was circulated at the meeting by the Australian delegation, which the New Zealand delegation whole-heartedly supported. Disappointingly, this was withdrawn at the last minute and not put to the vote.

**Closing Plenary: The Role of Social Media in Modern-day Politics**

Presentations were made by delegates from Sri Lanka, Canada, and the United Kingdom. The presenter from Canada spoke about members’ celebrity status that they can leverage off to connect with voters, and also use to successfully solicit campaign funds and mobilise voters. Social media also offers some challenges such as greater expectations of transparency and accountability, the need to keep social media up to date, and for activity to be very frequent. He stressed that politicians should create a brand and stick with this, and note that websites are a permanent record.

The speaker from the United Kingdom spoke mainly about the need to maximise access to the relevant technology, noting that a huge disparity of access to social media exists across the globe, reflecting social exclusion and the marginalisation of the poorest global citizens. While social media has changed the political landscape forever, this is not necessarily in the best interests of democracy when some governments can use social media as a means to control public discourse and to censure citizens.

Discussion centred around the implications of using social media while in the House in terms of parliamentary privilege, noting that there is no application of parliamentary privilege when using social media. The use of social media as a way to increase engagement for the illiterate was also touched on, by using images and word files, for example.

**Other meetings held in Sri Lanka: Dilmah, Fonterra, Honorary Consul**

While in Colombo, the delegation visited the Dilmah tea factory and the Fonterra factory, and had a breakfast meeting with New Zealand’s Honorary Consul in Colombo.

At Dilmah, the delegation met with Malik Fernando, Director, and son of the founder of Dilmah, and with Himendra Ranaweera, Deputy Chairman and Chief Executive. The delegation was warmly welcomed and shown around the Dilmah factory. Mr. Fernando told us that Dilmah was the number one tea brand in New Zealand. The comprehensive tour took in the loading bays, where tea arrives, the factory floor where tea is blended and
packed, and the latest innovation in tea marketing at Dilmah: the Tea Bar, where tea is
brewed for tasting and mixed for cocktails. The delegation had an instruction in tea quality
and a tea tasting opportunity followed by a chance to discuss issues of mutual interest.
Wide-ranging discussions centred on Sri Lanka’s relationship with New Zealand and
continued over lunch.

Fonterra Managing Director, Achyut Kasireddy, and Human Resources and Corporate
Relations Director Roshan Kulasuriya led the group who welcomed our delegation to the
Fonterra factory in Colombo. We were taken on a comprehensive tour of the facility which
manufactures primarily milk powder, yoghurt and flavoured milk. We learnt that Fonterra
Sri Lanka sources its milk powder from New Zealand, but is expanding the fresh milk
output from its network of local dairy farmers (most of whom own between one and five
cows) with a mixture of training and sharing of agricultural solutions. Profits from Fonterra
Sri Lanka return to New Zealand. Fonterra was keen to let us know that they would
welcome a closer relationship with the New Zealand Government to be able to facilitate
more trade between the two countries.

We were pleased to find time to meet with Mr S Senaka W Silva, New Zealand’s Honorary
Consul in Sri Lanka, for a breakfast meeting. Our conversation confirmed our view that the
relationship between New Zealand and Sri Lanka is strong, and it will be to the advantage
of both our countries to build upon this.

The delegation appreciated the opportunity to visit these factories, and meet with the
Honorary Consul, and wishes to note the hospitality shown to us. We also appreciated the
exchange of views on a wide variety of issues.

From left: Kanwaljit Singh Bakshi, Hon Annette King, and Aсенati Lole-Taylor at the Dilmah factory.
Conclusion

The CPA Conference is an excellent place to meet and learn from fellow colleagues from different parts of the world on how different processes and policies are developed and implemented in their nation state. This conference’s host country, Sri Lanka, has recently come out of a brutal civil war that resulted in the loss of a countless number of innocent lives, destruction of private and public property and large scale instability to its citizens.

The on-going issues with transparency and accountability at the CPA headquarters do not appear to have improved. In particular, it is very disappointing that the recommendation to appoint an external auditor was removed from the Working Group’s report. Moana Mackey worked hard chairing this group and it is a shame that there was no support from other jurisdictions to press this issue at this time.

New Zealand has a responsibility to support and encourage democratic parliamentary systems throughout the Commonwealth through the exchange of ideas and information, and conferences like this provide a valuable opportunity to continue to do this. The New Zealand delegation did find participation at the conference overall to be informative and useful.

Hon Annette King
Delegation Leader
Appendix 1

58th CPA Conference Programme

Friday, 7 September 2012
ALL DAY Arrival of CPA Working Group, CWP Steering Committee and Co-ordinating Committee Members
1900–2100 Dinner for members of the CPA Working Group, CWP Steering Committee and Co-ordinating Committee

Saturday, 8 September 2012
ALL DAY Arrival of Executive Committee and Small Branches Conference participants
0930–1630 Meeting of CWP Steering Committee
0930–1630 Meeting of CPA Working Group
1700–1800 Meeting of Co-ordinating Committee
1845–2215 CWP Dinner

Sunday, 9 September 2012
ALL DAY Meeting of Executive Committee and Small Branches Conference
1930–2130 Dinners for Executive Committee, CWP Steering Committee and Small Branches Conference delegates

Monday, 10 September 2012
ALL DAY Arrival of remaining delegates, observers, secretaries, accompanying persons and SOCATT participants
0930–1700 Meeting of the Executive Committee
0900–1700 Small Branches Conference
1900–2200 Cultural Show and Official Opening Dinner for all delegates

Tuesday, 11 September 2012
0700–0800 Breakfast Meeting of Regional Secretaries
0930–1030 Official Opening of the 58th Commonwealth Parliamentary Conference
1130–1300 Briefing for delegates, observers and secretaries followed by briefing for workshop moderators, discussion leaders, rapporteurs and session secretaries
1345–1530 Regional Group Meetings
1530–1700 Opening Plenary: Addresses by the Secretaries-General of the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association and Commonwealth followed by Question and Answer Session
1900–1930 Reception for clerks, secretaries to delegations and their spouses/partners
1930–2230 Dinner for clerks, secretaries to delegations and their spouses/partners
1930–2230 Dinner delegates, observers, accompanying persons their spouses/partners

**Wednesday, 12 September 2012**

0800–1045 Business Meeting of CWP and CWP Session: “Is there such a thing as a women’s agenda in Parliament? If not, why not? If so, what should it be?”

1100–1330 Workshops A – D

A – Empowering future generations through access to health, education, and vocational training

B – Should the Commonwealth establish a Commissioner for Democracy, the Rule of Law and Human Rights?

C – The politics of constitution-making, the role of parliaments in relation to the people

D – Ensuring adequate parliamentary scrutiny of foreign and Commonwealth affairs

1430–1700 Workshops E – H

E – The role of parliamentarians in conflict resolution and peace-building

F – Engaging political parties to improve gender-responsive governance

G – Terrorism – the threat to democracy, peace and security

H – Tackling youth unemployment

0930–17000 49th Annual Meeting of SOCATT

1900–2100 Dinner for leaders of delegations, Executive Committee members and spouses/partners

1900–2100 Dinner for all other delegates, observers, secretaries, accompanying persons, Society of Clerks-at-The-Table participants and spouses/partners

**Thursday, 13 September 2012**

ALL DAY Conference excursions

**Friday, 14 September 2012**

0900–1100 General Assembly and receiving of plaques

1100–1300 Final Plenary “The role of social media in modern-day politics”

1400–1500 Closing ceremony

1400–1700 49th Annual Meeting of SOCATT

1630–1700 Meeting of the new Executive Committee
1930–21300 Farewell dinner

Saturday, 15 September 2012

ALL DAY Departure of delegates
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Delegation media statements

7 September 2012

NZ MPs join parliamentarians to ensure a relevant Commonwealth for the future

A New Zealand parliamentary delegation will join over 600 MPs from across the Commonwealth for the 58th Commonwealth Parliamentary Association (CPA) conference, being hosted by the Sri Lankan Parliament in Colombo from 10 to 15 September 2010.

Under the conference theme of “Ensuring a relevant Commonwealth for the future” participants will explore topics such as whether the Commonwealth should establish a Commissioner for democracy, the rule of law and human rights, tackling youth unemployment and ensuring adequate parliamentary scrutiny of Foreign and Commonwealth Affairs.

Hon Annette King MP, will lead the delegation which includes Kanwaljit Singh Bakshi MP, and Le'aufa'amulia Asenati Lole-Taylor MP. Moana Mackey MP, will also attend, representing the Pacific region on the Executive Committee of the CPA.

Le'aufa'amulia Asenati Lole-Taylor will represent the Pacific region at a Steering Committee Meeting for the Commonwealth Women Parliamentarians (CWP) and will be joined by Hon Annette King and Moana Mackey at a general meeting of the CWP.

The Speaker, Dr The Rt Hon Lockwood Smith, said the CPA conference was an opportunity for New Zealand parliamentarians to strengthen relationships with their peers throughout the Commonwealth.

“The CPA is a network of parliamentarians representing 30 per cent of the world’s population who share a commitment to strengthening the institution of Parliament.

“New Zealand has a strong voice among Commonwealth Parliaments and has been closely involved in assisting smaller and emerging parliaments become accountable and more effective,” he said.
14 September 2012

**New Zealand parliamentarians support women’s agenda at Commonwealth Parliamentary Conference**

The New Zealand delegation at the 58th Commonwealth Parliamentary Conference has met with commonwealth colleagues over the past several days to address the need for increased women in leadership roles in parliaments throughout the commonwealth.

Delegation member Asenati Lole-Taylor attended the Commonwealth Women Parliamentarians (CWP) Steering Committee and successfully lobbied for £7,000 to be retained for the Pacific region, and for a further £5,000 to be added. This funding was confirmed at a special meeting of the New Zealand delegation and the Secretary-General of the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association. The money will be used within the Pacific to further enhance women’s participation in Parliament.

Hon Annette King said, “New Zealand would like to work with the Pacific to ensure that assistance through the programmes is delivered.”

The CWP was founded by women delegates in 1989 as a forum to discuss how to increase female representation in Parliament and work towards mainstreaming gender considerations in all Commonwealth Parliamentary Association programmes and has a Steering Committee of 10 members to plan its activities.

At its meetings this week, the CWP has addressed the issue of how to increase women’s participation in leadership roles in representative democracies, the need to increase women youth participation and how to encourage political parties to achieve a women representation figure throughout the commonwealth of 30%. While New Zealand has achieved this rate, no other Pacific country has.

The delegation, led by Hon Annette King, is in Sri Lanka until 16 September for the conference with the theme of “Ensuring a relevant Commonwealth for the future”. Kanwaljit Singh Bakshi and Moana Mackey are also part of the New Zealand delegation at the conference.
Meeting of the Commonwealth Speakers and Presiding Officers Conference Standing Committee, Namibia 11–12 January 2013

Dr The Rt Hon Lockwood Smith
Speaker
Fiftieth Parliament

Presented to the House of Representatives
Meeting of the Commonwealth Speakers and Presiding Officers Conference Standing Committee, Namibia 11–12 January 2013

Background

The 2012/13 inter-parliamentary relations programme provided for the New Zealand Parliament to attend the meeting of the Commonwealth Speakers and Presiding Officers Conference Standing Committee in Namibia from 11 to 12 January 2013. New Zealand will host the 22nd Conference of Commonwealth Speakers and Presiding Officers (CSPOC) in January 2014 and as host of the Conference assumed the chair of the Standing Committee following the 21st Conference in Trinidad and Tobago in January 2012.

The Conference is held every two years, usually in January. In alternate years, the Standing Committee meets to confirm the programme and agenda topics for the next conference. Speakers of the House of Representatives have regularly attended these conferences because of the unique professional development opportunity they offer. Speakers from most Commonwealth countries are present, providing the opportunity for wide ranging discussion and exchange of many different views on the role and responsibilities of presiding officers and the issues that confront parliaments.

Introduction

The 2013 meeting of the Standing Committee was hosted by the Namibian Parliament and was held in Swakopmund. I attended as the Standing Committee Chairman and was accompanied by the Clerk of the House of Representatives, Mary Harris.

A copy of the Standing Committee meeting programme is attached as Appendix A. Appendix B lists the Membership of the Standing Committee.

Meeting of the Standing Committee

Members of the Standing Committee were welcomed by Hon Dr Theo-Ben Gurirab, Speaker of the Namibian National Assembly. He spoke of the challenges Namibia had faced to reach independence in 1990, first at the hands of German colonists, who arrived in the 1880s, and then the South Africans, who in 1915 defeated the German troops in what was then South West Africa. He also drew attention to other challenges facing Commonwealth countries and their elected representatives, in particular the place of women in developing countries.

Speaker Gurirab presented me with a copy of the book, *The Kaiser’s Holocaust: Germany’s Forgotten Genocide and the Colonial Roots of Nazism*, by David Olusoga and Casper Erichsen, which draws parallels between the Nazi era and German tactics in Africa and details the unspoken racial genocide in Namibia from 1904 to 1908. He noted that his home area of Swakopmund, where the meeting was being held, was an area where there had been German prison camps and to this day there remained no monuments to the many Namibians who died there.

The Standing Committee then got down to the business of its meeting:
To address any outstanding issues from the 21st Conference in 2012

To agree the programme for the 22nd Conference in 2014

To agree the Conference agenda and workshop topics

To consider venues for future meetings of the Standing Committee and Conferences.

Conference programme

Prior to the meeting we prepared and circulated to the Standing Committee members a proposed programme for the 22nd Conference in 2014 and a list of topics for the workshops and a special plenary session. Our proposal is set out as Appendix C. The aim is to give the Conference a strong working and professional development focus for Speakers and presiding officers. The proposal formed the basis of the Standing Committee’s discussion.

Issues raised from the 21st Conference were as follows:

Conference programme

The changes from earlier conference programmes made for the 2012 conference were discussed. The change to include four workshops organised so that delegates could choose to attend any two of the workshops was strongly endorsed, as was the decision to have a special plenary session. Both these changes were incorporated into our proposed programme.

Chairing style

A style that achieved active discussion of the issues rather than statements of country position was strongly endorsed. It was the style of chairing that I brought to the special plenary session in Trinidad and Tobago, selecting a small number of pertinent issues from the lead Speaker’s presentation and encouraging comment and active discussion of these through the use of a roving microphone. The Standing Committee acknowledged that delegates for whom English is their second language do face difficulties and that for this reason some prepared statements are inevitable.

Role of the media

Changes to allow the media to be present at the opening plenary and the plenary where report back is received from the workshops were endorsed, as was the holding of a press conference at the conclusion of the Conference, led by the Conference chairperson, who gave a prepared statement and then answered questions. It was agreed that, to encourage free and frank discussion, the workshops should remain closed, as should the special plenary session.

Transcription and summary reports from the workshops

It was agreed that a verbatim transcript of the plenary sessions and the workshops should be made available to delegates by being published on the CSPOC website as soon as possible after each session.

The summary reports of the workshops should be short, focusing on the main points raised by the workshop presenters and raised in discussion at the workshops. Their purpose is to inform discussion in the plenary, not to record every issue a delegate may raise. They should be prepared as quickly as possible after the workshop and discussed with the workshop chairperson before they are presented.
Biography books

The printing of biography books was strongly supported by the Standing Committee. We were encouraged to make it clear the sort of material that should be included in biographies and that they should be short. We were also encouraged to set a deadline for the submission of biography information and delegates’ photographs at the time of Conference registration so that the biography book can be printed for the commencement of the Conference. Late entries would be included only on the CSPOC website.

Speakers’ procession

The Standing Committee agreed that Speakers should proceed into the opening session of the Conference in full regalia and at this time sit together in the Conference venue.

Workshop topics

In considering the topics for the workshops and special plenary, we developed a theme: Parliament’s powers and privileges and openness and transparency. This is a theme particularly relevant to 2013 when our Privileges Committee is considering the implications of a Supreme Court judgment that on the face of it seems to limit the extent of parliamentary privilege, the Law Commission has recommended that the Official Information Act 1982 be applied to aspects of parliamentary administration, and the House’s power of exclusive control of its operations is also under question.

These are important issues for Speakers and presiding officers to come to terms with, given their responsibility for parliamentary administration and concern for the future independence of the institution of Parliament. In developing the theme, we felt that there were issues where keynote speakers, who were not necessarily presiding officers, could provide a valuable starting point for further discussion.

Therefore, our proposal includes time for keynote speakers on each workshop topic to deliver their contribution in a plenary session open to the media. This way all delegates will have the benefit of well-informed comment on the critical issues that currently face Speakers and presiding officers before they go into the workshops, and the media will also have the opportunity to hear the issues.

One particular concern to us was to make the Conference relevant for my colleagues from other Pacific parliaments. We, therefore, suggested the topic: Small parliaments – big challenges. We believe that a Speaker from a Pacific parliament could be a keynote speaker for their topic and develop issues that are particularly relevant to my colleagues in the Pacific.

The topics we proposed were as follows:

- Reconnecting parliament with the people
- Openness and transparency
- Parliamentary privilege
- Small parliaments – big challenges
- Accountability of members of parliament (special plenary topic).

The topics were adopted by the meeting with some minor adjustments to include in Small parliaments – big challenges, an issue raised by the Lok Sabha (the House of the People of
the Indian Parliament) – the role of presiding officers in promoting gender sensitive parliaments.

Gender equity is a particular issue for Pacific parliaments and it is, therefore, relevant to discuss the role a Speaker might take in this context. The role of privileges committees was also raised and included under the Parliamentary privilege topic. Two additional topics raised were set down for consideration at future conferences.

Some concern was expressed about keynote speakers from outside parliament. While this could be an issue, should keynote speakers not be members of parliament, we believe proper briefing about the topic and the purpose of the Conference will undoubtedly overcome any such concerns.

Our proposal to consider further the special plenary topic from the 21st Conference as a workshop topic at the 22nd Conference was endorsed. There was strong support for our proposed special plenary session topic. The role of party whips was added to this as members of the Standing Committee were concerned to address the emerging issues of parliamentary accountability to the people in parliaments where one party dominates the Chamber and members are elected from national party lists, rather than as electorate representatives. Party whips have a particular role to play in ensuring loyalty to a party’s position; how accountability to the electorate unfolds in this context was a matter of particular interest.

A list of the agreed substantive topics for the 2014 Conference of Speakers and presiding officers’ workshops and special plenary session is attached as Appendix D. It was agreed that the final plenary, to confirm the next and subsequent Conferences and Standing Committee venues and deal with any other matters raised at the Standing Committee meeting, be held following the special plenary session on the final morning of the Conference.

Wider benefits of conferences of Speakers and presiding officers

The Conference is also an opportunity to showcase New Zealand to an influential group of politicians. Speakers and presiding officers from 55 fully sovereign national parliaments will be invited along with 12 almost fully sovereign parliaments. Given New Zealand’s expressed intention to seek a seat on the United Nations Security Council in 2015–2016, the Conference provides an opportunity to demonstrate to the world the strength of New Zealand’s system of representative parliamentary democracy and the contribution New Zealand can make in promoting democracy worldwide.

Speakers play an important role in international diplomacy. They can be pivotal in promoting international cooperation and democratic values. They can advance people-to-people contacts and encourage a consensual approach to resolving contentious issues. They maintain an extensive international network, putting forward the stance of their countries in international fora. Their views represent a variety of political perspectives and can add value through reflecting divergent views and bringing flexibility to the solution of often insurmountable problems. Inter-parliamentary organisations and the critical role Speakers play in them can bring parliamentarians together. Their merit lies in their capacity to generate goodwill – surpassing the divisions of development, regional disparities, or ethnic or cultural differences. They often prove to be the precursors of formal agreements.

For these reasons, the hosting of the 2014 Conference by the New Zealand Parliament is not only important to developing Speakers in their roles, but also potentially to New Zealand’s national interests.
Such conferences are funded from the Vote Office of the Clerk inter-parliamentary relations output, the prime purpose of which is to support the inter-parliamentary relations programme. Despite conference delegates being responsible for their own travel and accommodation costs, the host country’s costs of running such a conference are not insubstantial. Venue costs will be kept to a minimum by our hosting the Conference opening, plenary sessions and workshops at Parliament House. However, if the Conference is to really showcase New Zealand, some additional one-off funding will be required in Vote Office of the Clerk.

**Hosting of future conferences**

The Standing Committee acknowledged that Malaysia has offered to host the 23rd Conference in 2016. The Standing Committee will meet in Jersey in 2015 to plan that Conference. The Standing Committee was informed that the Isle of Man has indicated that it is interested in hosting the 24th Conference in 2018. This is the first time a non-fully sovereign parliament has offered to host the Conference as opposed to a Standing Committee meeting. Adoption of this proposal will be considered further at the 2014 Conference.

**Conclusion**

I extend my appreciation to the host of the 2013 Standing Committee meeting, Hon Dr Theo-Ben Gurirab, Speaker of the Namibian National Assembly. The hospitality and entertainment we received made our visit a memorable one. It was an honour to work with a leader of a liberation movement and former prime minister of an emerging nation on the African continent, and seasoned diplomat who served as President of the 54th Session of the United Nations General Assembly.

I commend the hosting of the 22nd Conference of Commonwealth Speakers and Presiding Officers in New Zealand in 2014 to the House.
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DRAFT PROGRAMME
MEETING OF THE STANDING COMMITTEE OF THE CONFERENCE
OF SPEAKERS AND PRESIDING OFFICERS OF THE
COMMONWEALTH
10-13 JANUARY 2013

10 January, Thursday

All day     Arrival of the Delegates at Walvis Bay International
           Airport and transfers to the hotels in Swakopmund
           (+40km)

           Free programme

11 January, Friday

07:00      Breakfast

08:15      Departure to the Swakopmund Hotel and
           Entertainment Centre

08:30      Official Opening of the Meeting

09:00      Group Photo

09:15      Meeting of the Standing Committee

10:30      Coffee Break

10:50      Meeting of the Standing Committee (continuation)

13:00      Lunch at the Conference venue

14h00-15h30 Preparation of final documents by the Clerks and
            Secretaries General present
14:15  Departure for a visit to the Crystal Gallery (Speakers and Presiding Officers only)
15:30  Departure to the Conference Centre
15:45  Coffee Break
16:00  Meeting of the Standing Committee
17:00  End of the Meeting
17:10  Departure to the Sea Side Hotel
18:45  Departure to the venue of the dinner
19:00  Dinner hosted by the Honourable Speaker of the National Assembly of Namibia
21:45  Depart for hotels

12 January, Saturday

07:00  Breakfast
08:00  Depart hotels for the Walvis Bay Yacht Club
09:00  All Participants go on the Dolphin Cruise
       Refreshments and Lunch will be served
15:00  Return to hotels
18:45  Departure to the venue of the dinner
19:00  Dinner hosted by the Honourable Speaker of the National Assembly of Namibia
21:45  Depart for hotels

13 January, Sunday

All Day  Departure of the Delegates for the Airport
CONFERENCE OF COMMONWEALTH SPEAKERS & PRESIDING OFFICERS
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HON. HENRY F. CHIMUNTHU BANDA, SPEAKER OF THE PARLIAMENT OF MALAWI

HON. CAVAYE YEGUIE DJIBRIL, SPEAKER OF THE NATIONAL ASSEMBLY OF CAMEROON

ASIA – 1 REPRESENTATIVE
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Commonwealth Speakers and Presiding Officers Conference

Standing Committee Members

22nd Conference of Commonwealth Speakers and Presiding Officers (CSPOC), Wellington, New Zealand, 21–25 January 2014

Introduction

The New Zealand Parliament is honoured to be able to host the 22nd Conference of Commonwealth Speakers and Presiding Officers (CSPOC). It is proposed that it take place from 21 to 25 January 2014 at Parliament House in Wellington, New Zealand. This paper sets out a proposed programme and conference agenda for consideration by the Standing Committee.

Attendees

Speakers and presiding officers from 55 fully sovereign national parliaments, consisting of 19 bicameral parliaments and 36 unicameral parliaments, will be invited to attend CSPOC along with their respective Clerks and secretaries-general, as observers.
It is a long-standing CSPOC practice to invite “Additional Participants”, namely those Speakers of almost fully sovereign parliaments (see Appendix A). The New Zealand Parliament will invite Speakers and presiding officers from these countries to attend the 22nd CSPOC.

Given the close proximity of the Pacific parliaments, it is hoped that as many Speakers from these parliaments as possible will also attend the 2014 conference.

Proposed programme

The New Zealand Parliament suggests the following programme for the 22nd CSPOC:

Day 1 Tuesday, 21 January
Arrivals
Meeting of the Standing Committee in the evening followed by dinner for Standing Committee members

Day 2 Wednesday, 22 January
Opening ceremony
Opening plenary and workshops
Regional meetings

Day 3 Thursday, 23 January
Plenary and workshops
Plenary session reports on workshops and closing plenary
Closing dinner

Day 4  Friday, 24 January
Special plenary session
Half-day cultural activity

Day 5  Saturday, 25 January
Departures

A proposed conference agenda is outlined in Appendix B. It includes key-note
speakers, who would bring particular expertise or perspective to the topic and would
not necessarily be presiding officers. It is suggested that the topics addressed by the
key-note speakers become the topics for the workshops, each led by a presiding
officer and a panel of two speakers who might give short papers aimed at generating
discussion.

The idea of a special plenary has been retained. The Standing Committee might like
to give some thought to whether special plenary topics should be followed through at
the next conference. The special plenary topic from the 21st CSPC in Trinidad and
Tobago is picked up as a suggested topic for this conference (Topic 1). The proposed
workshop topics for the 22nd CSPC are set out in more detail in Appendix C.

A half-day cultural activity is suggested for the Friday afternoon following the special
plenary session. This gives delegates the flexibility to depart early, should they wish.

Travel and accommodation arrangements

As with previous conferences, delegates are responsible for the cost of their airfares
and accommodation. As most international flights arrive in New Zealand via
Auckland, the New Zealand Visits and Ceremonials Office will assist with facilitation
at Auckland Airport. The flight from Auckland to Wellington is one hour in duration.

Hotel accommodation will be block booked at a number of suitable venues in
Wellington. Further information on how to make accommodation bookings will be
made available with the letter of invitation and related documents.

A list of countries with representation in Wellington is attached as Appendix D.

Accompanying spouses

Accompanying spouses will be invited to the opening ceremony, closing dinner and
cultural activity. A separate spouses' programme is not planned for this conference.
However, an information booklet with proposed self-arranged activities will be
provided for accompanying spouses.

Conclusion

The New Zealand Parliament is looking forward to hosting the 22nd CSPC and will
be contacting parliaments with further information about the event in the next few
months. In the meantime, if your parliament has any queries, please do not hesitate to
contact Yvonne Shelton at yvonne.shelton@parliament.govt.nz who will be coordinating the conference arrangements from the New Zealand Parliament.

Dr The Rt Hon Dr Lockwood Smith
Speaker of the New Zealand House of Representatives
Appendix A – CSPOC Additional Participants

Alderney
Anguilla
Bermuda
British Virgin Islands
Cayman Islands
Falkland Islands
Gibraltar
Guernsey
Isle of Man
Jersey
Montserrat
St Helena South Atlantic
Appendix B – Proposed conference agenda for CSPOC 2014

Wednesday 22 January 2014

Opening Ceremony 9.00am - 10.30am
- Powhiri – traditional Maori welcome for honoured guests
- Governor-General opens Conference
- Speaker – Welcome
- Conference photograph 10.00am – 10.30am
- Morning tea 10.30am – 11.00am

Opening Plenary 11.00am – 12.30pm
- Key-note speakers

1. Reconnecting Parliament with the public

2. Parliamentary Privilege

- Lunch 12.30pm – 2.00pm

Workshops 1 and 2 - 2.00pm – 4.00pm

1. Reconnecting Parliament with the public

2. Parliamentary Privilege

- Afternoon tea during workshop sessions

Regional Meetings – 4.15pm – 5.00pm

Thursday 23 January 2014

Plenary 8.30am – 10.00am
- Key-note speakers

3. Small Parliaments – Big Challenges

4. Openness and Transparency

- Morning Tea 10.00am – 10.30am
Workshops 3 and 4 – 10.30am – 12.30pm

3. Small Parliaments – Big Challenges
4. Openness and Transparency

- Lunch 12.30pm – 2.00pm

Plenary 2.00pm – 5.00pm
- Reports from workshops
- Closing Plenary

- Afternoon tea during plenary
- Closing dinner 7.00pm

Friday 24 January 2014

Special Plenary 9.00am – 11.00am
- Role and accountability of members of Parliament

Cultural Activities 1.00pm
Appendix C – 22nd CSPOC proposed Key-note speakers and workshop topics

1. Reconnecting Parliament with the public\(^1\) – keeping parliament relevant in the digital age
   - Representative parliamentary democracy and technology enabled direct democracy – can they coexist?
   - Facilitating public participation in parliamentary proceedings
   - Informing the public about what parliament is doing: the place of social media, parliament apps etc.
   - Engaging first-time voters and young people – use of outreach programmes, youth assemblies and interactive websites etc.

2. Parliamentary privilege – protecting the effective functioning of democracies
   - What is parliamentary privilege?
   - What purpose does it serve for parliaments of the 21\(^{st}\) century
   - Foundation for privilege - is legislation required? Should proceedings in parliament be defined? Should contempt be codified?
   - How is its scope and extent established - what is the place of the “necessity test”?

3. Small parliaments - big challenges
   - Achieving stable government – parliament’s role?
   - Parliamentary governance and management – the role of the Speaker
   - Non-members Speakers – do they have a role?
   - Making parliament relevant to the people

4. Openness and transparency – application of freedom of information legislation to parliaments
   - What is the place of proceedings in parliament in a freedom of information regime
   - Protecting members’ privacy, the privacy of their constituents and interest groups, and party policy development
   - Disclosure of members’ use of public funds
   - Proactive release and disclosure policies

Special plenary topic

Role and accountability of members of Parliament
   - Accountability to electorate
   - Accountability to political party
   - Conscience issues — balancing a member’s own interests, electorate and sector interests and the public interest in decision making.

\(^1\) Special plenary topic from the 21\(^{st}\) CSPOC
Appendix D – Commonwealth countries represented in Wellington

Australia
Canada
Cook Islands
India
Malaysia
Niue
Pakistan
Papua New Guinea
Samoa
Singapore
South Africa
United Kingdom
22nd CSPOC Workshop Topics

1. Connecting Parliament with the public – keeping parliament relevant in the digital age
   - Representative parliamentary democracy and technology-enabled direct democracy – can they coexist?
   - Role of the Speaker in facilitating public participation in parliamentary proceedings
   - Informing the public about what parliament is doing: the role of media, the place of social media, parliament applications, etc.
   - Engaging first-time voters and young people – use of outreach programmes, youth assemblies and interactive websites etc.

2. Parliamentary privilege – protecting the effective functioning of democracies
   - What is the purpose of parliamentary privilege in the 21st century?
   - Foundation for privilege – constitution (written or not), is legislation required? What is the scope and extent of privilege and how does it relate to freedom of speech?
   - Can natural justice be guaranteed in privilege committees? What is the role of such committees as well as the role of the Speaker?

3. Small parliaments - big challenges
   - Achieving stable government – parliament’s role?
   - Parliamentary governance and management – the role of the Speaker
   - Appointed members – benefits and challenges.
   - Making parliament relevant to the people including gender sensitivity.

4. Openness and transparency
   - What is the place of proceedings in parliament in a freedom of information regime? Alternatively, proactive release and disclosure policies as developed by parliament.
   - Protecting members’ privacy and that of their families, the privacy of their constituents and interest groups, and party policy development.
   - Ensuring appropriate disclosure: members’ assets and those of their families; conflicts of interest; and use of public funds.

Special plenary topic

Role and accountability of members of Parliament
   - Accountability to electorate
   - Accountability to political party including the role of the Whip
   - Conscience issues —balancing a member’s own interests, electorate and sector interests and the public interest in decision making.

Topics for a future conference:

Fiscal responsibility – Role of Parliament in fiscal policy

Point of Order: Power of the Speaker
Report of the Parliamentary Delegation to the 127th Inter-Parliamentary Union Assembly
Québec City, Canada
21–26 October 2012

Fiftieth Parliament
Hon Tau Henare, Head of Delegation

Presented to the House of Representatives
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The New Zealand delegation that attended the 127th Inter-Parliamentary Union Assembly (the Assembly) in Québec City, Canada comprised:

- Hon Tau Henare, delegation leader
- Hon Damien O’Connor
- Julie Anne Genter MP

The delegation was in Canada from 20 to 27 October 2012.

**Introduction to the Inter-Parliamentary Union**

The Inter-Parliamentary Union (IPU) is the international organisation of parliaments of sovereign states. It is a centre for dialogue and parliamentary diplomacy among legislators representing a wide range of ideological, economic and social systems. Through resolutions and reports, the IPU expresses its views and the positions of the world parliamentary community on issues of international interest, and makes recommendations for parliamentary action. The IPU works for peace and cooperation among peoples and for the firm establishment of representative democracy. It also supports the efforts of and works in close cooperation with the United Nations, providing a parliamentary dimension to its work.

Currently 162 national parliaments are members of the IPU. A list of members is attached as Appendix 1. Ten regional parliamentary assemblies are associate members. Most members are affiliated to one or more of the six geopolitical groups that are currently active in the IPU. These geopolitical groups are African, Arab, Asia-Pacific, Eurasia, Latin America and the Caribbean, and the Twelve-Plus.

The IPU is financed mainly by its members out of public funds. Its budget for 2012 totalled 13,690,300 Swiss francs down from 18,086,540 Swiss francs in 2011. The New Zealand Parliament’s assessed contribution to the IPU budget for 2012 was 54,500 Swiss francs (approximately New Zealand $70,900), down from 66,000 Swiss francs (approximately New Zealand $85,800) in 2011.

While the twice-yearly assemblies are the major focus for New Zealand parliamentarians, the IPU is constantly active in its work to promote representative democracy throughout the world, through workshops, committee visits and reports.
Its main areas of activity are:

- representative democracy
- international peace and security
- sustainable development
- human rights and humanitarian law
- women in politics
- education, science and culture.

**Assemblies**

The Assembly is the principal statutory body for expressing the views of the IPU on political issues. These are held twice a year in spring and autumn, usually alternating venues between Geneva, where the IPU secretariat is based, and a member country. A prerequisite for hosting rights is the guarantee that all member parliaments will be able to send representatives.

The Assembly comprises meetings of the following parts of the IPU:

- plenary session of the Assembly, attended by all delegates, which has a general debate on a particular theme, debates an emergency item, and holds panel discussions on particular subjects
- Governing Council, which is the policy-making body of the IPU, and consists of two or three delegates from each member country
- ad hoc committees established by the Governing Council
- standing committees, which debate and draft resolutions on chosen topics; and
- six geopolitical groups.

The agenda of the 127th IPU Assembly is attached as Appendix 2.

Our delegation attended the following sessions:

- Governing Council
- plenary debate
- panel discussion on the use of media, including social media, to enhance citizen engagement and democracy
- panel discussion on fair trade and innovative financing mechanisms for sustainable development
- panel session on peak oil: what prospects for energy security?
- informal panel on parliamentary and political law
- special gender partnership session on gender-sensitive parliaments
- launch of the handbook: Supporting Nuclear Non-Proliferation and Disarmament
- meeting of the IPU Committee on United Nations Affairs – Rio +20 in perspective and UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples: Five years on
- Asia-Pacific group meetings
- Twelve-Plus group meeting; and
- meeting of young parliamentarians.

The results of the Assembly meetings are available at:

Governing Council

The Governing Council met twice during the assembly and dealt with the following matters:

- membership of the IPU
- reports of subsidiary bodies
- implementation of the IPU Strategy 2012–2017: Parliamentary dimension of the WTO
- reports on meetings and activities; and
- finances of the IPU.

The Governing Council approved a request for membership of the Parliament of Lesotho to be held by both chambers. They also welcomed the resolution on *Interaction between the United Nations, national parliaments and the Inter-Parliamentary Union* that was adopted by the United Nations General Assembly in May 2012. This resolution enhances the growing relationship between the United Nations and the IPU. In particular, it recognises the strengths that the parliamentary IPU brings to the work of the governmental United Nations.

Plenary sessions

The plenary sessions were held on five days of the Assembly. The agenda for the plenary sessions consisted of the following topics:

- general debate on the theme of “Citizenship, identity and linguistic and cultural diversity in a globalized world”
- selection of an emergency item
- adoption of resolutions of the standing committees and on the emergency item; and
- approval of topics for discussion at the next assembly in March 2013.

I presented a keynote address to the afternoon session of the Special Debate on Tuesday 23 October. The address, “Weaving Culture into Ideology”, was well received, with a number of delegations seeking copies of the text, which is attached as Appendix 3.

Hon Damien O’Connor and Julie Anne Genter spoke in the General Debate. Hon Damien O’Connor addressed New Zealand’s contribution to diversity and Julie Anne Genter spoke generally on the Special Debate topic. The texts of the speeches are attached as Appendices 4 and 5.
The Syrian Arab Republic was not represented at the Assembly, due to difficulties with obtaining visas for the delegation in time to attend. Their Parliament’s inability to be represented was publicly noted by a number of parties and the need to ensure that visa difficulties do not prevent participation by any member parliament in future was seen as being of paramount importance.

Emergency item

At each Assembly, a topic is selected for emergency consideration and a resolution is drafted on that topic. Any member of the IPU may request the inclusion of an emergency item in the Assembly agenda.

Four requests were received. These were:

- “The violence perpetrated by armed terrorist groups against Christian and other minorities in Syria and attempts to drive them out of Syria”, proposed by the Syrian Arab Republic
- “The international role of parliamentarians in prohibiting the defamation of religions and the desecration of religious symbols and shrines by contributing to the conclusion of an international agreement on the criminalization of such acts and by recognizing respect for religions as a prerequisite for international peace, understanding and cooperation” proposed by the United Arab Emirates
- “The security and humanitarian impacts of the crisis in Syria, including in neighbouring countries” proposed by the United Kingdom
- “The institutional and security situation in Mali”, proposed by Mali.

Following a roll-call vote, the item on Mali was adopted and added to the agenda.

IPU Committee on United Nations Affairs

This Committee met in open sessions on three days of the Assembly. The final sitting examined the progress made and obstacles encountered in the implementation of the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, five years after its adoption in 2007. I was privileged to be asked to lead the debate, alongside Grand Chief Julie Anne Genter MP speaks at the Special Debate.
Edward John of Canada. The Declaration sets minimum standards for the survival, well-being and dignity of indigenous peoples. The participants noted positive developments; however, there remains a wide gap between the standards and their implementation.

Along with many others, I noted the low level of participation at this sitting, and said that the realisation of indigenous peoples’ rights is “a journey, for indigenous and non-indigenous, hand in hand.” Participants underlined that everybody should be concerned by indigenous rights.

**Gender-Sensitive Parliaments**

Julie Anne Genter and I attended the Special Gender Partnership sessions on Gender-Sensitive Parliaments. A number of suggestions and strategies for increasing women’s participation in parliaments were discussed, including the proposal for part-time parliamentarians when members of Parliament are caring for young children. Julie Anne Genter made an intervention, which is included as Appendix 6.

**Meeting of young parliamentarians**

Julie Anne Genter also attended the meeting of young parliamentarians. The meeting was attended by about 50 parliamentarians from all over the world and was chaired by Klaas Dijkstra, from the Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe. Many ages were represented, even some delegates in their 40s and 50s. A number of parliamentarians reported having good representation of youth in their parliaments, including many members in their 20s and even younger.

The mandate of the task force of young parliamentarians established at the 126th Assembly in Kampala was renewed. The group discussed the draft action plan that had been written by a small group following the meeting in Uganda. A formal entrey to the IPU for a standing group of youth representation (regarding gender) was discussed, but no decision was made. However, new members were co-opted to do further work on the proposed action plan to raise youth issues in the IPU.

**Geopolitical groups**

All but two members of the IPU are members of one or more of the six geopolitical groups that operate within the IPU structure. As outlined, these groups are: Africa, the Arab group, Asia-Pacific, Eurasia, Latin-America and the Caribbean, and the Twelve-Plus
New Zealand belongs to the Asia-Pacific group, a grouping of 30 member countries extending from the Middle East to the Pacific, and to the Twelve-Plus group, a group of European and Scandinavian countries, together with Australia, Canada and New Zealand. Membership of these two groups is attached as Appendix 8.

The geopolitical groups play an important role in the functioning of the IPU. The IPU rules provide that each group can nominate its own candidates for committee vacancies to ensure an equitable geopolitical representation on IPU committees. The Asia-Pacific group met once during the Assembly on the Sunday prior to the opening and the Twelve-Plus group met on Sunday, Monday, Wednesday and Friday of the Assembly. The Twelve-Plus group considered membership bids from Ukraine and Azerbaijan. It was also noted that Pacific Parliaments would be invited to attend as observers to the Quito Assembly in March 2013.

The Twelve-Plus group held elections for two permanent and one substitute member of the Committee on Middle East Questions and I stood as a candidate. A letter of introduction and short curriculum vitae was circulated to all delegations and I was invited to briefly introduce myself to the group. After a fraught process, both Lord Frank Judd of the United Kingdom House of Lords and myself were appointed as Twelve-Plus group candidates for the permanent positions. In the vote in the Governing Council meeting on Wednesday 24 October, we were formally elected, along with Ms Benarous from Algeria.

Bilateral meetings

The New Zealand delegation did not take part in any formal bilateral meetings, however, a large number of interactions took place, particularly with our colleagues from the Australian Federal Parliament, the observer delegate from the Fale Alea of the Kingdom of Tonga, and the delegations from the Federated States of Micronesia and Timor-Leste. On Monday 22 October, New Zealand and Australia coordinated a self-funding lunch with these delegations at the Hilton Hotel, which not only facilitated a good exchange amongst the delegates, but it also established relationships that we were able to build upon during the course of the Assembly. Other informal meetings and ‘pull asides’ also took place between our delegation and the Netherlands, Turkey and the United Kingdom.

Other activities

Nuclear disarmament

Julie Anne Genter attended a book launch and workshop meeting held by Parliamentarians for Nuclear Non-proliferation and Disarmament (PNND) on United Nations Day, 24 October, for the publication of the “Parliamentary Handbook on Supporting Nuclear Non-proliferation and Disarmament”. PNND has observer status at the IPU, with approximately 70 to 75 delegations represented at the launch and around 25 delegations were represented at the workshop.

The workshop presented innovative tools to promote nuclear disarmament to assist legislators in using the new handbook, and to familiarise them with online tools that had been developed to help advance nuclear non-proliferation and disarmament.

The workshop, chaired by Alyn Ware, a New Zealander who works as the Global Coordinator for PNND, whose headquarters are in Basel, Switzerland, featured a presentation on the tools in the handbook and the website. Australian MP Harry Jenkins
also provided an overview of IPU involvement in the area of nuclear non-proliferation and disarmament.

Maulen Ashimbayev, a parliamentarian from Kazakhstan gave a presentation on nuclear disarmament initiatives taken by Kazakhstan, including by the Non-Governmental Organisation, the ATOM Project. A video was shown on the legacy of nuclear testing in the Semipalatinsk region in Eastern Kazakhstan, chronicling severe environmental degradation and health effects, including for second- and third-generation inhabitants.

There were a number of interventions by delegations on issues such as nuclear energy and proliferation, achieving universality of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons and the proposal to create a Nuclear Weapon Free Zone in the Middle East. The text of Julie Anne Genter’s intervention is included as Appendix 7.

Informal whips meeting

A meeting of the whips network was held alongside the Assembly. The New Zealand Parliament did not have any whips in the delegation so Hon Damien O’Connor attended this meeting on behalf of New Zealand whips. Hon Joel Fitzgibbon, Chief Government Whip in the Australian House of Representatives, chaired the meeting.

The meeting considered how best to support whips, and how to attract wider participation in the group, as the term “whip” is usually associated with Commonwealth Parliaments, so while other parliaments may have members who carry out similar roles, they would not necessarily identify with the group. The group also considered how best to operate to exchange knowledge and experience.

Socialist International

Hon Damien O’Connor attended an informal Socialist International (SI) meeting. Present at the meeting were parliamentarians from Australia, Belgium, Botswana, Canada, Cape Verde, Cyprus, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Namibia, New Zealand, Niger, Palestine, Pakistan, Poland, Portugal, South Africa, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Tanzania, Turkey, United Kingdom and Venezuela. The meeting was chaired by the SI Secretary-General, Luis Ayala of Chile.
SI is a worldwide organisation of social democratic, socialist and labour parties. It works to strengthen and develop social democratic policies throughout the world. The IPU has only recently recognised SI, which now has observer status at the assemblies. One-hundred-and-sixty-two political parties worldwide belong to SI, and many others are applying for membership. It was noted that 48 Governments are led by social democrat parties.

Some members used the opportunity to present issues that are currently facing their parties or parliaments. These included Turkish and Palestinian parliamentarians facing detention in their countries, and the party from Mongolia having difficulty in participating in the parliamentary process and the IPU, as well as queries around election results. Pakistan discussed the challenge of dealing with terrorism. The good work of countries, including Pakistan, in dealing with the rise of fundamentalism was noted.

**Participation by Pacific nations**

As with previous Assemblies, there was very little representation from the Pacific region. The Parliament of the Kingdom of Tonga, was present as a “Parliament Participating as an Observer with a View to a Possible Affiliation” and was represented by Siosifa Tu’utua’ia MP. The Parliament of the Kingdom of Tonga expressed interest in affiliation; however they acknowledge that the costs of participation in Assemblies and membership fees are difficult for small nations to manage. The Federated States of Micronesia sent a Speaker-led delegation of three members, and the Timor-Leste Parliament was represented by four members. No Pacific women members of Parliament were present.

**Future meetings**

The 128th Assembly of the IPU will take place in Quito, Ecuador from 22 to 27 March 2013. It will be followed by the 129th Assembly, which will take place in Geneva from 14 to 16 October 2013.

**Conclusion**

The New Zealand Parliament’s profile at this Assembly was particularly high. Positive reaction to the keynote address from other delegations was immediate and sustained throughout the Assembly. If our Parliament takes opportunities presented to it in the future, we are well positioned to take the lead in international parliamentary forums on indigenous representation. We speak from the position of the longest continuous fully enfranchised democracy, with broad representation in Parliament, allowing our voice to carry authority on the world stage.

---

Hon Tau Henare

Head of Delegation
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1 Membership of IPU (as at 1 May 2012)

The Inter-Parliamentary Union has 162 members and 10 associate members.

Member Parliaments

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan
Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belarus, Belgium, Benin, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi
Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d’Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic
Democratic People’s Republic of Korea, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic
Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Estonia, Ethiopia
Finland, France
Gabon, Gambia, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea-Bissau
Haiti, Honduras, Hungary
Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy
Japan, Jordan
Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan
Lao People’s Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg
Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar
Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway
Oman
Pakistan, Palau, Palestine, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal
Qatar
Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Rwanda
Samoa, San Marino, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Africa, South Sudan, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic
Tajikistan, Thailand, The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey
Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay
Venezuela, Viet Nam
Yemen
Zambia, Zimbabwe.
**Associate members**

Andean Parliament

Central American Parliament

East African Legislative Assembly

European Parliament

Inter-Parliamentary Committee of the West African Economic and Monetary Union

Latin American Parliament

Parliament of the Economic Community of West African States

Parliament of the Economic and Monetary Community of Central Africa

Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe

Transitional Arab Parliament.
2 Agenda of 127th IPU Assembly

Item 1 Election of the President and Vice-Presidents of the 127th Assembly

Item 2 Consideration of possible requests for the inclusion of an emergency item in the Assembly agenda

Item 3 Special Debate on Citizenship, identity and linguistic and cultural diversity in a globalized world

Item 4 Panel discussions on the subject items chosen for debate during the 128th Assembly (Quito, 22 – 27 March 2013):
   (a) Enforcing the responsibility to protect: The role of parliament in safeguarding civilians’ lives (First Standing Committee)
   (b) Fair trade and innovative financing mechanisms for sustainable development (Second Standing Committee)
   (c) The use of media, including social media, to enhance citizen engagement and democracy (Third Standing Committee)

Item 5 Reports on:
   (a) Special Debate on Citizenship, identity and linguistic and cultural diversity in a globalized world
   (b) Special gender partnership session on gender-sensitive parliaments
   (c) IPU Committee on United Nations Affairs

Panel sessions
1. Multilateralism and the role of parliamentary diplomacy
2. Peak oil: What prospects for energy security?
3. Building peace after conflict
4. Creating opportunities for youth in today’s global economy
5. Parliamentary immunity: benefit or burden?
6. Informal panel: Parliamentary and political law
7. Workshop on new tools to promote nuclear disarmament.
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3 Keynote address to Special Debate by Hon Tau Henare

Weaving culture into ideology – how recessions shape a nation

With all the talk of recession and how to get out of it, I remember only too well the last one. The 80s downturn for us in Otara was like a bold-faced gate crasher who arrived early, wrecked the place and wouldn’t leave.

Sixth form certificate wasn’t enough to get me a job. Thirty years of service on the railways wasn’t enough to protect my father from redundancy.

Yet as bad as things may have appeared to others, it was still one of the most upbeat times of my youth. I owe this to the rise of Māori culture. A culture largely forgotten by many of my father’s generation as they settled into the gentle pace of urban life.

But its timely revival in rough times had given my own generation enthusiasm mixed with hope.

When cultural renaissance and recession collide it throws up some pretty odd stuff. For us it was new, it was exciting and we could change the world with our reckless blend of race, feminist, and class politics all thrown together to form one simple rant “we’ve all been done over by the rich white man and we want justice”.

Yet it didn’t take long to realise that we got it all wrong. That race was not about culture. “Māori culture was around long before the theory of race was hatched in the laboratories of Europe” my old uncle said. And far from being simply a racial category, Māori culture, like all cultures, is in fact a set of ideals. It was only about the good stuff, and if we commit a crime or do bad things, we are operating outside the prescribed limits of our culture.

We act as individuals. To say Māori crime then, is as stupid as saying Christian crime, or English crime or Welsh crime. For no society sets out to promote rules that are evil or bad.

Those words have never left me and while I might revert sometimes to the easy rhetoric of race politics, I mostly remember how culture comforted me and distracted me, the exhilaration of rowing a waka (Māori canoe) down the Waikato River with 100 others, the voluntary work at the local marae (the complex of buildings around and including the open courtyard area in front of the wharenui/meeting house, where formal greetings and discussions take place, a communal meeting place for individual tribes). Hitching to hui (a gathering or assembly) across the country and picking up the language along the way, meeting relations for the first time, changing our names [from European to Māori names].

So if culture is only about the good stuff then why aren’t we grabbing it with both hands?

The role of culture comes into its own during hard times. Essentially, it’s because it distracts us from the hopelessness of our situation while compelling us to become more creative, inventive and imaginative. Together with visionary leadership, we have the very fundamentals to freeing ourselves from recession.

The combination of visionary leadership and culture can be seen in an earlier era. During the Great Depression, Sir Āpirana Ngata [a prominent early 20th century Māori lawyer, politician and leader] understood that this was central to Māori economic recovery. He believed
communities had to become self-reliant, socially cohesive and bound together by a peaceful culture with arts at its axis. Consequently, the renaissance was born resulting in a resurgence of marae building, carving, weaving, kapa haka (Māori cultural performance) and everything else in between.

The dairy farms he promoted as a foray into self-employment was back-breaking work with sometimes meagre returns, yet there was no burning resentment, no chip on the shoulder, no dole when things got a bit rough. Their motivation was fed by something that cannot be found in any economic model.

Fittingly his image graces the New Zealand $50 note as a reminder that economic recovery and cultural regeneration are mutually inclusive. The blueprint was set as a remedy for future downturns.

Māori faced similar problems in the 80s. And through the chaos of urbanisation, a 23 per cent unemployment rate and a youthful population, two guardians of an earlier era, Sir James Hēnare and John Rangihau [20th century Māori leaders], emerged with a new twist to the old remedy.

The revitalisation of Māori language was their focus forged from the old education system and remodelled to create a new philosophy, for out of early childhood centres, “te kōhanga reo” (language nests) was formed; out of schools, te kura kaupapa (primary school operating under Māori custom and using Māori as the medium of instruction); out of universities, wananga (a tertiary educational institution that caters for Māori learning needs); and from there came a record number of Māori tertiary graduates.

All that was old is new again. The current situation spurs us on to explore new pathways and the coalition between the Māori and the National Party provides a unique political platform for that to occur, not only because it is the mean between two extremes, but because it offers a forum to develop policy with the power to unify a nation facing uncertainty using the old remedies from the past. Whereas in the past cultural revival has been exclusively for Māori by Māori, this time I sense a maturity and a willingness to share the same vision. That vision has a Māori heart whose presence, detectable only by nuances, pervades everything we do as a nation. The haka (vigorous dances with actions and rhythmically shouted words, often used as a challenge before a rugby game) is a familiar example and so too the singing of the national anthem in Māori, proficient pronunciation, the hongi (to press noses in greeting), body moko (traditional tattoo) are all now common features of our nation’s cultural pulse.

To build on that requires world views to merge. For instance in relation to recent policy statements, where some see just a cycleway, I see an opportunity for cash poor, land rich Māori communities to enter the tourism industry by unlocking some of the most scenic and historically fascinating geography in the country.

Where some see an army boot camp, I see shades of the old Māori Battalion whose noble mantra of service and sacrifice for one’s country should be an inspiration to a troubled generation. Where some see the nine-day working fortnight as a day off, I see an opportunity for workers to learn Māori.

As someone who has traversed the full spectrum of political thought, and started a party based on this very concept of culture, I have come to the conclusion that it has no natural political home but culture should be woven into the fabric of all ideologies. Because its true worth, particularly in times of crisis and uncertainty, is that it encourages the energy,
enterprise and intellect in people to aspire to a greater cause or as my old uncle would say “all the good stuff”.

So how does our Māori cultural renaissance affect our representation in the political world? Renaissance and re-engagement with culture and language doesn’t just happen once, it comes in waves, and you have to take account of the generations. Generations missed out on our culture – now there has been a second wave. Like many treasures, it is not until we see what we are losing, and we are on the edge of the abyss that we act.

New Zealand Aotearoa (Māori name for New Zealand) is the oldest living continuous democracy. We have had full, indigenous and women’s, enfranchisement since 1893. We can lead the way in participatory representative democracy. We set aside an electoral roll and seats in the House for those who identify as Māori.

But these seats came about in the late 19th century, not to enhance Māori representation, but to halt Māori representation. Despite population changes, and cultural changes, the number of Māori seats under-represented the Māori population from when they were established, until 1996, for more than 100 years. Secret voting was not secured for Māori until 1938. There were no actual Māori electoral rolls until 1948-9. It was seen as too difficult to register us. Our reserved seats were criticised by Pākehā [New Zealand European] politicians as “apartheid”. Until 1967 we could not stand for a general population seats unless we identified as “half caste”. No Māori candidate was successful in general seat until 1975.

Today New Zealand can beat its chest about its indigenous representation around the world and how it can be done. Many will say it is the worst there is, but in terms of the literal meaning of House of Representatives, then it does represent. There has been a Native (Māori) Affairs Select Committee for 140 years, although it did take until the 1970s for the Māori Affairs Minister to be Māori. But the importance of how culture plays a huge part in the country’s identity is how we treat our indigenous people. We are not the best in the world but we are up there. All countries can do better.

New Zealand’s change to proportional representation was good for Māori because now parties represent a slice of New Zealand life. The four largest parties are good in terms of indigenous and ethnic representation. A governing coalition partner, the Māori party, has 100% Māori representatives. Twenty-one of 121 members of Parliament self-identify as Māori, a higher percentage than in the population.

Now we have an enhanced version of what we started with 150 years ago. Looking at our history, no one can doubt the contribution by Māori politicians. From Sir Apirana Ngata to the Rt Hon Winston Peters, they are all part of the great melting pot but recognising the special nature of Māori in our country – not special for any other reason other than that they are from New Zealand and only New Zealand; from the hills, the rivers, the humanity, the soul.

In 1840, regardless of the reasons back then, two peoples, Māori and Pākehā, came together to sign an agreement we call the Treaty of Waitangi. This is our nation’s founding document. There is still more to be done to recognise and fulfil the spirit of what happened on the 6th of February 1840, but we are getting there.

In New Zealand, we take for granted that we have the right to vote every three years and participate in democracy. The way you increase any electoral representation, school
participation or anything else is by making it exciting for participants. Politicians and political parties need to make it exciting, engaging and relevant.

I believe we are second to none in how we deal with our indigenous issues. The Māori Affairs Select Committee does a good job of allowing people to participate in the system, by bringing Parliament closer to the people. Committee hearings are regularly held on marae and in rural areas. New Zealand has three official languages – English, Māori and New Zealand Sign language. Māori may be spoken at any time in Parliament by any member. There is full-time simultaneous translation available. Many say that we can do more, and we can, but only 100 years ago the dominant culture was smoothing the pillow of a dying race. For us, as Māori and Pākehā, it is about sharing vision (not power) of the nation. If the vision of what the nation can be is not shared, then we will never share the spoils or power.
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4  Address to the Special Debate by Hon Damien O’Connor

Contribution to diversity

Bonjour, Kia Ora, Mr President, delegates

New Zealand is a small country that takes pride in its diversity. We have, like many other Commonwealth countries, a history of colonisation by our European forebears. They thankfully had the foresight and wisdom to formalise a partnership agreement that allocated rights to both indigenous and settling populations. That agreement, the Treaty of Waitangi, still stands today and formalises the rights of active engagement between governments, our indigenous people and all New Zealand citizens.

Our Pacific neighbours are a significant and growing part of our evolving national identity. We have accepted a moral and political responsibility to assist the sustainable development of those small countries, many of whom are directly threatened by global climate change and sea level rise.

We are located close to the many nations in Asia who face the increasing challenges of balancing sustainable economic growth with environmental protection. Our good fortune through recent history and a small population allows us a unique opportunity to exchange our knowledge and experience. We believe we can assist collectively to achieve the aspirations of not only our neighbouring Asia Pacific nations but also the global community as a whole.

We are proud of our bicultural nation and emerging multicultural society but we have challenges. Like many first world nations we continue to endure disparities of health status and educational outcomes related to cultural background. We consider this unacceptable in a world where every human is deserving of an opportunity to live and grow with dignity and we still have much work to do.

We understand the link between economic disparity and human suffering even in a country blessed with many advantages such as New Zealand.

We commit through international organisations such as the IPU, CPA and the United Nations to advocate strongly for the rights of every citizen of the world regardless of race, colour, religion, sexuality or economic status.

We are proud to be an independent nation of strong minded men and women. We will take the opportunity to fight for and support any initiative by any nation here at any forum to promote a world where we respect individual human beings as equal in the eyes of their family, their community and their nation.

But all the words and resolutions at forums such as this will amount to nothing without the absolute commitment by each and every one of us here to return to our parliaments and fight for legislation that protects the human rights of every one of our citizens and allows diversity to flourish.

We need a world where diversity must be celebrated as a culture for the creation and renewal of life itself, to build a world where our children and grandchildren are free of prejudice, free of persecution and free of suffering.
Thank you IPU for the opportunity to speak at this important international gathering of nations.

It is a privilege to be here and we must ensure that future forums remain open to every nation without visa restriction because we know inclusion and dialogue should never be forced to give way to exclusion and conflict.
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5 Address to the Special Debate by Julie Anne Genter MP

IPU General Assembly

Tena koutou, tena koutou, tena tatou katoa. Monsieur le Président, et tous les délégués à cette assemblée, Mr President, honourable delegates to the 127th Assembly of the IPU, respectful greetings to you all.

It is a great pleasure to briefly speak on this Special Debate topic: Citizenship, identity and linguistic and cultural diversity in a globalised world.

I am, in many ways, a living example of the recent accelerated pace of globalisation that has influenced my generation. As you may hear from my accent, I did not grow up in New Zealand, in fact I was born and raised in North America. I have multiple citizenships, I have lived on several continents, et je parle plusieurs langues (plus ou moins bien).

As a young, female immigrant to Aotearoa New Zealand, I am privileged to be a representative in the 50th Parliament. It is a testament to the cultural diversity and opportunities afforded by my adopted country that I am here. But it is especially due to our proportional voting system, Mixed-Member Proportional, MMP, which has significantly improved the diversity of representation in Parliament since it was first introduced in 1996. Fifteen years on, at our most recent election in November last year, we held a referendum that confirmed MMP as the preferred voting system of New Zealand.

I must also recognise the work that Aotearoa New Zealand has done to ensure that the indigenous Māori identity and culture finally began to reverse the decline that followed colonisation. As we heard earlier from my colleague the Honourable Tau Henare, representation of Māori in the New Zealand Parliament has finally reached a level that more than equals their proportion of the population, assisted again by MMP.

Finally, as a concrete example of law making that represents tolerance and diversity, I am happy to report than since the last IPU meeting at Kampala, where the human rights of homosexuals were advocated for by my parliamentary colleagues, including Louisa Wall, the New Zealand Parliament has begun the process of considering her Member’s Bill, which would grant full marriage equality to couples, regardless of sexual orientation. The first reading of this Bill passed recently, with the support of two-thirds of our Parliament.

To conclude, encouraging and maintaining diversity in our parliaments is essential to achieve true democratic representation, and to ensure robust and just law making. To this end, I believe that proportional and fair voting systems like MMP are essential to meet the plurality of challenges we face.

Thank you Mr President. Je vous remercie de votre attention. Kia ora koutou.

I’d like to thank our hosts for the excellent choice of a special debate topic, and all the delegates at the 127th assembly of the IPU for their contributions to the important debate.
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6 Intervention by Julie Anne Genter MP

Special Gender Sensitive Parliaments Session

Bonjour à tout le monde, Greetings, tena koutou. Thank you Mr Chair, for this opportunity to briefly share the experience of Aotearoa New Zealand on this important topic of gender sensitive parliaments.

As the first country in the world to give women the vote, in 1893, New Zealand would be expected to be a leader on gender equality in Parliament. The introduction of proportional voting, MMP, in 1996 initially significantly increased the proportion of MPs that were female. In 1999 both the prime minister and the leader of the opposition were women, and for a time in 2005 four of the five most powerful positions in the country, the prime minister, Governor General, the Chief Justice and the Speaker of the House were all women.

However, in recent years we have seen something of a backwards slide. In the current 50th parliament, just under a third of the MPs are women. The leaders of all the parties except the two that have co-leadership are men. These developments suggest that we have more work to do, and that there is an important role for political parties to play in improving the gender balance of their lists and of their electorate candidates. There is currently no requirement for gender sensitivity in party lists.

I am a member of the third largest party, the Green Party, which holds 11% of the seats, that is, 14 out of 121. The Green Party does have a policy of gender balance in our list ranking, whereby one gender cannot be less than 40% or more than 60% of the list. It is for this reason we have the highest proportion of women, 8 out of our 14 MPs are women. That is nearly 58%. The two larger parties have approximately 20% and 35% women respectively, no other party in the New Zealand parliament has more than 40% women at this time.

This suggests that a country must not become complacent and believe that equality of opportunity has been definitely achieved because some women have made it to prominent roles. Maintaining gender equality in our societies and in parliaments must be an ongoing process, which will require continued vigilance and a structured approach by all political parties to ensure that gains are not subsequently lost.

Thank you, Mr Chair.
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Handbook launch by Parliamentarians for Nuclear Non-proliferation and Disarmament

On behalf of the New Zealand delegation, I would like to begin by expressing our enthusiasm for the important work of the Parliamentarians for Nuclear Non-proliferation and Disarmament.

We especially welcome this handbook. I have no doubt it will prove to be a practical tool to assist parliamentarians around the world in implementing the UN Secretary-General’s Five Point Plan for nuclear disarmament, which was of course supported by the IPU 2009 resolution.

The New Zealand Parliament has already taken actions to follow up the 2009 IPU resolution, including adopting a motion by consensus on May 5, 2010 supporting the UN Secretary-General’s Five Point Plan and the proposal in his plan for a Nuclear Weapons Convention.

I am proud to say that among the examples of legislation prohibiting nuclear weapons included in this handbook is the legislation adopted by New Zealand in 1987.

To commemorate the 25th anniversary of our 1987 anti-nuclear legislation, the New Zealand Parliament took further action this year in June 2012, when we adopted a motion, by cross-party consensus again, reinforcing the agreement by all States Parties to the Nuclear – Non-proliferation Treaty in 2010 that any use of nuclear weapons would cause catastrophic humanitarian consequences, and supporting the conference in March 2013 to be hosted by the Government of Norway on the Humanitarian Consequences of Nuclear Weapons. And on the 29th August 2012, the UN International Day against Nuclear Tests, the New Zealand Red Cross launched in the New Zealand Parliament their excellent ‘Make Nuclear Weapons the Target’ campaign.

To conclude my brief comments, I am proud of the small but brave role New Zealand has played in contributing to a nuclear safe world. I heartily encourage other parliaments to take similar actions. New Zealand is an example that it is possible to achieve cross-party support for concrete steps, including legislation, which is indispensable for humankind to secure a nuclear-weapon free future. I hope that many of you will be able to join us for the workshop immediately following this handbook launch.

Thank you, Kia Ora!
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Report of the Parliamentary Delegation to the
Republic of Korea and the 21st Annual Meeting
of the Asia Pacific Parliamentary Forum (APPF)
Vladivostok, Russian Federation
22–31 January 2013

Introduction
The New Zealand delegation that visited the Republic of Korea and Vladivostok, Russian Federation to attend the Asia Pacific Parliamentary Forum (APPF) comprised three members of Parliament:

- Lindsay Tisch MP, Assistant Speaker of the House of Representatives
- Denise Roche MP
- Iain Lees-Galloway MP.

Before attending the APPF, the delegation undertook a bilateral parliamentary visit to the Republic of Korea. This was an opportunity for the New Zealand Parliament to recognise 50 years of formal diplomatic relations between New Zealand and the Republic of Korea and to develop new parliamentary relationships following the recent general election.

The visit programme for Korea, which is set out as Appendix 1, was intensive and provided for excellent meetings and engagement with people from the parliamentary, executive, and private sectors. It was planned in consultation with the North Asia Division of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade, and the New Zealand Embassy in Seoul.

During four days of deliberations in Vladivostok the New Zealand delegation was able to make a substantial contribution to the APPF, the organisation and running of which was a credit to our Russian hosts. The programme of the APPF is attached as Appendix 2 and media releases about the visit as Appendix 3.

The delegation would like to acknowledge the assistance of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade, including the advice and support from the New Zealand Embassy in Seoul provided by Ambassador Patrick Rata and his team, particularly assistance from Charles Boulton, Second Secretary, and Moon Sun-Hee, Political Advisor; and support from the Ambassador, His Excellency Hamish Cooper, and staff at the New Zealand Embassy in Moscow.

We would also like to thank the diplomatic missions of the Republic of Korea and the Russian Federation in Wellington and especially HE Park Yong Kyu, Ambassador of the Republic of Korea, and Mr Nikolay Barabanov, Chargé d’Affaires of the Embassy of the Russian Federation, for their assistance.
Republic of Korea

The New Zealand delegation visited the Republic of Korea from 22 to 25 January at the invitation of the Deputy Speaker of the National Assembly to promote exchanges between the New Zealand Parliament and the National Assembly, and to further New Zealand’s bilateral relationship with Korea.

Meeting with members of the Korea–New Zealand Parliamentary Friendship Group

Our first parliamentary meeting was hosted by Representative Yoo Jeong-bok, President of the Korea-New Zealand Parliamentary Friendship Group, and was also attended by Rep Kim Tae-won, Vice President of the group, and group member Rep Shin Dong-woo. The leadership of the group had changed after the last Korean elections, and Mr Yoo was very pleased to be able to meet our delegation so soon after becoming the president.

We discussed the significance of linkages between people in our two countries, and both sides agreed that active parliamentary engagement was a good way of supporting and encouraging such links. Mr Yoo expressed a desire to be an active president of the group, and would welcome an opportunity to travel to New Zealand.

Meetings with chairs of committee

We then had a series of meetings with chairs of select committees in the National Assembly. The first was with Rep Oh Jae-sae, Chair of the Health and Welfare Committee. Mr Oh is in his third term in the National Assembly, and has been chair of the committee for nine months.

Mr Oh gave an overview of the basic structure of the Korean health system, explaining that while 94 per cent of Korean hospitals are private, 19 per cent of patients use the public system. The government subsidises health care for families with low socio-economic profiles, and all citizens pay into a National Healthcare scheme. In addition, about 60 per cent of Korean citizens take out private health insurance, and Mr Oh felt that this gave Korea a good, affordable healthcare system for the majority of its citizens relative to other developed countries. Current government expenditure on health sits at around 7.1 per cent of GDP, but the cost of the system increases by roughly 12 per cent per annum.
Iain Lees-Galloway commented on the rising incidence of obesity and diabetes in New Zealand and asked whether this was also an issue for Korea. Mr Oh responded that it is indeed an issue of high concern, and that the government has been taking steps to promote healthy life-style choices and eating habits, particularly in schools. Korea is also developing a remote diagnosis system to allow people to accurately self-diagnose changes in cholesterol and hopefully detect glucose metabolism disorder, a key indicator of pre-diabetes and Type 2 diabetes.

The high rate of smoking in Korea is also of concern, and Mr Oh was impressed by New Zealand’s stance, and particularly our tobacco price legislation. The issue is complicated in Korea by the fact that the government owns the largest tobacco firm, and while legislation is in progress to ban smoking in public places, there is more work to be done to reduce smoking rates.

We concluded with a brief discussion on welfare issues. Korea’s welfare spending is at the lower end relative to other OECD countries, but there are efforts underway to increase this by providing more support to families in the lower socio-economic bracket, as well as providing additional support to families with young children and those with special needs.

Our next meeting was with Rep Shin Gye-ryeun, Chair of the Environment & Labour Committee. Mr Shin had just that day completed a five-day walking tour of one of Korea’s national parks, so we were very grateful that he made time to meet with us.

Mr Shin explained that in the past Korea had focused on rapid economic growth and industrialisation, so has not had a strong environmental consciousness. Only in the last decade as major concerns surfaced has there been recognition of environmental problems and a firm commitment from government to address them.

One of the current environmental issues facing all of Korea, and Seoul in particular, is the disposal of food waste. Until recently most food waste was dumped directly into the ocean, which was seen as a cheap method of dealing with it. As new regulations came into effect in December 2012 banning this practice, Korea is suddenly faced with finding suitable alternatives. With limited land resources, landfills are not desirable or cost-effective. There has been rapid recognition of this problem at the legislative level, and new treatment facilities are opening to alleviate some of the urgency.

Denise Roche asked about Korea’s Emission Trading Scheme and how this was progressing. Mr Shin said that a five-year plan is being developed and that he would be interested to hear about the experiences of other countries, including New Zealand, with their emissions trading schemes.

Korea is also facing environmental pressure from its high population density, affecting access to clean drinking water, and air quality. These are difficult and complex issues for a country with a large population and limited usable land. All of these issues are currently before the committee, so Mr Shin expects a heavy workload in 2013.

We also briefly touched on labour issues, mainly regarding compensation for workplace accidents. I asked if Korea had a compensation scheme similar to New Zealand’s, or if workers had to take matters to the courts. Mr Shin replied that while Korea has a strong, comprehensive system of industrial insurance which usually resulted in a satisfactory
outcome for all parties, in some instances workers have taken their employers to court over particularly complex disputes.

Our final committee meeting was with Rep. Ahn Hong-joon, Chair of the Foreign Affairs, Trade and Unification Committee. Mr Ahn had returned the previous week from a visit to New Zealand, where he had met with Members of Parliament Melissa Lee and John Hayes, and with New Zealand veterans of the Korean War. He expressed to us his deep gratitude for New Zealand’s assistance during the war, and for our longstanding and continuing contribution to the United Nations Command Military Armistice Commission (UNCMAC).

Our meeting centred on the Free Trade Agreement (FTA) negotiations between our countries, which are soon to be resumed. Both Mr Ahn and I expressed confidence that the FTA will be concluded successfully. Korea and New Zealand are both relatively small countries reliant on trade, and a quality FTA will be mutually beneficial.

Mr Ahn also mentioned the working holiday scheme open to Koreans who wish to travel and work in New Zealand. The scheme is very popular amongst young Koreans, and Korea would like to see the available number of places in it raised. He also thanked New Zealand for our support of Korea’s successful bid to gain a non-permanent seat on the United Nations Security Council (UNSC).

The meeting was concluded by Ambassador Rata expressing his appreciation to Mr Ahn for facilitating the excellent engagement New Zealand enjoys with the Foreign Affairs, Trade and Unification Committee. Both sides agreed that strengthening the parliamentary relationship can only be of benefit to the pursuit of our wider bilateral goals.

Meeting with the Deputy Speaker

We finished our first day of parliamentary meetings with a call on the Deputy Speaker of the National Assembly, Lee Byung-suk. Mr Lee was the official host of our visit to Korea.

The Deputy Speaker again mentioned New Zealand’s on-going contribution to monitoring security on the Korean peninsula, echoing earlier expressions of thanks for our contribution during the war. He also noted our support for Korea’s UNSC seat, and assured us that the Republic of Korea will offer the same support for New Zealand’s bid.
I took the opportunity to thank the Deputy Speaker for inviting us to Korea, noting that the programme prepared by his staff was excellent. I also congratulated him on Korea’s rapid rise to become one of the powerhouse economies of the Asia Pacific region. In this context, I expressed my belief that a FTA will be mutually beneficial and enhance the relationship between the two countries. Deputy Speaker Lee agreed, but asked for some patience while the remaining hurdles to resuming FTA negotiations were cleared.

The Deputy Speaker was also keen to stress that people-to-people exchanges are what will ultimately cement the relationship between Korea and New Zealand. I commented that in this regard the relationship is strong and growing, with two of New Zealand’s rising golf stars Danny Lee and Lydia Ko both hailing from Korea. There is also a growing expatriate Korean community in New Zealand, along with a large number of Korean students who have chosen New Zealand as their study destination. Mr Lee was pleased to hear this, and also noted the popularity of the working holiday scheme.

We then discussed employment rates in Korea. Employment was a major issue during the most recent election campaign and remains a “hot topic” for voters. The Deputy Speaker said that the unemployment rate of younger citizens is worrying, and reducing it will be a focus for the new government. More emphasis will be placed on supporting the growth in medium-sized businesses, a departure from previous policies that focussed almost exclusively on large business conglomerates such as Hyundai and Samsung. While the Korean people take great pride in the achievements of these companies, perhaps a more balanced approach is needed.

We left the Deputy Speaker with a token of our appreciation from the New Zealand Parliament, and looked forward to meeting him again that evening for dinner along with some of his colleagues from the National Assembly.

Meeting with Deputy Speaker of the National Assembly Lee Byung-suk

Meeting with the Speaker of the National Assembly

The following day the delegation called on the Speaker of the National Assembly, Kang Chang-hee.
Mr Kang said that he had visited New Zealand in a private capacity three times and has a great appreciation of the country. He again mentioned the New Zealand contribution to the Korean War, and hopes that New Zealand veterans will travel to Seoul later in the year to commemorate the 60th anniversary of the conflict. He noted in particular that the assistance of New Zealand and the other UNMAC member countries had allowed the Republic of Korea to rebuild and prosper in the post-conflict years. I assured Mr Kang that New Zealand would be sending a full delegation to the commemorations, no doubt including a number of veterans.

I also took the opportunity to once again thank the National Assembly for hosting us in Korea, and also reiterated an invitation issued by the New Zealand Speaker in 2011 for his Korean counterpart to visit New Zealand. Mr Kang expressed his gratitude for the invitation and said that he would like to visit New Zealand in an official capacity in April 2014 to coincide with the opening of a new Antarctic research facility which Korea is establishing in Christchurch. He also issued an invitation for the new New Zealand Speaker to visit Korea. We agreed that any arrangements would be best made in due course through official channels.

The call on Mr Kang concluded our official parliamentary programme in Seoul.

Meetings and activities outside of the National Assembly

Along with parliamentary meetings, our programme included a number of meetings and site visits that reflected the interests of the delegation and exposed us to some of the impressive technology development taking place in Korea.

Samsung

We began our official programme by visiting the Samsung Electronics exhibition store. Samsung is one of Korea’s most successful businesses and a world leader in electronics. This allowed us a glimpse into the future, with many products on display that are yet to be released. Amongst them were integrated household networks, controlling and monitoring
the power use of every appliance. This type of technology will be increasingly valued and necessary as we seek to reduce and maximise the efficiency of energy consumption. We were also shown a highly networked and engaging “virtual classroom” in which teachers could monitor their students’ work in real time, and students would have access to knowledge resources as needed via the internet. The visit to Samsung exposed the delegation to some of the high-tech innovations that have become synonymous with Korea in the last decade, and gave us an insight into how these advances will be integrated into daily life in the very near future.

K-Biz

K-Biz is the Korean federation of small and medium businesses. This call was an opportunity to hear about the challenges faced by small and medium-sized enterprises (SMEs) in Korea, and the efforts to support their growth. Korea’s economic development has been driven by government-supported growth of the now huge chaebol conglomerates (such as Hyundai and Samsung), and attention is now turning to other areas of the economy. Many of the challenges faced by Korean SMEs are similar to those faced by New Zealand companies, and our meeting was an opportunity to discuss the countries’ respective policies for fostering enterprise.

K-Biz represents some 3 million SMEs, and seeks to create a good business environment for its members, and to increase their competitiveness in the domestic and global marketplaces. Reconciling the positions of SMEs and the chaebol is a key challenge for the new Government in which K-Biz will be actively involved. We were hosted at K-Biz by Executive Vice Chairman Song Jae-hee rather than the chairman because he was meeting with the incoming Government that very morning. The reduction or removal of regulations that constrain SME growth is being discussed, and increased state support for SMEs. These initiatives were to begin following the inauguration of President Park.

Vice Chairman Song also expressed the desire of K-Biz members to see the re-invigoration of FTA talks between New Zealand and Korea, to increase potential export growth for Korean SMEs, to the benefit of both countries.
Korea and Seoul Chambers of Commerce and Industry

Our next meeting was with Executive Vice Chairman Lee Dong-geun of the Korea and Seoul Chambers of Commerce and Industry (KCCI). KCCI is Korea’s largest private economic organisation, and encompasses 71 regional chambers and approximately 135,000 members from all parts of the Korean economy. The objectives of KCCI are to promote improvement and development in Korea’s commerce and industry, grow the national economy, and enhance Korea’s status in the international community.

Mr Lee commented on the stalled FTA talks, saying that while most of KCCI’s members would support a successful resumption, agricultural interests remain a source of opposition. I commented that New Zealand did not see our products as competing head to head with Korean producers, but rather with other countries that already have FTAs with Korea, and that our seasonal difference could be complimentary for Korean consumers. Mr Lee acknowledged this, but also said that the perception of FTAs was still one of risk to Korea’s agricultural products. Such agreements always require some patience and compromise, and Mr Lee was confident of a successful outcome once negotiations resume.

Dongdaemun Environmental Resources Centre

This site visit allowed us to see some of the efforts to deal with Seoul’s mounting waste disposal issue. The centre is situated in the middle of a busy retail and residential area of the city. Perhaps surprisingly, the large waste processing facility did not present problems in this location, or create an eye-sore.

The facility is cleverly concealed under a well-manicured park, children’s playground and community exercise area; and from the outside there is no noticeable odour or indication (other than signage) of what is happening beneath. The main processing unit itself functions like a giant artificial stomach, with food waste going in one end and usable composting material coming out the other. While the single facility barely makes a dent in Seoul’s mountain of food waste, the centre is a great example of potential solutions in the limited spaces available to urban planners. A handful of such sites are in operation, and many more are planned.

Roundtable discussion with the Kiwi Chamber of Commerce

This meeting was an opportunity for the delegation to learn about New Zealand business links with Korea, with direct feedback from the business people involved on the challenges and opportunities for New Zealand in the Korean market. About 20 members of the Kiwi Chamber attended the meeting, representing a cross section of New Zealand business interests in Korea, including New Zealand businesspeople, Korean business people with a New Zealand business connection, and New Zealand companies with a presence in Korea.

Several Kiwi Chamber members delivered short presentations on the topics Trade and Economics and Environment and Sustainability. Members of the delegation were then asked to offer comment on what New Zealand has to offer in Korea, based on their knowledge of New Zealand and impressions of Korea, in response to remarks by Kiwi Chamber members. This was an engaging format with lively discussions that allowed all of the New Zealand parliamentarians ample opportunity to participate.
What was made clear to the delegation is that Korea presents very good prospects for New Zealand business, particularly for premium agricultural and processed food and beverage products, but that New Zealand needs to create a stronger “brand” in the Korean market. While we greatly value and need Korea as an export destination (it is our fifth-largest trading partner), we need to better ensure that Korea also sees the benefit to their consumers and businesses in trading with us.

**Visit to the De-militarised Zone**

Before our final meeting with the Speaker, we had the opportunity to visit the De-militarised Zone (DMZ), the buffer zone between North and South Korea that divides the two states along the 38th parallel. Since 2005, the New Zealand Defence Force has had three officers deployed to UNCMAC, two based in the DMZ as military observers, and an operations officer working in UNCMAC headquarters at Yongsan base, the principal US military garrison in Seoul. New Zealand also has a permanent Defence Attaché to the Republic of Korea, based in Seoul. The four NZDF officers work alongside the senior US and Korean military commanders to implement the terms and obligations of the ceasefire, under the 1953 Korean War Armistice Agreement. We were lucky to be accompanied and hosted throughout our visit to the DMZ by New Zealand’s Defence Attaché, Colonel Jeremy Ramsden.

Our visit to the DMZ demonstrated to us first-hand the reality of Korea’s existence as a divided country, with a looming military threat just 40 kilometres north of Seoul. This has come even more clearly into focus since the time of our visit, with escalating tensions between the two Koreas and their allies raising the possibility of renewed military conflict. This year marks the 60th anniversary of the Korean War, which caused the loss of hundreds of thousands of lives on both sides, we can only hope that diplomacy prevails and that North and South Korea can make a swift return to peaceful negotiations.

We ended our time in Korea with an informal debrief over dinner, hosted by the ambassador, His Excellency Patrick Rata, at his residence, giving the delegation a chance to reflect on a busy and productive three days. Again, I would like to commend the
ambassador and his staff for their excellent facilitation and support during our time in Seoul.

21st Meeting of the Asia-Pacific Parliamentary Forum

General

The Asia-Pacific Parliamentary Forum (APPF) is a forum of national parliamentarians of the Asia-Pacific region, which seeks to

- identify and discuss matters of common concern and interest in a global context
- deepen their understanding of the policy concerns, interests, and experiences of the countries of the region
- examine the critical political, social, and cultural developments resulting from economic growth and integration
- encourage and promote regional cooperation at all levels on matters of common concern
- further in their respective countries a sense of regional cohesion, understanding, and cooperation.

The APPF acts to promote regional identification and cooperation, with particular focus on

- cooperation for the further advancement of peace, freedom, democracy, and prosperity
- open and non-exclusive cooperation for the expansion of free trade and investment, and sustainable development and sound environmental practices
- non-military cooperation, giving due consideration to issues relating to regional peace and security.

The APPF expresses its views on these issues and the positions of the parliamentarians of the Asia-Pacific region through resolutions and a joint communiqué signed by all the heads of delegation.

To a great extent, the APPF acts as the parliamentary branch of Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation, and keeps close ties with other regional integration institutions such as the Association of Southeast Asian Nations, the South Pacific Forum, the Pacific Economic Cooperation Council, and the Pacific Basin Economic Council, even though it maintains an independent agenda. 27 national parliaments are current members of the APPF.

21st Annual Meeting of the APPF

Parliaments from 23 member countries participated in the 21st Annual Meeting of the Asia-Pacific Forum in Vladivostok, the Russian Federation. Afghanistan and Kazakhstan participated as special guests at the invitation of the Executive Committee.

All the delegation members delivered speeches in the plenary sessions and represented New Zealand at the Drafting Committee and other meetings. I also attended the Executive Committee meeting.
Executive Committee

The Executive Committee met on Sunday 27 January and was chaired by Mr Ilyias Umakhanov, Vice-Chairperson of the Council of the Federation of the Federal Assembly on behalf of HE Ms Valentina Matvienko, President of the 21st APPF and Chairperson of the Council of the Federation of the Federal Assembly of the Russian Federation.

I represented the Oceania region, along with its other nominated representative, Micronesia.

The Executive Committee discussed and adopted the forum’s agenda and programme of activities, the election of chair and vice-chairs of the drafting committees, the time limit for speeches, and the date of the 22nd Annual Meeting. It also acknowledged the draft resolutions submitted by the national delegations. The minutes of the Executive Committee meeting are attached as Appendix 4.

Plenary sessions

The plenary sessions of the 21st APPF took place from Monday 28 to Wednesday 30 January. The delegates exchanged views on agenda items, which were grouped in four broad categories:

1) Political and security matters in the Asia-Pacific region
2) Economic and trade matters in the Asia-Pacific region
3) Regional cooperation in the Asia-Pacific region
4) The future work of the APPF.

Members of the New Zealand delegation presented their views in three of the plenary sessions. These sessions were also opportunities for the delegation to become more informed on the major topics.
First plenary session: political and security matters in the Asia-Pacific region

The first plenary session focused on political and security matters in the Asia-Pacific region:

- Peace and stability in the Asia-Pacific region: strengthening of democracy, respect for sovereignty and prospects of building up a regional collective security system.
- Fighting against terrorism, drug trafficking and organised crime.
- Developments in the Middle East and in North Africa: potential challenges to the global and regional stability.
- Parliamentary diplomacy: challenges and perspectives.

Iain Lees-Galloway spoke on the topic of Peace and Stability in the Asia Pacific region. His speech is attached as Appendix 5.

Second plenary session: economic and trade matters in the Asia-Pacific region

The second plenary session focused on:

- APEC 2012 (report of the Russian delegation on the results of the APEC Summit in Vladivostok)
- Parliamentary dimension of trade and economic cooperation and integration processes in the Asia-Pacific Region, taking into account the WTO aspect.
- Development of transport infrastructure and modern logistics centres.
- Intensive cooperation for insuring the innovative growth.
- Strengthening of food security.

I spoke on promoting economic development and free trade, and my speech is attached as Appendix 6.

Third plenary session: regional cooperation in the Asia-Pacific region

The third plenary session agenda topics were as follows:

- Dialogue of civilisations, promotion of cultural, educational and humanitarian contacts, harmonisation of youth policy, migration processes.
- Problems of poverty eradication, sustainable social security in the context of global financial imbalances.
- Energy security, energy dialogue and energy efficiency.
- Cooperation in disaster prevention and disaster management, environmental protection.

Denise Roche delivered speeches on the problems of poverty eradication, sustainable social security in the context of global financial imbalances, and cooperation in disaster prevention and disaster management and environmental protection; copies of these are attached as Appendices 7 and 8. It should be noted that Denise’s second speech in particular received much acclaim from the other delegates, with many coming to congratulate her after her speech and some asking for copies of it.
Fourth plenary session: Future work of the APPF

Mexico was confirmed as the venue for the 22nd Annual Meeting of the APPF, which will be held from 12 to 16 January 2014.

Adoption of resolutions and joint communiqué

The joint communiqué, which included 14 resolutions, was adopted and signed by the heads of delegations and is attached as Appendix 9. The resolution on trade and economic cooperation in the Asia-Pacific region, co-sponsored by New Zealand, was adopted as Resolution 7. It is included as Appendix 10.

The closing ceremony followed, with a closing speech by Chairman Mativienko and an address by Senator Teófilo Torres Corzo, the head of the Mexico delegation, on behalf of the incoming President and host of the 22nd Annual Meeting of the APPF, HE Francisco Arroyo, President of the Chamber of Deputies Directive Board of the Congress of the Union of Mexico.

Other meetings

Meeting of Young Parliamentarians

At this year’s APPF a new grouping of young parliamentarians within the organisation met for the first time. Iain Lees-Galloway represented New Zealand to discuss youth issues shared by all countries. With youth engagement and youth unemployment looming as major issues for the region, the meeting of young parliamentarians should emerge as an important forum for the APPF.

Meetings of the Drafting Committee

The Drafting Committee meetings ran concurrently with the plenary sessions on Monday 28 to Wednesday 30 January. I undertook the role of New Zealand’s representative at the
Drafting Committee. Iain Lees-Galloway attended the meeting in my place whenever I was required to speak in the plenary sessions or elsewhere.

A total of 38 draft resolutions were lodged, and subsequently referred to topical working groups, which developed an agreed version of each resolution for discussion at the Drafting Committee.

New Zealand sponsored a resolution on trade and economic cooperation in the Asia-Pacific region and I participated in the working group meeting to discuss this resolution, along with MPs from Chile, Ecuador, Japan, Mexico, the Republic of Korea and the Russian Federation.

**Bilateral Meetings**

We were approached by the Mexican delegation for a bilateral meeting, which took place on Wednesday 30 January.

The meeting centred mainly on possibilities for agricultural cooperation and exchange between New Zealand and Mexico. There appears to be some potential for crop research and also livestock genetics. I offered to act as a link should any of the Senators present wish to follow this matter up.

We also had a brief discussion around the Trans Pacific Partnership, and expressed our gratitude for Mexico agreeing to host the APPF in January 2014.
obviously has an in-depth knowledge of the APPF and a wealth of experience to share with other members. Both sides mentioned the FTA, the Russian side conceding that a swift conclusion to negotiations is in the best interests of both countries.

It was clear from our meeting that New Zealand’s agricultural expertise and reputation as a safe food producing nation is highly regarded in Russia, with a comment that New Zealand sets the benchmark in quality. The Russian participants also expressed a desire for more cultural and educational exchange, which I assured them was mutual.

Ms Orlova is a current World and Olympic champion speed skater, and as such is keen to promote healthier lifestyles for young Russians. The 2011 Rugby World Cup was briefly mentioned in the context of the Russian team’s participation, and she hoped that sporting exchanges between our two countries would also increase in the future.

I concluded the meeting by passing on the best wishes of the New Zealand Ambassador in Moscow, and by thanking our hosts for their gracious hospitality and congratulating them on a highly successful 21st APPF.

Conclusions

Republic of Korea

The delegation was grateful for the opportunity to visit the Republic of Korea at the invitation of the Deputy Speaker, Mr Lee. Our meetings with him and the Speaker, Mr Kang, and with the chairs of committees and the Korea–New Zealand Parliamentary Friendship Group, highlighted the strong historical links and good will between our two countries. While both countries hope to see an increase in trade and people-to-people exchange, we feel that the relationship is in good health and has a strong platform for expansion.

Korea views parliamentary exchanges as an important means of maintaining the long-term relationship between the two countries. A wish for more parliamentary exchange was reiterated on several occasions, and it is hoped that the Speaker will visit New Zealand in the near future.

Our meetings outside of the National Assembly gave us an insight into some of the issues facing Korean business, and the exciting innovations in its technology sector; while our visit to the DMZ was a sobering experience, which has now taken on further significance because of the rising tensions on the Korean Peninsula.

The delegation would like to record its gratitude to the National Assembly of the Republic of Korea for its generous hospitality and for arranging a very relevant and interesting programme, and to the New Zealand Ambassador, Mr Patrick Rata, the Second Secretary, Charles Boulton, and the Political Advisor, Moon Sun-Hee, and the other staff members of the New Zealand Embassy for their invaluable assistance to the delegation.

21st Annual Meeting of the APPF

The 21st APPF comprised a full program of meetings and formal social activities. The New Zealand delegation contributed to all aspects of the forum, including debate in the plenary
sessions, negotiations on draft resolutions in working groups, and the work of the Drafting Committee throughout.

The forum provided a valuable opportunity for parliamentarians from the attending Asia-Pacific nations to work together to gain an understanding of each other’s perspectives on a wide range of international issues. This was especially true for Denise Roche and Iain Lees-Galloway, both of whom are relatively new members of Parliament, for whom representing New Zealand at the APPF was a valuable experience.

Notwithstanding the diplomatic delicacy of some matters, such as the recent tension on the Korean Peninsula and territorial disputes in the South China Sea, considerable goodwill was evident between participants, and constructive efforts resulted in resolutions being adopted on all conference topics.

Participants also welcomed the opportunity to establish or renew contacts with representatives from delegations attending the APPF, and I believe that these connections will prove valuable in the future as other challenging international issues arise.

The warm hospitality of our Russian hosts was greatly appreciated, and all members of the New Zealand delegation enjoyed our time in Vladivostok.

Lindsay Tisch
Assistant Speaker of the House of Representative
## Appendix 1 – Korea Programme

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tuesday 22 January</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17:45</td>
<td>Arrive Incheon Airport KE130 from Auckland. Met at Gate by Lim Jin-pyo, Advisory Ambassador to National Assembly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Wednesday 23 January</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:30</td>
<td>Depart from Lotte hotel for Samsung Electronics Headquarters in Seocho</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:30-11:30</td>
<td>Samsung Electronics Headquarters Seocho.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:00</td>
<td>Luncheon hosted by Representative Yoo Jeong-bok, President of Korea-New Zealand Parliamentary Friendship Group. Attendees: Rep Kim Tae-won, Vice president of Group, and Rep Shin Dong-woo, Member of Group. TBC: Rep Kim Yoon-deok, Member of Group.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14:00</td>
<td>Meeting with the Chair of the Health &amp; Welfare Committee, Oh Jae-sae.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15:00</td>
<td>Meeting with the Chair of the Foreign Affairs, Trade &amp; Unification Committee, Ahn Hong-joon (TBC).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16:00</td>
<td>Meeting with the Chair of the Environment &amp; Labour Committee, Shin Gye-ryeun.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16:30</td>
<td>National Assembly Tour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Event</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17:00</td>
<td>Meeting with Deputy Speaker Lee Byung-suk.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18:00</td>
<td>Dinner hosted by Deputy Speaker Lee Byung-suk. Attendees: Rep Kim Jong-hoon and Rep Chun Soon-ok.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday 24 January</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:00-9:30</td>
<td>Breakfast Roundtable hosted by the Kiwi Chamber of Commerce.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:00</td>
<td>Meeting with the Deputy Chair of K-Biz, Song Jae-hee. Yoido.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:30</td>
<td>Visit to Noryangjin Fish Market</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14:00</td>
<td>Meeting with the Executive Vice Chair of the Korean Chamber of Commerce &amp; Industry, Lee Dong-geun.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15:30</td>
<td>Dongdaemun Environmental Resources Centre – Waste Management.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17:00</td>
<td>Dongdaemun Tesco. Representatives from Zespri will explain their experiences in the Korean market. Zespri Representatives: Peter Thomas Oh JinWoo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friday 25 January</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:00</td>
<td>Depart from Lotte hotel for DMZ.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Event</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:00-11:00</td>
<td>DMZ tour, accompanied by New Zealand Defence Attaché. Tour of DMZ will be conducted by NZDF officer seconded to UNCMAC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:00</td>
<td>Informal discussion of Korea’s defence policy and settings with Defence Attaché.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15:00</td>
<td>Courtesy Call on the Speaker of the National Assembly, H.E. Kang Chang-hee.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18:30</td>
<td>Farewell Dinner hosted by H.E. Ambassador Rata at New Zealand Residence.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Saturday 26 January**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>07:00</td>
<td>Depart hotel for airport</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09:45</td>
<td>Depart Incheon Airport KE981 to Vladivostok</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 2 – APPF Programme

Sunday, January 27, 2013

Arrival of the delegations at the international airport of Vladivostok, transfer to the hotel, registration of the delegates in the hotel lobby

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING

Discussion and adoption of:
- the agenda of the session
- the program of events

20:00 WELCOME RECEPTION FOR THE GUESTS
on behalf of the Governor of the Primorsky Krai

Monday, January 28, 2013

09:00 Gathering in the lobby of the hotel and transfer to the venue of the opening ceremony

OPENING CEREMONY
- welcome address by H.E. Ms. Valentina Matvienko, Chairperson of the Council of the Federation of the Federal Assembly of the Russian Federation, President of the APPF
- statement by the Leadership of the Russian Federation (to be confirmed)
- statement by H.E. Mr. Yasuhiro Nakasone, Honorary President of the APPF (to be confirmed)
- statement by the Leader of the Japanese Delegation
- photo session (Leaders of the Delegations)

11:00-11:30 Coffee break

11:30- FIRST PLENARY SESSION
13:00 Section I: Political and Security Matters

13:00 - Lunch
14:15

14:15 DRAFTING COMMITTEE MEETING

14:15 - FIRST PLENARY SESSION (continued)
16:00 Section I: Political and Security Matters

16:00 - Coffee break
16:15

16:15- FIRST PLENARY SESSION (continued)
Section I: Political and Security Matters

19:30 Reception hosted by the Delegation of the Russian Federation in honor of the national delegations

Tuesday, January 29, 2013

09:00 - SECOND PLENARY SESSION
10:30 Section II: Economy and Trade Matters

09:00 DRAFTING COMMITTEE MEETING

10:30 - Coffee break
10:45 - SECOND PLENARY SESSION (continued)
12:45 Section II: Economy and Trade Matters

13:00 Lunch
14:15

14:15 DRAFTING COMMITTEE MEETING

14:15 - SECOND PLENARY SESSION (continued)
15:30 Section II: Economy and Trade Matters

15:30 - Coffee break
15:45

15:45 DRAFTING COMMITTEE MEETING

15:45 - THIRD PLENARY SESSION
17:45 Section III: Regional Cooperation in Asia Pacific

18:00 PRESENTATION OF THE PROGRAMS OF DEVELOPMENT AND INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION OF THE RUSSIAN REGIONS OF SIBERIA AND THE FAR EAST
19:30

PRESENTATION OF THE EDUCATION AND RESEARCH PROGRAMS

20:00 Dinner. Concert Program.

Wednesday, January 30, 2013

09:00 - THIRD PLENARY SESSION (continued)
11:00 Section III: Regional Cooperation in Asia Pacific

09:00 DRAFTING COMMITTEE MEETING
11:00

11:00 Coffee break
11:15
ROUND TABLE (ASIA PACIFIC – EUROPE: NEW HORIZONS FOR COOPERATION) with participation of the members of delegations and special representatives (observers) from the Inter-Parliamentary Assembly of Member Nations of the Commonwealth of Independent States, Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe, OSCE Parliamentary Assembly, Inter-Parliamentary Union, Asian Parliamentary Assembly and other international parliamentary organizations

11:15 - MEETING OF THE YOUNG PARLIAMENTARIANS FROM THE ASIA-PACIFIC REGION

13:30 - DRAFTING COMMITTEE MEETING (completion of work on final documents)

11:15 - Lunch

13:30 - Coffee break

15:00 - FOURTH PLENARY SESSION

16:30 - Section IV: Further work of the APPF

16:45 - FIFTH PLENARY SESSION

17:00 - Adoption of the Resolutions and the Joint Statement

17:45 - Signature of the Joint Statement by the leaders of the delegations

CLOSING CEREMONY

17:45 PRESS CONFERENCE

Reception hosted by H.E. Ms. Valentina Matvienko, Chairperson of the Council of the Federation of the Federal Assembly of the Russian Federation, President of the APPF

19:00 Gala-concert

Thursday, January 31, 2013

Departure of the delegations
Appendix 3 – Press Releases

21 January 2013

New Zealand parliamentarians to undertake bilateral visit and attend regional parliamentary forum

New Zealand members of parliament Lindsay Tisch, Iain Lees-Galloway and Denise Roche are this week to undertake a bilateral visit to the Republic of Korea before attending the 21st Asia-Pacific Parliamentary Forum (APPF) in Vladivostok, the Russian Federation.

The APPF is a forum for parliamentarians from the Asia-Pacific region who meet to identify and discuss issues of mutual concern, with the aim of strengthening understanding and encouraging regional cooperation. The APPF supports other regional cooperation vehicles such as APEC, and New Zealand hosted its annual meeting in 2008.

There are 27 member countries, and the discussion agenda focuses on regional political and security matters, economics and trade, and regional cooperation between the member states. All the New Zealand delegates hope to deliver speeches over the course of the event, and New Zealand is also sponsoring a draft resolution supporting trade in the region.

Prior to attending the APPF, the delegation will make a three-day visit to the Republic of Korea. The focus is to build relationships between the two parliaments, and to reinforce New Zealand’s commitment to the bilateral partnership with the Republic of Korea. Meetings will include a call on the Speaker, discussions with select committees and the New Zealand – Republic of Korea Parliamentary Friendship Group, and various site visits.

The Speaker of the House, Dr The Rt Hon Lockwood Smith, said the bilateral visit and attendance at the APPF is a valuable opportunity for the parliamentarians and of wider benefit to New Zealand.

“Inter-parliamentary relationships strengthen New Zealand’s international profile, build links between nations, and provide opportunities for New Zealand parliamentarians to engage on the global stage.

I am particularly pleased to see a delegation visiting the Republic of Korea as we have recently marked 50 years of bilateral engagement between our two countries. The APPF is also a significant international organisation that contributes to matters of regional importance, including supporting the work of APEC. I am sure that the delegates will represent New Zealand well at the upcoming deliberations in Vladivostok.”

The bilateral visit to the Republic of Korea takes place from 23 to 25 January, with the APPF taking place from 27 to 31 January.

ENDS
New Zealand Parliamentarians take the stage at Asia-Pacific Forum

A delegation of New Zealand Parliamentarians has been engaging in the deliberations of the 21st Asia-Pacific Parliamentary Forum (APPF) being held in Vladivostok this week. The Forum brings together delegates from over 30 countries in the Asia Pacific region to discuss issues such as regional stability, trade, and regional cooperation.

New Zealand is represented at this year’s APPF by Members of Parliament Lindsay Tisch, Iain Lees-Galloway and Denise Roche. Delegation leader Lindsay Tisch, who has been participating in the Forum since 2004, says that it provides a valuable and useful opportunity for parliamentarians from across the region to engage in dialogue on regional issues, as well as helping to form stronger links between countries.

“The APPF is an annual event that gives New Zealand a chance to engage with key partners and other countries in our region, as well as enabling New Zealand parliamentarians’ exposure to an international audience. Our delegation represents a range of views across our Parliament, but we all have the same goal of supporting New Zealand’s relationships and interests in the region”, said Mr Tisch.

First time attendees Denise Roche and Iain Lees-Galloway have valued the opportunity to participate in a significant regional forum, with both giving plenary speeches and engaging in working groups tasked with agreeing on resolutions stemming from the meeting.

“It has been a stimulating forum, with a lot of opportunity to meet and engage with colleagues from other Parliaments in the Asia Pacific. The forum has also provided a chance for less experienced parliamentarians such as Iain and myself to speak to issues of regional significance in an international forum. I’ve been impressed with the high profile and respect that New Zealand enjoys in the APPF”, says Ms Roche.

This year also sees a new grouping within the APPF of young parliamentarians meet for the first time. Palmerston North MP Iain Lees-Galloway says that this will be a good chance to discuss youth issues shared by all countries.

“Increasing youth engagement and combating youth unemployment are looming as major issues for our region, and indeed the globe. This meeting of young parliamentarians will be an important forum for discussions, and I’m looking forward to sharing my ideas around how we might improve youth outcomes in a proactive and effective way”, says Mr Lees-Galloway.

Prior to attending the APPF, the delegation undertook a series of bilateral meetings with senior parliamentarians in the Republic of Korea, culminating in a meeting with the Speaker of the National Assembly. Korea is New Zealand’s fifth largest trading partner, and the two countries are soon intending to re-start stalled free trade negotiations. Along with discussions centred on trade, health and labour issues, the talks also included discussions on sustainability, waste management and the environment.

The APPF runs until 31 January.

ENDS
Appendix 4 – Minutes of the Executive Committee Meeting

The Asia-Pacific Parliamentary Forum Executive Committee Meeting was held in Vladivostok on 27 January 2013. Participants included representatives of the Executive Committee member countries, namely: Canada, Chile, China, Indonesia, Japan, Malaysia, Micronesia, New Zealand and the Russian Federation. The host countries of the next and the following APPF Annual Meetings, Mexico and Ecuador, were also represented.

By the assignment of H.E. Ms. Valentina Matvienko, Chairperson of the Council of Federation of the Federal Assembly of the Russian Federation and President of the Asia Pacific Parliamentary Forum, the meeting was chaired by Hon. Mr. Ilyas Umakhanov, Deputy Chairman of the Council of Federation of the Federal Assembly of the Russian Federation.

The Executive Committee resolved that:

1. The Agenda of the 21st Annual Meeting of the APPF, as set out in Annex 1 be adopted;

2. The Program of Work for the 21st Annual Meeting of the APPF as set out in Annex 2 be adopted;

3. In compliance with clauses 15 and 17 of the Rules of Procedure of APPF Hon. Mr. Ilyas Umakhanov, Deputy Chairman of the Council of Federation of the Federal Assembly of the Russian Federation be the Chairman of the 21st Annual Meeting of the APPF, and Hon. Ms. Svetlana Orlova, Deputy Chairperson of the Council of Federation of the Federal Assembly of the Russian Federation, Hon. Mr. Vyacheslav Shtyrov, Deputy Chairman of the Council of Federation of the Federal Assembly of the Russian Federation, and Hon. Mr. Sergey Zheleznyak, Deputy Chairman of the State Duma of the Federal Assembly of the Russian Federation, be Deputes of the Chairman of the 21st Annual Meeting of the APPF to preside at the plenary sessions on 29 and 30 January 2013. The order of business be: the time limit for registered speakers at the plenary sessions is 7 minutes for speeches and 5 minutes for participants in the debate. The list of speakers be arranged by the Chairperson basing on the requests submitted by the Secretaries of the national Delegations through the Secretariat of the Annual Meeting, the timetable of the scheduled bilateral meetings may be taken into consideration. The Chairperson of the plenary session may give the floor to the guests of the Annual Meeting to address the subject items of the Agenda up to 5 or 7 minutes.

4. The Draft Resolutions submitted by member delegations to the 21st Annual Meeting of the APPF, as set out in Annex 3 be adopted for consideration in the Annual Meeting. The Drafting Committee be established and commence work on 28 January 2013;

5. Mr. Andrey Klimov, Deputy Chairman of the Council of Federation Committee for Foreign Affairs, be the Chairperson of the Drafting Committee. The working groups be established by the Drafting Committee.
6. The subregion countries groups, which have not yet done so, be recommended to hold in the course of the 21st Annual Meeting of the APPF the consultations regarding the appointment of their representative members of the Executive Committee from the year 2013. To ensure succession one of the current members could continue the membership for two remaining years, and the second one, a new representative, could be elected for full four years term. The results of such consultations of the subregion countries groups be reported at the fourth plenary session of the 21st Annual Meeting of the APPF.

7. The Executive Committee unanimously welcomed the proposals of Ecuador and Mexico to host the forthcoming APPF Annual Meetings. In compliance with Article 20 of the APPF Rules of Procedure, the Executive Committee fully approved their mutual concord on Mexico to host the 22nd Annual Meeting of the APPF in 2014 and Ecuador to host the 23rd Annual Meeting of the APPF in 2015.
Appendix 5 – Speech by Iain Lees-Galloway

Speech to the 21st meeting of the Asia-Pacific Parliamentary Forum

Vladivostok, Russian Federation 27-30 January 2013

Mister Chair, fellow delegates, thank you for the opportunity to address the issues of peace and stability in our region from the New Zealand perspective.

I would like to acknowledge the Russian Federation for their efficient hosting of this forum and the warm hospitality extended to our delegation.

Colleagues: A recent recruitment campaign for the Royal New Zealand Navy reminded New Zealanders of some of the lesser-known verses of our National Anthem:

Peace, not War shall be our boast,
But, should foes assail our coast,
Make us then a mighty host.
God defend our free land.

It is our very good fortune that there has never been a call upon us to become a mighty host. Not since the days of colonisation have foreign forces entered our lands without invitation.

It seems there is something to be said for living on a distant group of islands perceived by most to be of negligible strategic value.

Peace at home is certainly our boast. But we do not take that peace for granted. We have bled in foreign lands, alongside you, to ensure that peace reigns throughout our region and across our planet.

It was once true that New Zealand fought for peace out of a sense of obligation to the British Empire and Commonwealth. Our soldiers fought and died in Europe, not the Pacific.

But since the end of the Second World War a growing awareness of our own independence and the contribution we can make as an active participant in the stability and security of our region has led us to take part in operations in Korea, Malaya and more recently in Afghanistan, Timor-Leste and the Solomon Islands.

We are small and free from conflict and acts of terror but that is no excuse for complacency and no excuse to leave our friends unaided when we have the capacity to support them in a just cause.

We are proud to work alongside our friends and allies. And we are pleased to be an active and contributing participant in the organisations and structures that allow us all to safeguard peace and security by working together.

We fiercely guard our status as an independent nation-state with an independent foreign policy that articulates our independent point-of-view.
That was most evident in our decision to declare our nation nuclear free. Our position at the vanguard of nuclear non-proliferation put considerable strain on our relationship with our close friend the United States.

But we did it anyway because we believe in the right of nations to determine their own policies without fear of interference.

Over time, particularly over the last 10 years, the relationship between New Zealand and the United States has been rebuilt through diplomacy and a recognition of shared global interests. Recently, US Marines participated in exercises with the New Zealand Army and our Air Force and Navy participated in RIMPAC.

Nevertheless, our nuclear free status remains firm.

We make our own decisions about the operations we participate in, while being an engaged member of regional and global organisations.

ASEAN, the APT, APEC and the EAC provide a robust institutional architecture to support the pursuit of closer economic relationships and equitable access to markets across our region.

New Zealand shares the desire expressed by many nations for an equally robust institutional architecture to support the pursuit of security, stability and peace in our region.

We must continue our commitment to the EAS, ARF and ADMM+ and seek to strengthen our regional structures to enhance our regional security.

In doing so, we must make paramount the principles on which our co-operation is based:

Mutual respect for the independence, sovereignty, equality, territorial integrity and national identity of all nations;

The right of every state to lead its national existence free from external interference, subversion or coercion;

Non-interference in the internal affairs of one another;

Settlement of differences or disputes by peaceful means;

Renunciation of the threat or use of force; and

Effective cooperation amongst nations.

Cooperation is vital if we are to reach our full potential. No single nation should be expected to carry the burden of driving our security agenda alone.

It is incumbent upon each of us, whatever our size, whatever our population, to engage,
participate and continue to strive towards more effective preventative diplomacy and a better developed conflict management capacity.

Increasingly the pursuit of peace and security manifests in efforts to suppress organised crime and the use of terrorism for political gain.

Terrorism is like a disease. It can quickly spread if there is not a fast and decisive response.

Counter-terror operations are like the antibiotics or surgery that doctors use to stop a disease in its path. However these interventions, although absolutely necessary, are often costly and have other consequences that cause on-going complications for the patient.

It is much more effective to prevent the disease from taking hold in the first place.

Well nourished, prosperous people who have access to clean water, good sanitation, immunisation and adequate housing are better equipped to resist disease.

Likewise, societies in which all people experience real political and economic freedom as well as fair and equitable treatment by their justice system and have a genuine opportunity to express themselves, to be prosperous and get ahead in life are more resistant to the doctrine of extremism, criminal activity and the use of terror.

We must be ready to respond to terrorism and build the capacity to do so.

But we will gain much more if we also use all the political, economic and social resources available to us to create the conditions in which terrorism cannot thrive.

We must work together on this by advocating and supporting the advancement of democracy, freedom and human rights, expanding economic opportunities through trade and encouraging domestic policy settings that ensure all citizens tangibly reap the rewards of prosperity.

Colleagues: Peace, not war, shall be our collective boast if we all strive together and recognise the contribution that each and every one of us can make to creating a region that is safe, prosperous and full of hope for the future.

Thank you.

Iain Lees-Galloway, Member of Parliament, New Zealand
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Speech to the 21st meeting of the Asia-Pacific Parliamentary Forum

Vladivostok, Russian Federation 27-30 January 2013

Promoting Economic Partnership and Free Trade

Vladivostok, Russian Federation 27-30 January 2011 At the 20th Asia Pacific Economic Cooperation (APEC) Economic Leaders meeting in Vladivostok in September 2012, the APEC leaders recognised that robust international trade, investment and economic integration are key drivers of strong, sustainable and balanced growth. With all APEC countries now being members of the World Trade Organisation (WTO), the leaders reaffirmed their commitment to avoiding protectionist measures and continuing progress toward a Free Trade Area of the Asia-Pacific.

APEC represents a regional economic grouping of considerable economic and political significance. It provides a vehicle for regular contact at Ministerial and Leaders’ level with New Zealand’s key regional partners; it helps to advance New Zealand’s trade and economic interests by promoting trade and investment liberalisation, economic integration, structural reform and trade facilitation, counter terrorism and monitoring food security and it provides significant capacity building assistance to developing economies.

Governments have been responding to these changes through the negotiation of bilateral FTAs. FTAs have taken on particular significance given the difficulty of bringing the WTO’s Doha Development Agenda negotiations to a conclusion. However, the proliferation of bilateral agreements risks creating a “noodle bowl” of separate provisions which could work against the spread of regional production networks.

Trade and investments are propelling high growth in the Asia-Pacific region. As barriers to trade and investment have fallen, firms have increasingly spread their activity across borders. Free movement of goods, services, investment and intellectual property are increasingly important in the creation of “value chains” that are powering the regional economy.

To mitigate this downside of proliferating bilateral agreements, governments are pursuing other agreements with a wider range of members, ie. Plurilateral FTAs. The P4 agreement concluded by New Zealand with Brunei, Chile and Singapore was instrumental in opening the way to the Trans Pacific Partnership (TPP) negotiations, which now includes 11 countries. ASEAN members have built upon their own FTA, and their bilateral agreements with six other countries, to launch the Regional Comprehensive Partnership (RCEP) negotiations.

New Zealand is involved in both Trans Pacific Partnership (TPP) negotiations and the Regional Comprehensive Economic Partnership (RCEP). We seek high quality outcomes both as a means to safeguard our own trade interests, including agricultural products, and in recognition of the fact that comprehensive liberalisation provides the greatest welfare gains.

New Zealand sees both TPP and RCEP as potential stepping stones to a Free Trade Area of the Asia-Pacific (FTAAP).
The 21 member economies, of APEC, account for 40 percent of the world’s population, approximately 53 percent of the world’s gross domestic product, and 44 percent of international trade.

In recognising the current uncertainties in the global economy, the Leaders reaffirmed their pledge to refrain from introducing new barriers to investment or trade in goods and services through until the end of 2015. They also pledged not to impose new export restrictions, or implement WTO-inconsistent measures in all areas, including those which stimulate exports. The Leaders also pledged to roll-back such measures that have already been implemented.

**WTO Doha Update**

The World Trade Organisation (WTO) is an organisation of 157 member governments that negotiate together to liberalise barriers to international trade and establish and uphold international trade rules. Through our WTO membership, New Zealand benefits from clear trade rules that are applicable to all. Through the WTO’s multilateral trade negotiations, New Zealand is able to participate in broad and ambitious international trade gains (eg. Reductions in tariffs/import duties on our exports in third markets). The WTO also has an effective dispute settlement mechanism to resolve trade disputes between its members, which New Zealand has used to protect its interests.

The Doha Round (Doha) of WTO trade negotiations commenced in 2001 with the aim of further reducing trade barriers to goods and services’ trade amongst WTO members and assisting developing countries through trade liberalisation.

New Zealand has been actively involved in pursuing an ambitious and balanced conclusion to the negotiations. Doha has, however, been stalled due to disagreement on whether further concessions on agricultural and industrial market access should be offered, particularly by major developing countries. New Zealand has continued to work constructively with others to move the negotiations forward.

New Zealand believes that the legal framework of the WTO is of immense value in advancing global prosperity and resisting protectionist pressures during times of economic crisis. It must be supported and preserved despite the Doha impasse. The eventual successful conclusion of Doha is important for the long term health of the multilateral system. A patient, calibrated approach to seeking progress on Doha is necessary pending a more conducive political climate in key countries.

Lindsay Tisch, Assistant Speaker of the New Zealand House of Representatives
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Speech to the 21st meeting of the Asia-Pacific Parliamentary Forum

Vladivostok, Russian Federation 27-30 January 2013

Problems of poverty eradication, sustainable social security in the context of global financial imbalances.

The problems of poverty eradication and sustainable social security are not obliquely related to global financial imbalances they are the result of international and domestic inequality.

The international community might take some comfort from the reported steady decline in the numbers of world citizens living in absolute poverty, but delegates that comfort must be short lived for, while absolute economic poverty shows decline, world hunger is on the rise.

Poverty, hunger and lack of security are not mere economic or technical problems to be resolved within an existing order. These are fundamental and structural problems which are the symptoms of a much deeper inequality, the inequality of political rights.

It is no co-incidence that those most likely to suffer poverty, hunger and insecurity are women and children for these are the groups without access to political power.

If we travel to the poorest countries on earth we will find those who are blessed with power, - the political and business elites - are not poor, are not hungry and they have security.

If we travel to the richest nations we will also find amongst the homeless and the sick people who are poor, who are hungry, who lack security. We will find people unable to have their basic needs met, in a country of abundance.

Inequality between nations institutionalises underdevelopment and dependency and the last decade has seen the greatest increase in this corrosive inequality so that now after all our years of global co-operation the income gap between the richest and poorest countries has never been greater.

Similarly inequality within nations has soared - and in this unprecedented transfer of resources to the most wealthy a new orthodoxy has emerged. An order that suggests the very basic services required to combat inequality, - access to food, shelter, education and healthcare - might be less affordable and need to be rationed in this new age.

Critics would argue that a global economic order which has seen many governments retreat from economic governance, leaving this to market mechanisms which have concentrated rather than distributed wealth is an order which will destroy security. The emergence of a digital age which has revolutionised communications is shining a light on the murky dealings which have enriched the powerful and disenfranchised the poor.

Thirty five years ago the NZ economist Wolfgang Rosenberg wrote of “full employment as the fulcrum of the welfare state”. Applying his findings to a global stage we can see that
failing to encourage and allow a nation to work and trade condemns its citizens to a life without security. And the absence of security - combined with growing inequality - is a real threat to peace and development within nations and across the region.

Under Rosenberg’s model the greater access citizens have to work and income generation - the greater the capacity of the state to provide - and the less support needed by the citizen. The emphasis then would be on the creation of work not wealth. And with work comes the opportunities for organised labour and access to political power.

Returning again to the theme of political power, working to reduce inequalities in political power and access to resources is often the area we in governance avoid most.

Far easier, more tangible and sellable to work in more mechanistic ways, - a treaty here, an aid project there, - so much less controversial yet in respect of the lives of the powerless often ineffective.

The FAO estimate that the biggest single intervention to increase the supply and availability of food that we could make is within our grasp.

- It is not a new GE crop,
- Not a new wonder fertilizer
- Not a new tractor or trade deal

It would be to give the world’s women equal access to the means of food production (the land, tools, seeds and credit) as that enjoyed by men. Moreover that this increased production would have a significant impact on child health and education. Would that be so hard?

And yet it seems so for whenever we embark on a rights based approach to poverty elimination or universal social security it seems we run up against a problem, our problem, an existing economic order which concentrates resources and power in the hands of a few and suggests we should not intervene.

But failing to intervene has brought us increased inequality. It is time to hear less from those who have been enriched by this order. It is time to rebuild a governance of fairness of inclusion of mutual support and respect both within our nations and across our region.

For those who are least powerful - those excluded from economic and political power - are relying on us.

Denise Roche, Member of Parliament, New Zealand
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Speech to the 21st meeting of the Asia-Pacific Parliamentary Forum

Vladivostok, Russian Federation 27-30 January 2013

Cooperation in disaster prevention and disaster management and environmental protection

Mr Chairman, and colleagues from the Asia Pacific region:

Without a doubt cooperation between Asia Pacific nations is essential to ensure a rapid response in times of natural disasters. In fact, this is when we see cooperation between nation states at its best.

In our part of the world - in the Pacific - over the last few years many countries rallied to help during the 2010 Canterbury earthquake. A month later we went to help in the aftermath of the tsunami in Japan. Most recently we have been actively helping Samoa with the aftermath of Cyclone Evan that struck just before Christmas. Aside from the tragedy of the many lives lost to these disasters - the economic impact of these events has also been debilitating. According to the United Nations the cost of the Japanese tsunami is around US $210 billion; the Christchurch earthquake is NZ $17 billion and the Australian floods in December 2010 and January 2011 cost AUS $7.3 billion.

In NZ we recognise the importance of regional cooperation to create resilience in the face of disasters and have welcomed the 2008 Apec-wide strategy for risk reduction and emergency preparedness and response in the Asia-Pacific Region. We support the Hyogo Framework for Action and its five priorities that were set in place at the World Conference on Disaster Reduction in 2005.

One of the Hyogo Framework for Action priority areas is to address the underlying risk factors that contribute to natural disasters.

If we are to truly address disaster prevention then we do better around environmental protection. What we do to the environment has an impact on the weather – and for many of the smaller nation states of the Pacific climate change impacts like unpredictable weather and more extreme weather events and rising sea levels from global warming are the disasters that they face.

Developed nations like our own talk of building resilience to natural disasters. For many of the smaller Pacific states resilience is hard to achieve because their people live in poverty. And given the precariousness of their small local economies rebuilding after a natural disaster is frequently reliant on overseas aid – more so than for developed countries.

Oxfam NZ estimates that around one third of the entire population in the Pacific (approximately 2.7 million people) do not have the income or subsistence production to meet their basic needs. And within that sector of the poor – women are the poorest - as they face more discrimination.
The poorest people in our Pacific region rely on the land, on the water and on the climate to produce enough to provide an existence and their livelihood. The margin between survival and hardship is very slim.

It is a matter of concern and a matter of justice that our near-lying neighbours in the Pacific are amongst the first nations in the world to experience the terrors unleashed by manmade climate change. Our near Pacific neighbours are already suffering – with droughts in Kiribati, cyclones throughout Polynesia, king tides and crop failure from salination of fresh water supplies in atoll states across the Pacific. It is a huge injustice that these states are losing their birthright to their land-based cultures and their culture and language because the more powerful amongst us want to consume more.

And these are the least populated nations with the lowest carbon footprints – and yet they are the most effected by climate change - a problem not of their making and which they are powerless to defeat.

We have not taken disaster prevention and environmental protection seriously and we must do so. International climate change forums have not succeeded in halting the effects of climate change in the Pacific.

In 2010 a woman by the name of Ursula Rakova went to the Global Climate Change talks in Cancun to plead for action to address climate change. Ursula is from an island called Huena – part of the Cataret Islands which are part of Papua New Guinea. She described how the land is disappearing into the sea and trees are dying and falling down. Some report that the islands will be uninhabitable by 2015. Families are preparing to leave – which undermines their ability to feed themselves or create a living from their traditional lands.

Like the people of Tuvalu, of Kiribati, these are the first climate change refugees. And yet in the Asia-Pacific region we have the ability to cooperate to prevent this type of disaster by taking immediate action to seriously reduce our carbon emissions. We have a duty to help the most vulnerable in our region. That means not simply managing the disasters that happen to them but preventing disasters and creating climate stability by protecting our environment.

Denise Roche, Member of Parliament, New Zealand
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THE 21ST ANNUAL MEETING
OF THE ASIA PACIFIC PARLIAMENTARY FORUM

JOINT COMMUNIQUE

1. At the invitation of the Council of Federation of the Federal Assembly of the Russian Federation the 21st Annual Meeting of the Asia Pacific Parliamentary Forum (APPF) was held on 27-31 January 2013 in Vladivostok, Russia. 328 delegates from 23 APPF Member States and one Observer State attended the Annual Meeting. Representatives of the Parliaments of Afghanistan, Kazakhstan, and of UN, PACE, OSCE, IPA CIS, IPA EurAsEC, PABSEC and SCO also attended the meeting as guests. The list of participants is attached in Appendix 1.

2. The APPF Executive Committee convened on 27 January 2013 to approve the Agenda and the Program of Work of the Annual Meeting. The report of the Executive Committee meeting is attached in Appendix 2.

3. On 28 January 2013 the President of APPF and Chairperson of the Council of Federation of the Federal Assembly of the Russian Federation, Her Excellency Ms. Valentina Matvienko, accorded a warm welcome to all the participants and declared the Annual Meeting open. In her opening address, Her Excellency Ms. Valentina Matvienko highlighted that the region is in need of a new system of intergovernmental relationship with a view to strengthen peace and security, intensify nations’ development, ease the negative impact of climate change, ensure food and energy security, and enhance regional cooperation.

4. The President of the Russian Federation, His Excellency Mr. Vladimir Putin sent a Welcoming Address to all the delegates on the occasion of the inauguration of the APPF 21st Annual Meeting. Welcome message was also sent by His Excellency Mr. Ban Ki-moon, Secretary General of the United Nations Organization.
5. Special message from His Excellency Mr. Yasuhiro Nakasone, Honorary President of the APPF was delivered. Honorable Mr. Masahiro Imamura addressed the delegates as leader of the delegation of Japan, the country of the preceding APPF Presidency.

6. At the opening plenary session the report of the Executive Committee was adopted and approved by the Annual Meeting. On the agenda topic of political and security matters delegates engaged in wide-ranging discussions on strengthening peace and stability in the Asia Pacific region and prospects of establishing regional collective security system. Their discussions also focused on combating terrorism, illicit drug trafficking, human trafficking and organized crime. Delegates exchanged views on the challenges and the prospects for further development of the parliamentary diplomacy.

7. At the plenary session on economic and trade cooperation in Asia Pacific delegates welcomed the Asia Pacific Economic Cooperation 2012 Report by the Delegation of the Russian Federation. They discussed the global economic situation, development of transport infrastructure, cooperation for innovative growth, promoting economic partnership and free trade, and food security. Special attention was paid to the parliamentary dimension of trade and economic cooperation and integration processes in the Asia Pacific region.

8. At the plenary session on regional cooperation in the Asia Pacific delegates discussed and put forward resolutions on dialogue of civilizations, promotion of cultural, educational and humanitarian contacts, harmonization of youth policy, migration processes, energy security, cooperation in disaster management and environmental protection.

9. In course of the 21st Annual Meeting of the APPF the delegates were invited to take part in the round table discussion of the prospects of further cooperation between the Asia Pacific and Europe, including in a parliamentary dimension. Young
parliamentarians held their meeting on 30 January 2013 to discuss the matters of youth related politics and their harmonization in the Asia Pacific. Presentations of the international cooperation programs of the Russian Far East and Siberia and of the educational and scientific programs attracted the attention of the delegates. Those new features of the APPF meeting pattern were accepted as contributive and useful.

10. At the final plenary session the delegations reported on the progress of implementation of the New Rules of Procedure. Delegates discussed the future activities and the results of the reform of the APPF.

11. 21st Annual Meeting of the APPF adopted 14 resolutions based on the topics mentioned in the preceding paragraphs. The full list of resolutions adopted is attached in Appendix 3.

12. Delegates also accepted Mexico’s kind proposal to host the 22nd Annual Meeting of the APPF in Puerto Vallarta from 12 to 16 January 2014. They also acknowledged the proposal of Ecuador to host the 23rd Annual Meeting of the APPF in 2015.

13. At the conclusion of the Annual Meeting the Delegates thanked the Working Groups and the Drafting Committee for their efforts in developing the Joint Communiqué with related resolutions, which contributed to the successful outcome of the Meeting.

14. The Delegates expressed heartfelt gratitude and sincere appreciation to the Chairperson of the Council of Federation of the Federal Assembly of the Russian Federation, Her Excellency Ms. Valentina Matvienko for her presidency of the 21st Annual Meeting of the APPF and to the people of Russian Federation and citizens of Vladivostok in particular for their hospitality and to the Secretariat and the staff for their hard work and excellent arrangements.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Signature</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kingdom of Cambodia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Republic of Chile</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People’s Republic of China</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Republic of Costa Rica</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Republic of Ecuador</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Republic of Indonesia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Republic of Korea</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lao PDR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malaysia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federated States of Micronesia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Mongolia

New Zealand

Papua New Guinea

Republic of Philippines

Russian Federation

Republic of Singapore

Kingdom of Thailand

Socialist Republic of Vietnam

Brunei Darussalam (Observer)

Valentina Matvienko
President of the APPF
Appendix 10 – Resolution 7

TRADE AND ECONOMIC COOPERATION IN ASIA PACIFIC

Resolution
(Sponsored by Chile, Ecuador, Japan, New Zealand, Mexico, the Republic of Korea and the Russian Federation)

THE 21ST ANNUAL MEETING OF THE ASIA PACIFIC PARLIAMENTARY FORUM (APPF):

Noting the “Resolution on Economy and Trade” which was adopted at the 20th Annual Meeting of the APPF in January 2012, the “G20 Los Cabos Leaders Declaration” in June 2012, as well as the “Vladivostok Declaration” of the 20th APEC Economic Leaders’ Meeting in September 2012;

Affirming that global growth remains modest and pressures on the financial system pose further downside risks;

Confirming that protectionist measures in trade and investment can further jeopardize the world economy;

Recognizing the fact that although the Asia Pacific region has ensured its position as a vanguard of economic growth in the world, significant challenges have still to be addressed and new responsibilities for Asia Pacific nations are emerging;

Reconfirming that our priority task is supporting sustainable, balanced, inclusive and environmentally-friendly economic growth both in the region and in the world and ensuring the effectiveness of the international financial regulatory and supervisory system;

Reaffirming the commitments made in the Bogor Declaration adopted by APEC leaders in 1994 to achieving that goal of free and open trade and investment in the Asia-Pacific region, recognizing significant progress towards that goal, and hoping for its full achievement by 2020;
Aware of the support to be provided to different free trade schemes existing in the region through cooperation, reduction of tariff and non-tariff barriers, trade facilitation and investment;

Convinced that more action by the APPF Member States in negotiations related to economic integration and trade matters in the Asia Pacific region and in the multilateral system would definitely contribute to more social transparency, fairness and legitimacy;

Welcoming the successful completion of the WTO accession process by the Russian Federation and the Lao People’s Democratic Republic;

Resolves to:

1. Call upon the APPF Member States to continue to implement effective and sound fiscal and financial policies in order to respond to downside risks and ensure the stability of economies and employment, as well as to consider at different international forums coordinated efforts to establish various safety mechanisms and early warning systems both on regional and global levels to respond to possible financial risks;

2. Support the important role the WTO plays through the promotion and strengthening of the multilateral trading system and speedy conclusion of the Doha Development Round;

3. Support a pledge by APEC Economies’ Leaders to: refrain through the end of 2015 from raising new barriers to investment or to trade in goods and services, imposing new export restrictions, or implementing WTO-inconsistent measures in all areas, including those that stimulate exports; reaffirm commitment to rollback protectionist measures and continue maximum restraint in implementing WTO-consistent measures with a significant protectionist effect.

4. Call upon the APPF Member States concerned to continue exploring different ways towards realization of a Free Trade Area of the Asia Pacific (FTAAP), as a means not only to further promote regional economic integration in the Asia-Pacific region, but also to complement and strengthen the multilateral trading system centered on the WTO in a transparent and globally beneficial way;
5. **Recognize** the importance of transparency and openness while elaborating bilateral and multilateral free trade area agreements;

6. **Encourage** the APPF Member States to participate actively in the process of forming free trade agreements, elimination of tariff and non-tariff barriers to trade, improvement of the investment climate, economic integration, as well as establish cooperation with the Parliamentary Conference on the WTO to facilitate the parliamentary dimension of the multilateral system;

7. **Urge** the APPF Member States to support the promotion of information and communications technologies by advancing regulatory convergence and coherence as well as by cooperation in e-commerce.

8. **Confirm** the importance of attracting private investments and facilitation of public-private partnerships for the development of regional infrastructure, such as the efforts by the Russian Federation to utilize the said mechanisms in the Russian regions of Siberia and Far East in order to ensure their active integration in trade, economic and investment cooperation with Asia Pacific countries;

9. **Encourage** businesses to use the advantages of bilateral and regional trade agreements and member states to explain the benefits and opportunities they provide through domestic outreach programs;

10. **Promote** an innovation-friendly environment and stimulate jobs and economic growth in Asia Pacific countries by strengthening intellectual property rights and law enforcement that provide for and protect the incentives that encourage creativity and innovation and provide the tools for successful management and utilization of intellectual property.
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Report of the Parliamentary Delegation to the 128th Inter-Parliamentary Union Assembly
Quito, Ecuador
22–27 March 2013

The New Zealand delegation that attended the 128th Inter-Parliamentary Union Assembly (the Assembly) in Quito, Ecuador comprised:

- Hon Tau Henare, Head of Delegation
- Louisa Wall MP
- Jan Logie MP.

The delegation was in Ecuador from 20 to 28 March 2013.

Introduction to the Inter-Parliamentary Union

Established in 1889, the Inter-Parliamentary Union (IPU) is the international organisation of parliaments of sovereign states. It is a centre for parliamentary dialogue and diplomacy among legislators representing a wide range of ideological, economic and social systems. Through resolutions and reports, the IPU expresses its views and the positions of the world parliamentary community on issues of international interest, with the aim of bringing about parliamentary action. The IPU works for peace and cooperation among peoples, the defence and promotion of human rights and the firm establishment of representative democracy. It also supports the efforts of and works in close cooperation with the United Nations (UN), whose objectives it shares, and provides a parliamentary dimension to UN
work. It also cooperates with regional inter-parliamentary organisations, as well as with like-minded international, inter-governmental and non-governmental organisations.

Currently 162 national parliaments are members of the IPU (a list of members is attached as Appendix 1). Ten regional parliamentary assemblies are associate members. Most members are affiliated to one or more of the six geopolitical groups that are currently active in the IPU, which are: African, Arab, Asia-Pacific, Eurasia, Latin America and the Caribbean, and the Twelve-Plus.

The IPU is consistently active in its work to promote representative democracy throughout the world through workshops, committee visits and reports, and the biannual Assembly. Its main areas of activity are:

- representative democracy
- international peace and security
- sustainable development
- human rights and humanitarian law
- women in politics; and
- education, science and culture.

Assemblies

The Assembly is the principal statutory body for expressing the views of the IPU on political issues. These are held twice a year in spring and autumn, usually alternating venues between Geneva, where the IPU secretariat is based, and a member country. A prerequisite for hosting rights is to guarantee that all member parliaments will be able to send representatives.

The Assembly comprises meetings of the following parts of the IPU:

- the plenary session of the Assembly, (attended by all delegates), which has a general debate on a particular theme, debates an emergency item and holds panel discussions on particular subjects
- the Governing Council, which is the policy-making body of the IPU, and consists of two or three delegates from each member country
- ad hoc committees established by the Governing Council
- standing committees, which debate and draft resolutions on chosen topics; and
- six geopolitical groups.

The agenda of the 128th IPU Assembly is attached as Appendix 2.

Our delegation attended the following sessions:

- Election of the President and Vice-Presidents of the 128th Assembly
- Consideration of possible requests for the inclusion of an emergency item in the Assembly agenda
- General debate on the political, economic and social situation in the world with the overall theme ‘From unrelenting growth to purposeful development ‘Buen Vivir’: New approaches, new solutions’
- Enforcing the responsibility to protect: The role of parliament in safeguarding civilians’ lives (First Standing Committee on Peace and International Security)
• Fair trade and innovative financing mechanisms for sustainable development (Second Standing Committee on Sustainable Development, Finance and Trade)
• The use of media, including social media, to enhance citizen engagement and democracy (Third Standing Committee on Democracy and Human Rights)
• Approval of the subject items for the 130th Assembly and appointment of the Rapporteurs
• Amendments to the Statutes and Rules of the IPU; and
• Emergency item: The role of parliaments in addressing the security and humanitarian impact of the crisis in Syria and in bringing pressure to bear on their governments to assume their international and humanitarian responsibility towards Syrian refugees and to support the neighbouring countries that receive them.

**Governing Council**

The Governing Council is composed of mixed gender delegations of three parliamentarians from each parliament. It met twice during the Assembly and dealt with the following matters:

- membership of the IPU and observer status
- reports of the President and annual report by the Secretary General
- reports on specialised meetings and activities of committees and other bodies
- implementation of the IPU strategy
- cooperation with the UN system
- future assemblies and inter-parliamentary meetings
- amendments to the statutes and rules, elections to the executive committee; and
- finances of the IPU.

The Governing Council approved a request for observer status for the Global Organization of Parliamentarians Against Corruption (GOPAC) and The Parliamentarians for the Americas (ParlAmericas).

The Governing Council noted the report of Deputy Secretary General, Mr Martin Chungong, on recent activities in strengthening parliaments, research and standards setting, advancing gender equality and protecting and promoting human rights. Democracy related work took place in “Arab Spring” countries, Bangladesh, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Myanmar and Palestine. The IPU also cooperated with our Parliament and the Parliament of Australia in developing a programme of assistance to Pacific Island parliaments.

The IPU is working to establish standards for democratic parliaments, including measurable targets and indicators for assessing parliaments’ contribution to democracy. Following on from this would come peer review mechanisms, allowing parliaments to share experiences on democratic processes.

Work to map the representation of minorities and indigenous peoples is progressing, and this will feed into the UN World Conference on Indigenous Peoples in September 2014. The IPU continues its gender equality work, particularly in protecting the rights of women and promoting parliaments’ contribution to fighting violence against women. In human rights, the focus remains on the protection of members of parliament. Capacity building assistance in this area has been offered to parliaments.

The President took the opportunity to condemn the coup d'état in the Central African Republic, deploring the unconstitutional removal of an elected government and parliament. This event serves to remind parliamentarians of the fragility of democracy, and the need to remain vigilant in its protection.

The Governing Council heard reports of recent specialised conferences and meetings, and reports from the plenary bodies and specialised committees. Venues for upcoming IPU Assemblies in Geneva in October 2013, Baku, Azerbaijan in April 2014 and Ha Noi, Viet Nam in March 2015 were approved.

The Governing Council noted that the tenure of the current Secretary General, Mr Anders Johnsson, would be concluding next year and that a vacancy announcement would be published. A decision on the new Secretary General would be made by election at the Baku Assembly in 2014.
Meeting and Coordinating Committee of Women Parliamentarians

The 18th meeting of Women Parliamentarians took place on 22 March and was attended by Jan Logie and Louisa Wall, along with more than 100 other female parliamentarians and eight male parliamentarians.

The gender partnership group congratulated the Parliament of Saudi Arabia, which included women in its Parliament for the first time in January 2013. The IPU Secretariat advised that a Plan of Action for Gender-Sensitive Parliaments had produced a brochure in four languages. The meeting considered the gender perspective on the topic for the First and Second Standing Committees and proposed a number of amendments to the resolutions.

The meeting later heard the worldwide percentage of women in parliaments at the end of 2012 was 20.3. While progress had been made, there were also setbacks. Special measures and access to campaign funding were also discussed.

A dialogue session discussed violence against women, particularly sexual violence. This concluded with a request that this Assembly adopt a solemn declaration urging parliaments to condemn sexual violence and to act against it without delay.

The agenda for this meeting is attached as Appendix 2.

The Assembly

The Assembly sessions were held on four days. The agenda for the plenary sessions consisted of the following topics:

- General debate on the theme “From unrelenting growth to purposeful development ‘Buen Vivir’: New approaches, new solutions”
- selection of an emergency item
- panel discussion on the theme “Legalisation of drugs: can it help curb organised crime?”
- panel discussion on the theme “Addressing the rights of children with disabilities”
- panel discussion on the theme “Development in danger: Filling legislative gaps to combat tomorrow’s natural disasters”
- open session of the Committee on the Human Rights of Parliamentarians on the theme “Promoting greater parliamentary solidarity with MPs under threat”
- open session of the Committee to Promote Respect for International Humanitarian Law (IHL) on the theme “The IHL dimension of the Responsibility to Protect”
- workshop on the theme “Ensuring accountability for women’s and children’s health”
workshop on the theme “Towards a new vision for sustainable development: What place for democratic governance?”
- adoption of resolutions of the standing committees and on the emergency item
- approval of topics for discussion at the next assembly in October 2013.

Jan Logie and Louisa Wall spoke in the General Debate on the Special Debate topic and universal human rights. The texts of the speeches are attached as Appendices 5 and 6.

Emergency item

At each Assembly, a topic is selected for emergency consideration and a resolution is drafted on that topic. Any member of the IPU may request the inclusion of an emergency item in the Assembly agenda.

Six requests were received. These were:

- “Should the deliberate destruction of world cultural heritage not be considered as a crime against humanity? The role of parliaments in: 1) passing appropriate legislation to guarantee protection of world cultural heritage; and 2) developing international criminal law provisions that criminalise serious attacks on the cultural heritage of humanity”, proposed by Morocco
- “That homosexuals are entitled to full rights of citizenship. It is the role of parliaments to pass legislation that decriminalises homosexuality and homosexual acts between consenting adults”, proposed by New Zealand
- “The role of parliaments in achieving international peace and security through a peaceful settlement of the Syrian crisis”, proposed by the Syrian Arab Republic
- “The status of Syrian refugees: The role of parliaments in bringing pressure to bear on their governments to assume their international and humanitarian responsibility towards these refugees and to support the neighbouring countries that receive them”, proposed by Jordan
- “Unaccompanied migrant children around the world”, proposed by Mexico
- “The security and humanitarian impacts of the crisis in Syria, including in neighbouring countries”, proposed by the United Kingdom.

The emergency item submitted by the New Zealand delegation was proposed in response to legislation emerging in some parliaments that imprisoned people for homosexual activity between consenting adults. In Uganda, the death penalty was at one stage considered. The Québec City Declaration, adopted unanimously by the 127th IPU Assembly, stated that “All individuals must be allowed the full enjoyment of their equal and inalienable rights recognized in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and other international human rights and humanitarian law treaties and standards. Limitations or restrictions on any of these rights must be consistent with international law, necessary and proportionate. They should not lead to any discrimination whatsoever based on culture, race, colour, language, ethnicity, religion, sex, sexual orientation or political affiliation”. As there is evidence that the human rights of lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender and intersex people are being violated in IPU member countries, the New Zealand delegation felt that it was imperative that this issue be brought to the forefront of discussion in parliaments.

We submitted the item to the IPU Secretariat and found broad support across IPU, particularly within the Twelve-Plus geopolitical group. However, once all the emergency items had been submitted, we consulted with Twelve-Plus colleagues and decided that Louisa Wall would speak to the item in the General Assembly and then withdraw it in
favour of submitting it as a proposed topic for the Third Standing Committee at the 129th IPU Assembly.

The full text of the emergency item is attached as Appendix 3.

**Third Standing Committee (Democracy and Human Rights)**

The Third Standing Committee met twice. The Twelve-Plus geopolitical group put forward Louisa Wall as candidate for substitute member of the bureau of this committee and she was elected to the role. The committee considered the report and draft resolution on the topic, “The use of media, including social media, to advance citizen engagement and democracy”. Following the plenary debate, a drafting committee was appointed. A number of amendments were suggested, with many adopted. The resolution was submitted to the Assembly, where it was adopted unanimously.

When the selection of the subject item and co-Rapporteurs for the Third Standing Committee at the 130th Assembly was introduced, a heated debate followed. We submitted our proposed subject (attached as Appendix 7) for inclusion. Despite widespread support for the subject in principle, some vocal opponents aired their opinions in a manner many considered to be both improper and unparliamentary, which proceeded largely unchecked by the chair. It was both a frustrating and distressing turn of events. The committee finally voted by 31 votes to 21 to accept the committee bureau’s subject recommendation, rather than to reopen the discussion and allow it to be voted on, and so our proposal was, in essence, defeated.

**Panel discussion: The legalisation of drugs: Can it help curb organised crime?**

I attended this session and discussion began with the historical setting for many of the world’s legal systems based on the prohibition of production, trafficking and consumption of drugs. This had mixed results, and participants felt it was time to review the systems and consider other ways of managing the drug problem. There was a lively debate with opinions from both ends of the spectrum, including suggestions of State regulation and some forms of decriminalisation.

It was agreed that the underlying causes of the drug production and use must be examined. The links between poverty, equality and drugs were key, as were the links to corruption and weak government. Strengthening parliaments, in a top down approach, as well as addressing the root causes, were essential to addressing this important issue and discussions are needed at all levels of society.

The problem of drug trafficking meant that one country cannot effectively manage the problem alone, and the issue must be considered at the regional and global level. As parliamentarians, we must be prepared to translate solutions into legislation, and our responses need to be cross-party.

**Panel discussion: Addressing the rights of children with disabilities**

Louisa Wall participated in this discussion. The right to life and dignity of children with disabilities was agreed upon by the parliamentarians who participated in this discussion. It was recommended that parliamentarians in countries that were yet to accede to international conventions should strive to make this happen, particularly the Convention on the Rights of the Child, the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities, and the Standard Rules on the Equalisation of Opportunities for Persons with Disabilities.
Participants also agreed that parliaments must ensure that enacting legislation is passed to protect children, particularly, from all forms of violence and trafficking. The support to families with children with disabilities was considered, in relation to assisting with financial burdens and psychological care.

**Workshop: Towards a new vision for sustainable development: What place for democratic governance?**

We were very pleased that Jan Logie was invited to facilitate this workshop, alongside former New Zealand parliamentarian and now UN Development Programme (UNDP) Parliamentary Advisor, Charles Chauvel, and Senator Hoohlo of Lesotho. It was chaired by IPU Deputy Secretary General, Martin Chungong.

The workshop highlighted the central role of democratic governance in the post-2015 development framework. There were three parts to the session: a panel discussion providing an overview of democratic governance’s contribution to, and context in, development, a presentation of the results of a survey conducted during the Assembly and a breakout session to discuss specific questions.

The three main dimensions of democratic governance – participation, transparency and accountability – could all fall victim to corruption. However, democratic governance was deemed to be crucial to maintain trust in institutions, as was the inclusion of civil society. The workshop’s findings would now be part of the IPU’s contribution to future development goals.

**Committee on Middle East Questions**

I attended in-camera committee meetings as a titular member of this committee. We elected Lord Judd of the United Kingdom’s House of Lords as committee President. We then considered the report of a recent committee mission to Palestine. Lord Judd expressed his hope that this committee would be a voice that is not heard elsewhere and offered the advice that if you want peace, you must talk with your enemies.

I addressed the group, observing that New Zealand had spent 143 years before tribal groups were finally settling with the Government. Although a number of tribes still have no settlement, they are continuing dialogue with the Government. I agreed that it was important to get everyone to the table. I recalled that the Northern Ireland peace process would not have happened without talking to Sinn Féin. The benefit of IPU participation is the bringing together of collective experience, and the IPU can play a huge part in the peace process if we are let in. I will join the committee for a mission to Israel and the West Bank later this year.

**Geopolitical groups**

All members of the IPU are members of one or more of the six geopolitical groups that operate within the IPU structure, except for Azerbaijan. New Zealand belongs to the Asia-Pacific group, a grouping of 30 member countries extending from the Middle East to the Pacific, and to the Twelve-Plus group, a group of 47 parliaments of Europe, Scandinavia, and former Soviet and Yugoslavian States, together with Israel, Australia, Canada and New Zealand. Membership of these two groups is attached as Appendix 8.

The geopolitical groups play an important role in the functioning of the IPU. The IPU rules provide that each group can nominate its own candidates for committee vacancies to ensure an equitable geopolitical representation on IPU committees. The Asia-Pacific group
met once during the Assembly on the Friday prior to the opening and the Twelve-Plus group met on Thursday, Saturday and Wednesday of the Assembly. The Twelve-Plus group accepted a membership request from Ukraine.

**Bilateral meetings**

The New Zealand delegation arranged formal bilateral meetings with the delegations from Australia and Canada. In addition we participated in a number of informal meetings and pull-asides with Heads of Delegations and participants from the United Kingdom, Timor Leste, South Africa and others.

**Other activities**

**Whips meeting/IPU Parliamentary Coordinators’ Network**

For the second time, a meeting of parliamentary whips was held alongside the Assembly. The New Zealand Parliament did not have any whips in the delegation so I attended this meeting on behalf of New Zealand whips. Hon Patrick Secker, Opposition Whip in the Australian House of Representatives, chaired the meeting. Delegates from Afghanistan, Australia, Bangladesh, Bahrain, Canada, Chad, Chile, Ecuador, Ethiopia, Lesotho, Namibia, South Africa, Trinidad and Tobago and Uganda also attended.
The group discussed the establishment of an 18-month pilot network of parliamentary whips, with the aims of professional development, information sharing and inter-parliamentary cooperation. We agreed to adopt a provisional name “IPU Parliamentary Coordinators’ Network” under the auspices of the IPU and explore options for a website and workshop.

**Field visits on addressing the rights of children with disabilities**

Louisa Wall participated in field visits jointly organised by the IPU, UNICEF and the Office of the Vice-President of the Republic of Ecuador, which were in two parts. The first was the presentation of the Manuela Espejo and Joaquín Gallegos Lara Missions of Solidarity at the Office of the Vice-President of Ecuador. A presentation on Missions and the programmes intended to improve the lives of Ecuadorians known as “Ecuador sin barreras” (Ecuador without Barriers) was given as well as an explanation of the four components of the Missions – study, care, prevention and integration. The participants then broke into three groups, each visiting a person with disabilities in a different neighbourhood.

**Meeting with Fundación Causana**

Jan Logie and Louisa Wall took the opportunity to meet with Karen Barba, Director of the Ecuadorian activist group, Fundación Causana. The group has been active in campaigning to expose, and then close, clinics in Ecuador accused of using torture methods to cure women of being lesbian, while masquerading as drug dependency rehabilitation facilities. The Ecuadorian Ministry of Health had closed three clinics, rescuing dozens of women, but more than 200 reportedly remain open. Ecuador, through its Ministry of Health, has entered into a commitment with society to deconstruct the belief that homosexuality is an illness and to investigate the use of torture in these clinics.

**Participation by Pacific nations**

As with previous Assemblies, there was very little representation from Pacific Island parliaments. The Federated States of Micronesia sent a delegation of two members, and the Timor-Leste Parliament was represented by six members, including two women. The New Zealand and Australian delegations co-hosted a reception for the Pacific Parliamentary Community, inviting the heads of delegation from all Pacific Rim members. The event was attended by the Secretary General, Anders Johnsson, and Deputy Secretary General, Martin Chungong, and afforded a good opportunity for delegates to meet and discuss regional issues.
Future meetings

The 129th Assembly of the IPU will take place in Geneva, Switzerland from 7 to 9 October 2013. It will be followed by the 130th Assembly, which will take place in Baku, Azerbaijan from 10 to 13 April 2014.

Conclusion

Once again, the New Zealand Parliament’s delegation profile at the IPU Assembly was particularly high. Through our emergency item campaign, (which became our Third Committee topic proposal), Louisa Wall’s and Jan Logie’s addresses to the General Debate, and Jan’s facilitation of the development workshop, we demonstrated the New Zealand Parliament’s commitment to human rights and equality amongst people. Although our campaigns ultimately did not bear fruit this time, our Parliament’s reputation of being a champion of marginalised communities through our on-going advocacy for universal human rights and fair indigenous representation continued to be enhanced.

Hon Tau Henare
Head of Delegation

An Ecuadorian market
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Appendix

1 Membership of IPU (as at 1 May 2013)

The Inter-Parliamentary Union has 162 members and 10 associate members.

Member Parliaments

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan
Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belarus, Belgium, Benin, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi
Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d’Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic
Democratic People’s Republic of Korea, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic
Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Estonia, Ethiopia
Finland, France
Gabon, Gambia, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea-Bissau
Haiti, Honduras, Hungary
Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy
Japan, Jordan
Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan
Lao People’s Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg
Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar
Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway
Oman
Pakistan, Palau, Palestine, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal
Qatar
Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Rwanda
Samoa, San Marino, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Africa, South Sudan, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic
Tajikistan, Thailand, The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey
Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

**Associate members**

Andean Parliament

Central American Parliament

East African Legislative Assembly

European Parliament

Inter-Parliamentary Committee of the West African Economic and Monetary Union

Latin American Parliament

Parliament of the Economic Community of West African States

Parliament of the Economic and Monetary Community of Central Africa

Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe

Arab Parliament.
Appendix

2 Agenda of 128th IPU Assembly

Item 1 Election of the President and Vice-Presidents of the 128th Assembly

Item 2 Consideration of possible requests for the inclusion of an emergency item in the Assembly agenda

Item 3 General debate on the political, economic and social situation in the world with the overall theme From unrelenting growth to purposeful development “Buen Vivir”: New approaches, new solutions

Item 4 Enforcing the responsibility to protect: The role of parliament in safeguarding civilians’ lives (First Standing Committee on Peace and International Security)

Item 5 Fair trade and innovative financing mechanisms for sustainable development (Second Standing Committee on Sustainable Development, Finance and Trade)

Item 6 The use of media, including social media, to enhance citizen engagement and democracy (Third Standing Committee on Democracy and Human Rights)

Item 7 Approval of the subject items for the 130th Assembly and appointment of the Rapporteurs

Item 8 Amendments to the Statutes and Rules of the IPU

Item 9 The role of parliaments in addressing the security and humanitarian impact of the crisis in Syria and in bringing pressure to bear on their governments to assume their international and humanitarian responsibility towards Syrian refugees and to support the neighbouring countries that receive them
Appendix

3 Emergency item submitted by the New Zealand delegation

COMMUNICATION ADDRESSED TO THE SECRETARY GENERAL
BY THE HEAD OF THE NEW ZEALAND DELEGATION

22 February 2013

Dear Mr Secretary General

In accordance with the relevant rules of the Inter-Parliamentary Union, specifically Assembly Rule 11.1, the New Zealand delegation wishes to submit a request for the inclusion of an emergency item in the agenda of the 128th IPU Assembly, which will take place in Quito (Ecuador) from 22 to 27 March 2013, entitled:

“That homosexuals are entitled to full rights of citizenship. It is the role of parliaments to pass legislation that decriminalises homosexuality and homosexual acts between consenting adults.”

Please find attached an explanatory memorandum and draft resolution in support of this request.

Yours sincerely

Hon Tau Henare
Permanent Delegate to the Inter-Parliamentary Union
New Zealand House of Representatives
THAT HOMOSEXUALS ARE ENTITLED TO FULL RIGHTS OF CITIZENSHIP. IT IS THE ROLE OF PARLIAMENTS TO PASS LEGISLATION THAT DECRIMINALISES HOMOSEXUALITY AND HOMOSEXUAL ACTS BETWEEN CONSENTING ADULTS.

Explanatory Memorandum Submitted by the Delegation of New Zealand

On 26 October 2012 the members of the 127th IPU Assembly unanimously adopted the Quebec City Declaration which states:

1. We, members of parliament gathering in Quebec City on the occasion of the 127th Assembly of the Inter-Parliamentary Union, firmly uphold cultural, linguistic, ethnic, racial, political and religious diversity as a global value which should be celebrated, respected, encouraged and protected within and among all societies and civilisations.

2. We are concerned that a diversity of ideas, values, beliefs, languages and cultural expressions among peoples and civilisations enriches our outlook and experiences at the national, regional and international levels.

3. We affirm our aspiration to attain harmony and unity in our diversity and the reconciliation of human cultures. We believe that a world where people with their differences co-exist is possible, one where there is awareness of differential solidarity and where a dialogue of civilisations is encouraged. Such a world, which depends on our mutual understanding and acceptance, would be a source of progress for humanity and would lead to the wellbeing of our global society.

4. All individuals must be allowed the full enjoyment of their equal and alienable rights recognised in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and other international human rights and humanitarian law treaties and standards. Limitations or restrictions on any of these rights must be consistent with international law, necessary and proportionate. They should not lead to any discrimination whatsoever based on culture, race, colour, language, ethnicity, religion, sex, sexual orientation or political affiliation.

We particularly want to highlight the commitment to ensuring that legislative limitations or restrictions should not lead to any discrimination based on sex or sexual orientation.

In addition, the justification for this emergency item is evidenced in the publication Born Free and Equal: Sexual Orientation of Gender Identity in International Human Rights Law.¹ This report draws on documented violations of the human rights of Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender and Intersex (LGBTI) people and analyses State compliance with

international human rights law and recognises that passing laws that decriminalise homosexuality be a priority.

The five priorities identified through the recommendations arising from the report, *Born Free and Equal*, are as follows:

1. Protect people from homophobic and transphobic violence
2. Prevent the torture and cruel, inhuman and degrading treatment of LGBT persons in detention by prohibiting and punishing such acts and ensuring that victims are provided with redress
3. Repeal laws criminalising homosexuality, including all laws that prohibit private sexual conduct between consenting adults of the same sex
4. Prohibit discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation and gender identity
5. Safeguard freedom of expression, association and peaceful assembly for LGBT and intersex people.

Laws that criminalise homosexuality give rise to a number of separate but interrelated violations of an individual’s right to be free from discrimination. Article 2 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and other core international human rights treaties enshrine a person’s right to be free from discrimination. These same treaties and human rights instruments also protect a person against unreasonable interference with their privacy and arbitrary detention. On 18 December 2008, the United Nations General Assembly issued a statement “urging all states to take necessary measures to ensure that sexual orientation or gender identity may under no circumstances be the basis for criminal penalties, in particular executions, arrests or detention.”

Furthermore, we believe laws that impose the death penalty for sexual conduct violate a person’s right to life, as guaranteed by Article 3 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and Article 6 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (ICCPR). Such laws, even if they are never enforced, breach State obligations under international human rights law.

We are aware of at least 76 countries that have laws which, in effect, are used to criminalise consensual sex between adults of the same sex. Furthermore we believe the criminalisation of private, consensual sex between adults of the same sex breaches a State’s obligation to protect individual privacy and guarantee non-discrimination as set out under international law. And we note that this has been the consistent position of United Nations

---

3 Everyone is entitled to all the rights and freedoms set forth in this Declaration, without distinction of any kind, such as race, colour, sex, language, religion, political or other opinion, national or social origin, property, birth or other status.
4 Article 12 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and Article 17 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights.
5 Article 9 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and Article 9 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights.
human rights experts since 1994, when views regarding *Toonen v Australia* were adopted by the United Nations Human Rights Committee (UNHRC).²

The *Toonen v Australia* case concerned a challenge to laws in the Australian State of Tasmania criminalising consensual same-sex sexual conduct. The UNHRC found that adult consensual sexual activity is covered by Article 17 of the ICCPR and that the mere existence of that criminal law *continuously and directly interferes with [Mr Toonen’s] privacy*.⁷ The UNHRC further concluded that Tasmania’s laws did not achieve the aim of protecting public health and were not necessary to protect public morals,⁸ and noted that all laws criminalising homosexuality had been repealed throughout Australia and that Tasmanian law *arbitrarily interfered with Mr Toonen’s rights*.⁹

Since Toonen was decided, United Nations human rights treaty bodies have repeatedly urged States to reform laws criminalising homosexuality or sexual conduct between same-sex partners. They have also welcomed legislative or judicial repeal of such laws.

We are also concerned that in five countries,¹⁰ as well as some regions of at least two other countries, the death penalty may be applied for homosexuality related offences.¹¹ The imposition of the death penalty gives rise to a separate violation under Article 6 of the ICCPR and Article 3 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, which provides that in countries which have not abolished the death penalty, this provision can only be applied for the most serious crimes. We contend that consensual same-sex conduct does not meet any test or definition of serious crimes.

For almost two decades, human rights treaty bodies, special rapporteurs and other experts appointed by the United Nations Human Rights Council have documented widespread violations of the human rights of LGBTI people. Reported violations include killings, rape and physical attacks, torture, arbitrary detention, the denial of rights to assembly, expression, information, and discrimination in employment, health, education and access to goods and services. In each case, the victims were targeted because they are, or are assumed to be, LGBTI people. Often, the mere perception of homosexuality or transgender identity is enough to place people’s lives and wellbeing at risk of injury or death.

In recent years, many countries have made a determined effort to either strengthen or implement legislation to recognise the rights and protect the lives and wellbeing of

---

³ Ibid at paragraph 8.2.
⁴ Ibid at paragraph 8.4.
⁵ Ibid at paragraph 8.6.
⁶ Islamic Republic of Iran, Mauritania, Saudi Arabia, the Sudan and Yemen.
LGBTI people. This includes the adoption of laws banning discrimination, penalising homophobic hate crimes, granting recognition of same-sex relationships and removing procedural barriers so Transgender individuals can obtain official documents that reflect their preferred gender identity. In addition, training programmes have been developed for police, prison staff, teachers, social workers and other personnel, and anti-bullying initiatives have been implemented in many schools.

Despite international efforts more needs to be done urgently to confront the prejudice, and address the humanitarian situation of violence and discrimination affecting LGBTI people around the world. There are important international principles at stake, including our collective responsibility to protect all of our citizens, including LGBTI people, and to prevent the continuation of human rights violations perpetrated against them on a daily basis.

We are concerned that the recent introduction of proposed anti-homosexual legislation by some IPU member countries, which includes the death penalty, directly contravenes the rights of LGBTI people. We all made a commitment to contribute to the defence and promotion of human rights – an essential factor of parliamentary democracy and development, when our respective governments joined the IPU.

We believe that current legislation, as well as bills that are being developed or considered by governments, represents a significant breach of human rights. Furthermore these laws challenge the fundamental principles of equality and non-discrimination enshrined in human rights treaties such as the United Nations Declaration of Human Rights. The entire membership of the IPU has an obligation and primary role to provide the context for constructive dialogue and to support the continued development of a comprehensive process for global homosexual law reform.

The New Zealand IPU delegation therefore requests that an emergency item entitled “The political, legislative and humanitarian situation of Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual and Transgender people and international support for all parliaments to pass legislation to decriminalise homosexuality and homosexual acts between consenting adults” be included in the agenda of the 128th IPU Assembly.

---

12 Nigeria, Liberia and Uganda.
THAT HOMOSEXUALS ARE ENTITLED TO FULL RIGHTS OF CITIZENSHIP. IT IS THE ROLE OF PARLIAMENTS TO PASS LEGISLATION THAT DECRIMINALISES HOMOSEXUALITY AND HOMOSEXUAL ACTS BETWEEN CONSENTING ADULTS

Draft resolution submitted by the delegation of NEW ZEALAND

The 128th Assembly of the Inter-Parliamentary Union,

(1) Deeply concerned at the recent legislative developments in Nigeria and Liberia, and in Uganda, where consideration is being given to legislation relating to homosexuals, which originally included the death penalty,

(2) Noting the five priorities identified in the recommendations of the United Nations Commissioner for Human Rights in her 2012 report Born Free and Equal: Sexual Orientation of Gender Identity in International Human Rights Law, including her statement that passing laws that decriminalise homosexuality [be] a priority,

(3) Recognising that the United Nations Declaration of Human Rights stipulates that all human beings are entitled to be born free and equal in dignity and human rights and that the implementation and administration of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights has recognised those rights without distinction on the grounds of sexual orientation and gender identity,

(4) Recalling the statement of the United Nations General Assembly on 18 December 2008, “urging all states to take necessary measures to ensure that sexual orientation or gender identity may under no circumstances be the basis for criminal penalties, in particular executions, arrests or detention”;

(5) Noting that laws that impose the death penalty and/or criminalising same-sex consensual sexual conduct violate the rights confirmed in human rights treaties, including the United Nations Declaration of Human Rights and the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights,

(6) Noting the United Nations Human Rights Committee’s decision in Toonen v Australia further confirming that the criminalisation of private, consensual sex between adults arbitrarily interferes with a citizen’s rights,

(7) Noting that in recent years, many IPU members have made a determined effort to recognise the rights and protect the lives and wellbeing of Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender and Intersex people,
(8) Considering the Quebec City Declaration unanimously adopted by the 127th IPU Assembly on 26 October 2012 entitled “Special Debate: Citizenship, Identity and Linguistic and Cultural Diversity in a Globalised World”, in which the Assembly confirmed, “all individuals must be allowed the full enjoyment of their equal and inalienable rights recognised in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and other international human rights and humanitarian law treaties and standards. Limitations or restrictions on any of these rights must be consistent with international law, necessary and proportionate. They should not lead to any discrimination whatsoever based on culture, race, colour, language, ethnicity, religion, sex, sexual orientation or political affiliation.”

(9) Urges parliaments to pass laws that decriminalise homosexuality and homosexual acts between consenting adults as a first step towards stopping discrimination against members of the Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender and Intersex community,

(10) Entrusts the IPU with conveying this resolution to all its members, associate members and observers and other international organisations.
Appendix

4 Summary Explanation of the Emergency Item by Louisa Wall MP

Mr President, Delegates, Hola – Kia Ora, Greetings.

In accordance with IPU Assembly rule 11 2(a) the New Zealand delegation concluded –

“That homosexuals are entitled to full rights of citizenship. It is the role of parliaments to pass legislation that decriminalises homosexuality and homosexual acts between consenting adults.”

This proposed emergency item relates to events of international concern, which has seen countries proposing and debating recently and currently:

Enhanced criminalisation

Re-criminalisation

Criminalisation of homosexual acts.

And it is the New Zealand delegation’s position that it is necessary for the IPU to express its opinion on this issue.

New Zealand passed legislation to decriminalise homosexual acts between consenting male adults in 1986. We inherited this law from the British and I note their homosexual law reform occurred in 1967.

I want to highlight that New Zealand’s indigenous people, the Māori people, have a name for homosexuals, LGBTQI or third gender – it is Takatāpui.

This is New Zealand’s indigenous people who through our language and cultural expression affirm the acceptance and existence of homosexuals. New Zealand, like many countries, was colonised by the British Monarchy and the British Religious Missionaries that introduced concepts from their legislation and from the Victorian interpretation of the bible that labelled homosexuals as criminals, as lesser human beings and as second class citizens.

In 1993 New Zealand added sexual orientation as a ground of non-discrimination in our Human Rights legislation.

In proposing this emergency item we hoped that the IPU would debate this issue and that it would become a Champion of Human Rights for all.

We thought the timing was right to follow on from the 127th IPU Assembly, which unanimously adopted the Quebec City Declaration which noted that Discrimination should not occur based on culture, race, colour, language, ethnicity, religion, sex, sexual orientation or political affiliation.

While we believe that this issue is an emergency we have been persuaded that this issue can be dealt with via other means within the framework of the IPU and therefore I am giving notice that New Zealand is withdrawing our emergency item.

However, we seek the Assembly’s support for our proposed subject for a report in the IPU Committee on Democracy and Human Rights. It reads:
“Sexual orientation and gender identity rights: the role of parliamentarians in affirming these rights in legislation”.

New Zealand respectfully requests your support for the global acceptance and recognition that homosexuals are equal human beings, that homosexuals have been born free and equal in dignity and rights and that homosexuals are equal citizens of the world and we as parliamentarians from democracies across the world will serve and protect their right to exist.

Muchas Gracias. Thank you.
5 Address to the General Debate by Jan Logie MP

I would like to acknowledge the first peoples of this land, who allow us a temporary place to stand and discuss Buen Vivir new approaches, new solutions to purposeful development.

I would like too to recognise this earth on which we all stand and the air which we all breathe. Acclimatising to this high altitude I have a new appreciation for the bliss of enough air to breathe. It has been a good reminder of our absolute interdependence with nature.

All too many of our international and national structures create and recreate systems of exploitation and promote the power of one person and one group of people over the ‘other’, the power of man over nature.

It has been made possible by disassociation and compartmentalism.

This thinking has given us climate change, environmental degradation, mass poverty, violence against women, homophobia, racism, obscene inequality, genocide and war.

I don’t believe it’s a coincidence that this proudly Catholic country, who has given us Buen Vivir, protects sexual orientation and gender identity in their constitution. I think this recognition of the beauty of diversity and honesty and the releasing of the need to control others is the pulse that breathes life into Buen Vivir.

I know many of you are wondering why New Zealand is pushing this. New Zealand is not pushing this to offend anyone. We are pushing it because we believe in a new model of development where EVERYONE is included.

We are pushing it because we oppose all discrimination and hate based crimes individual or State sanctioned.

We are pushing it because we were the first country in the world where women fought for and won the vote and that bolshiness is ingrained.

We are pushing it because the vision of plurality has been enshrined in our law through the protection of indigenous sovereignty and we can see the true possibility of that.

We are pushing it because we do not see culture in a separate box from sexuality and we do not see religion in another box either.

I am pushing this because to my knowledge I am the only type of person in this room who has their very humanity questioned by entire countries. You tell me quietly that I must understand your culture, your religion. I do and I will fight hard for your rights to your culture and your religion but I will never accept that your culture or religion has the right to make people like me in your country chose between being excluded and being given basic rights.

While we continue to deny the humanity and rights of so many people around the world we will be unable to achieve the balance needed to secure our collective future.
The world desperately needs to recognise our wholeness and our interdependence so we may one day be able to recognise our place in this ecosystem in which we all exist. Buen Vivir to all of us.
Hola! Rimaykullayki – Kia Ora – greetings to you all.

A special acknowledgement of the 14 indigenous peoples of Ecuador – Nga Mihi Nga Tangata Whenua o Ecuador.

To the people of Ecuador – muchas gracias – thank you for hosting us and supporting the IPU and its goals of providing the time and space for global dialogue.

To our Assembly theme – Buen Vivir. This term, as President Correa asserted in his address, is derived from the indigenous Ecuadorean Kichwa term “sumak kawsay” – the good living or living well.

How do we achieve a good living for all and how do we measure it?

Further research on Buen Vivir from an indigenous perspective revealed that it represents life in harmony and equilibrium between men and women, between different communities and, above all, between human beings and the natural environment of which we are part.

In practice, this concept implies knowing how to live in community with others while achieving a minimum degree of equality. It means eliminating prejudice and exploitation between people as well as respecting nature and preserving its equilibrium.

From our indigenous peoples in New Zealand we have a concept that aligns with the philosophy of Buen Vivir.

Our term is Kaitiakitanga, which translates to guardianship – we all have rights and responsibilities to protect and support each other and our natural environment, which we are part of and not separate from.

In our indigenous culture a person has genealogical connection to mountains, rivers and lands. We are one – to exploit these natural phenomena is to exploit ourselves and each other.

Given the time constraints my focus is how do we achieve equilibrium between different communities.

My definition of community is: people who live together and who share government and have a common heritage.

On Sunday I attended a UNICEF coordinated field visit to beneficiaries of the “Ecuador without Barriers” Mission Manuela Espejo – a Vice-Presidency led programme to ensure people with disabilities are identified, that adequate and appropriate resources are provided not only to the person with a disability but to their families, and intervention and prevention initiatives to improve the health and Wellbeing of all disabled Ecuadorians and their families.

I want to acknowledge Vice President of Ecuador, Lenin Moreno – it is obvious his leadership has been instrumental in this campaign.

Where did this initiative come from:
A Vision, a commitment to people with disabilities contained in the 1998 Constitution. All persons are equal and shall enjoy the same rights, duties and opportunities.

This for me is about creating and defining a new NORMAL reinforced by constitutional change and the rule of law AND political leadership with a commitment to capacity building and involvement of people with disabilities themselves.

Also, I want to highlight that Ecuador became the first country in the Americas (and only the third worldwide) to include sexual orientation as a protected category in its constitution. The others were South Africa and Fiji.

Ecuador includes both sexual orientation and gender identity in its constitutional prohibition against discrimination.

Again – all persons are equal and shall enjoy the same rights, duties and opportunities.

Again – from constitutional change can come the rule of law and political leadership and the involvement of the LGBTI community themselves in creating this new NORMAL.

Muchas Gracias – Solpayki – thank you.
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7 Subject Proposal to the Third Committee on Democracy and Human Rights

Proposed subject for a report in the IPU Committee on Democracy and Human Rights

“Sexual orientation and gender identity rights: the role of parliamentarians in affirming these rights in legislation”.

Rapporteurs: Louisa Wall, New Zealand Delegation and Izilda Soares, Timor-Leste Delegation

Explanatory Memorandum Submitted by the Delegation of New Zealand

On 26 October 2012 the members of the 127th IPU Assembly unanimously adopted the Quebec City Declaration, which states:

We, members of parliament gathering in Quebec City on the occasion of the 127th Assembly of the Inter-Parliamentary Union, firmly uphold cultural, linguistic, ethnic, racial, political and religious diversity as a global value which should be celebrated, respected, encouraged and protected within and among all societies and civilizations.

We are concerned that a diversity of ideas, values, beliefs, languages and cultural expressions among peoples and civilisations enriches our outlook and experiences at the national, regional and international levels.

We affirm our aspiration to attain harmony and unity in our diversity and the reconciliation of human cultures. We believe that a world where people with their differences co-exist is possible, one where there is awareness of differential solidarity and where a dialogue of civilisations is encouraged. Such a world, which depends on our mutual understanding and acceptance, would be a source of progress for humanity and would lead to the well-being of our global society.

All individuals must be allowed the full enjoyment of their equal and alienable rights recognised in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and other international human rights and humanitarian law treaties and standards. Limitations or restrictions on any of these rights must be consistent with international law, necessary and proportionate. They should not lead to any discrimination whatsoever based on culture, race, colour, language, ethnicity, religion, sex, sexual orientation or political affiliation.

Prioritising this theme would enable the IPU to continue its work on human rights of all people and citizens across democracies of the world regardless of their sex, sexual orientation and gender identity.
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1 Foreword

Each year the official Inter-Parliamentary Relations Programme provides members of our Parliament with an opportunity to represent New Zealand on the international parliamentary stage. The programme accomplishes this through inward and outward inter-parliamentary visits, membership of international inter-parliamentary organisations, and hosting and contributing to parliamentary conferences and other events.

The programme provides New Zealand with important opportunities for international engagement at the parliamentary level, and for our members to develop professionally and expand their international networks. The Inter-Parliamentary Relations Programme allows us to further New Zealand’s interests in areas such as international agreements, educational and cultural exchanges, and contact between individuals. The diversity of the topics and issues canvassed at the events in which our members have engaged reflects positively on New Zealand’s reputation.

This year’s compendium of reports shows a broad scope of engagement, with diverse and interesting topics and issues discussed in a range of fora. The inward visits also reflect the interest that the New Zealand Parliament holds for our overseas counterparts, particularly our colleagues in the Pacific region. The Parliamentary Study Programme for Clerks and Deputy Clerks from the Pacific was successfully run for the third year, and this continues to be a highly regarded and sought after professional development opportunity for key officials in Pacific parliaments. Feedback from this year’s Study Programme was again excellent, reflecting the value placed on it by participants.

I would like to express my thanks and gratitude to colleagues who have submitted reports and for their active participation in the programme. I would also like to thank those parliaments that have shown an interest in engaging and strengthening ties with the New Zealand Parliament. We value such relationships highly and hope to see strong engagement continuing into the future. It is clear that the Inter-Parliamentary Relations Programme is of great value to the New Zealand Parliament in enhancing our reputation internationally and as such it is something that we can rightly be proud of.

Rt Hon David Carter
Speaker of the House of Representatives
2 Outward Programme

The official Outward Inter-Parliamentary Relations Programme includes participation by members at parliamentary conferences and seminars, and bilateral visits to other parliaments. The table below sets out each outward inter-parliamentary event attended by members of the New Zealand Parliament in 2012, and indicates whether a report has already been presented separately to the House; otherwise the report forms part of this compendium.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dates</th>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Delegates</th>
<th>Report</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7–12 January</td>
<td>21st Conference of Speakers and Presiding Officers of the Commonwealth</td>
<td>Dr The Rt Hon Lockwood Smith*</td>
<td>Delegation Report J.2A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Port of Spain, Trinidad and Tobago</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8–12 January</td>
<td>20th Annual Meeting of the Asia-Pacific Parliamentary Forum</td>
<td>Lindsay Tisch*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tokyo, Japan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5–10 March</td>
<td>61st Westminster Seminar on Parliamentary Practice and Procedure</td>
<td>Hon Trevor Mallard*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>London, United Kingdom</td>
<td>Richard Prosser</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 March – 5 April</td>
<td>126th Inter-Parliamentary Union Assembly</td>
<td>Hon Tau Henare*</td>
<td>Delegation Report J.2B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kampala, Uganda</td>
<td>Louisa Wall</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Jan Logie</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24–30 May</td>
<td>23rd Commonwealth Parliamentary Association Seminar</td>
<td>Jonathan Young*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Apia, Samoa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1–14 July</td>
<td>Speaker’s Delegation to United Kingdom, Croatia, and Belgium</td>
<td>Dr The Rt Hon Lockwood Smith*</td>
<td>Delegation Report J.2C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Darien Fenton</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Melissa Lee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Gareth Hughes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Denis O’Rourke</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23–27 July</td>
<td>43rd Conference of Regional Presiding Officers and Clerks and the Twinning Conference</td>
<td>Lindsay Tisch*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Honiara, Solomon Islands</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Event</td>
<td>Participants</td>
<td>Location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3–5 October</td>
<td>ASPG Conference</td>
<td>Charles Chauvel*, Louise Upston</td>
<td>Darwin, Australia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21–26 October</td>
<td>127th Inter-Parliamentary Union Assembly</td>
<td>Hon Tau Henare*, Hon Damien O'Connor, Julie Anne Genter</td>
<td>Québec City, Canada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6–8 November</td>
<td>Commonwealth Parliamentary Association United Kingdom Parliamentary Conference on Gender and Politics</td>
<td>Nicky Wagner*</td>
<td>London, United Kingdom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17–24 November</td>
<td>Australia and Pacific Regional Commonwealth Parliamentary Association Conference</td>
<td>Moana Mackey*, Hon Dr Nick Smith</td>
<td>Rarotonga, Cook Islands</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Head of Delegation
20TH ANNUAL MEETING OF THE ASIA-PACIFIC PARLIAMENTARY
FORUM AND BILATERAL MEETINGS
TOKYO, JAPAN
8 -12 JANUARY 2012

Head of Delegation – Lindsay Tisch

Introduction

The Asia-Pacific Parliamentary Forum (APPF) provides opportunities for national parliamentarians of the Asia-Pacific region to:

- raise and discuss matters of common concern and interest in a global context
- deepen their understanding of the policy concerns, interests, and experiences of the countries of the region
- examine the critical political, social, and cultural developments resulting from economic growth and integration
- encourage and promote regional co-operation on matters of common concern; and
- further in their respective countries a sense of regional cohesion, understanding, and co-operation.

The APPF acts to promote regional identification and co-operation, with a particular focus on:

- co-operation for the advancement of peace, freedom, democracy, and prosperity
- open, non-exclusive co-operation for the expansion of free trade and investment, and sustainable development and sound environmental practices; and
- non-military co-operation, giving due consideration to regional peace and security.

The APPF expresses its views on these issues and the positions of the parliamentarians of the Asia-Pacific region through resolutions and a joint communiqué signed by all the heads of delegation at each meeting.

The APPF acts principally as the parliamentary branch of Asia-Pacific Economic Co-operation (APEC) forum, and keeps close ties with other regional integration institutions such as the Association of Southeast Asian Nations, the South Pacific Forum, the Pacific Economic Co-operation Council, and the Pacific Basin Economic Council, while also maintaining an independent agenda. Twenty-seven national parliaments are current members of the APPF.

Parliaments from 17 member countries participated in the 20th Annual Meeting, with Brunei, Darassalam and Colombia participating as observers at the invitation of the Executive Committee. The New Zealand delegation comprised Lindsay Tisch MP, Assistant Speaker, House of Representatives, with assistance from HE Mr Ian Kennedy, New Zealand Ambassador to Japan, and Mr Stefan Corbett, First Secretary at the New Zealand Embassy in Tokyo. A copy of the programme is attached.
It was appropriate that the meeting was held in Tokyo, as the concept of APPF was initiated by Yasuhiro Nakasone, a former Premier of Japan, in 1982.

**Meeting with Hon Hidehisa Otsuji, Vice-President of the House of Councillors**

Mr Otsuji recalled his visit to New Zealand in 2011, and remarked that the bilateral relationship had developed over many years, bringing political trust, economic cooperation, and people-to-people contact.

Discussions with the Vice-President covered the disasters that both countries had recently suffered. The Vice-President thanked New Zealand and its people for providing considerable assistance in the aftermath of the Tohoku earthquake and tsunami disaster, and for assistance in the Christchurch earthquake.

All 28 Japanese victims of the Christchurch earthquake were identified and their remains returned to Japan with their families. Views were shared on the paths to recovery and reconstruction of Christchurch and North Eastern Japan.

**Meeting hosted by HE Mr Ian Kennedy, Ambassador, and Mrs Setsuko Kennedy**

A dinner was hosted by the Ambassador, Ian Kennedy, with invited guests:

- Mr Shintaro Ito, Senior Advisor, Pasona Group Inc
- Mr Ryu Yano, Chairman, Sumitomo Forestry Co Ltd, and Mrs Yano
- Professor Yorizumi Watanabe, Professor of International Political Economy, Keio University, and Mrs Watanabe
- Professor Ikuo Toshbata, Professor of Engineering, University of Tokyo, and Mrs Tohoshata; and
- Mr Stefan Corbett, First Secretary, New Zealand Embassy, and Mrs Corbett.

Mr Yano has had a long association with New Zealand and was awarded the New Zealand Order of Merit in the 2012 New Year’s Honours.

The recent earthquakes in both countries were discussed and the impact on Japan of the shutdown of its nuclear power stations. Nuclear power had been providing 35 percent of the country’s energy needs, but in the aftermath of the Fukushima nuclear power plant meltdown, all of Japan’s 56 nuclear power plants were shut down and reassessed for safety.

Professors Watanabe and Towhata consulted with New Zealand officials on earthquake and tsunami issues and were also interested in our geothermal power generation.

**20th Meeting of the Asia-Pacific Parliamentary Forum**

The gathering of the Forum consisted of meetings of the Executive Committee and the Drafting Committee, and plenary sessions. The location of meetings circulates around member states.
The Executive Committee comprises the President of the APPF (normally the Speaker from the host country), the head of delegation whose country is hosting the next Forum, and representatives of two countries from each of the four sub-regions of the APPF: Northeast Asia, Southeast Asia, Oceania, and the Americas.

The Executive Committee met on the first night of the Forum to discuss and adopt the agenda and programme of activities.

Meetings of the Drafting Committee

Most of the meetings of the Drafting Committee ran in parallel with the plenary sessions. During these meetings, countries that were sponsoring draft resolutions met to discuss and debate the language of draft resolutions. In many cases two or more countries decided to co-sponsor resolutions, showing a good level of consensus amongst the participants.

A total of 35 draft resolutions from nine countries were lodged, and referred to 10 working groups that developed agreed versions. The drafts were discussed at the Drafting Committee, and 13 resolutions adopted for presentation to the plenary session.

New Zealand sponsored two resolutions—Disaster Prevention, and Promoting Economic Partnerships and Free Trade. Mr Stefan Corbett of the New Zealand Embassy assisted me at the Drafting Committee and plenary sessions.

Plenary sessions

The four plenary sessions were attended by all delegates, allowing them to express their views on the agenda’s topics, which are outlined below. As New Zealand’s sole delegate I could not attend all the plenary sessions. However, I am indebted to HE Mr Ian Kennedy, the Ambassador, and Mr Stefan Corbett, First Secretary at the New Zealand Embassy, for their support, guidance, and participation.

First Plenary Session: Regional Co-operation in the Asia-Pacific Region

- Great East Japan Earthquake and Japan’s efforts toward reconstruction: Report by Japan
- Co-operation in disaster prevention
- Co-operation in nuclear safety
- Climate change
- Achievement of the Millennium Development Goals; and
- Promoting cultural, educational, and personal exchanges.

In this session I spoke on the topic of co-operation in disaster prevention.

Second Plenary Session: Regional and International Situation—Politics and Security

- Strengthening peace and security in the region
- Situation in the Korean Peninsula
- Combating terrorism, illegal drug trafficking, and organised crime; and
- Situation in the Middle East and North Africa.
Third Plenary Session: Regional and International Situation—Economy

- Asia Pacific Economic Co-operation (APEC) 2011: Report by the USA
- Global economic situation
- Imbalance in the world economy and sustainable economic growth
- Energy and food security; and
- Promoting economic partnerships and free trade.

I spoke on promoting economic partnerships and free trade.

Fourth Plenary Session

At previous APPF Annual Meetings in Singapore 2010 and Ulaan Baatar 2011, the Honorary President, Mr Yasihiro Nakasone, had called for suggestions on the reform of the APPF. The final report “The New APPF Rules of Procedure” was adopted in Tokyo. Many of the reforms I presented for consideration were subsequently included in the new rules.

Over the past 20 years the international community and the Asia-Pacific region have undergone major changes. The New Tokyo Declaration reaffirms the principles nurtured by the APPF and gives an indication of its future direction.

Adoption of resolutions and joint communiqué

The joint communiqué, which included the 13 resolutions, was adopted and signed by the heads of delegations.

The Russian Federation has taken over the presidency of the APPF, with the 21st Annual Meeting to be held in Vladivostok in January 2013.

Conclusion

The APPF provides a valuable opportunity for parliamentarians from Asia-Pacific nations to discuss a wide range of international issues. It continues to be a relevant forum for New Zealand to engage with the region, and contributes to our wider bilateral goals regarding APEC and other multilateral Asia-Pacific forums.

In terms of New Zealand’s relationship with Japan, the warm hospitality of our Japanese hosts was greatly appreciated, and the positive co-operation and goodwill between our two countries was strengthened as a result of this event.

Lindsay Tisch
Head of Delegation
Programme

Sunday, 8 January
14:00 Briefing for Delegation Secretaries
Venue: G510, TIF

16:00 Executive Committee Meeting
Venue: Hall B5, TIF

18:30 Reception hosted by the APPF Honorary President,
H.E. Mr Yasuhiro Nakasone, and the delegation of the National Diet of Japan
Venue: Imperial Hotel, Tokyo

Monday, 9 January
9:30 Group photo (heads of delegation only)
Venue: Hall D5, TIF

10:00 Opening Ceremony
Venue: Hall B5, TIF

11:20 First Plenary Session
Venue: Hall B5, TIF

12:30 Lunch
Venue Hall D5, TIF

14:00 First Plenary Session (Continued)
Item 1: Regional Cooperation in the Asia-Pacific Region

18:00 Dinner hosted by the Speaker of the House of Representatives,
H.E. Mr Takahiro Yokomichi
Venue: Hotel New Otani Tokyo

Tuesday, 10 January
9:00 Second Plenary Session
Venue: Hall B5, TIF

Item 1: Regional Cooperation in the Asia-Pacific Region
Item 2: Regional and International Situation: Politics and Security

12:00 Lunch
Venue: Hall D5, TIF

12:30 Lunch hosted by Mr Osamu Fujimura,
Chief Cabinet Secretary of Japan (heads of delegations only)
Venue: Iikura Kokan

14:00 Second Plenary Session (Continued)
Venue: Hall B5, TIF

Item 2: Regional and International Situation: Politics and Security

14:00 Drafting Committee Meeting
Venue: G510, TIF

Evening Embassy Night

Wednesday, 11 January

9:00 Third Plenary Session
Venue: Hall B5, TIF

Item 3: Regional and International Situation: Economy

9:00 Drafting Committee Meeting
Venue: G510, TIF

12:00 Lunch
Venue: Hall D5, TIF

14:00 Drafting Committee Meeting
Venue: G510, TIF

14:15 Meeting with H.E. Mr Yoshihiko Noda
Prime Minister of Japan (heads of delegations only)
Venue: Prime Minister’s Official Residence

15:30 Third Plenary Session (Continued)
Venue: Hall B5, TIF

Item 4: Future Work of the APPF

19:00 Dinner hosted by the President of the House of Councillors
HE Mr Hirata Kenji
Venue: The Ritz-Carlton, Tokyo

Thursday, 12 January

9:00 Fourth Plenary Session
Signing of Joint Communiqué
Closing Ceremony
Venue: Hall B5, TIF

11.00 Press Conference
Venue: G510, TIF

13.30 Cultural Tour.
* Meeting Venue: Tokyo International Forum
61st Westminster Seminar on Parliamentary Practice and Procedure
London, United Kingdom
5–9 March 2012

Head of Delegation – Trevor Mallard

Introduction

The Westminster Seminar on Parliamentary Practice and Procedure is an annual event hosted by the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association (CPA) United Kingdom Branch. The seminar allows members of Parliament and parliamentary staff to examine recent developments in parliamentary practice and procedures within a Westminster framework.

Delegation members

The New Zealand delegation consisted of MPs Hon Trevor Mallard and Richard Prosser. Peter Carr, Clerk-Assistant (Organisational Performance and Public Information), was in attendance for the clerks’ programme.

Event programme

The seminar offered an opportunity for Commonwealth parliamentarians to discuss various topics with a specific focus on the Westminster model. The following topics were explored through briefings, discussion sessions, practical observation, and workshops:

- The role of Parliament in holding the Executive to account, including scrutiny of legislation, committee work, questions, debates, and financial oversight
- The role of opposition parties and cross-party relations
- Party discipline and transparency
- The role of a second chamber and bicameralism
- The relationship between Parliament and the media
- Representation and the role of the MP in the constituency, and
- The management and administration of Parliament, including the work of the Speaker/Presiding Officer, Members’ Services, and security.

The programme was divided into discussion sessions with UK members and senior Westminster officials, and workshops and constituency visits, allowing participants to engage with a wide range of issues. Each session was designed to build members’ professional capacity and enhance their understanding of the challenges facing their Commonwealth colleagues. A copy of the programme is attached.

The seminar was attended by representatives from very diverse Commonwealth countries; while democracy and its institutions were a consistent focus, the diversity of its practice was on conspicuous display. Two non-Commonwealth jurisdictions, Oman and
Hong Kong, were represented, and there was an observer from the United Nations Development Programme. A list of participants is attached.

The strength and solidity of the UK parliamentary system was discussed in depth, and the seminar delegates were very fortunate to be afforded such a detailed glimpse into the workings of this historic, still-evolving system.

All the models of democracy represented had some common features, but the differences were also stark. It was a vivid illustration of how countries interpret democratic functions and processes differently according to their diverse cultures. The role of the Speaker of the House and the influence they can exert to bring parties together on issues was a highlight of the seminar.

**Meetings outside the event programme**

A highlight of the week was the constituency visits.

Hon Trevor Mallard MP travelled to Mitcham and Morden. This constituency has a relatively youthful population with a high proportion of managerial and skilled manual workers. Most people work for the public sector or in retail outside the constituency. Unemployment in May 2008 was 3.1 percent.

Richard Prosser MP visited Islington North. This is a compact, densely-populated inner-city constituency in North London. It is the smallest in the United Kingdom by area. While there is some gentrification, the constituency covers some of the most deprived, troubled, and crime-ridden parts of Islington.

**Conclusion**

While the seminar focused on the strength and durability of the Westminster system as it operates in the United Kingdom, changes to the system as it adapts to changes in UK society were also noted. The seminar coincided with the beginning of the build-up to the referendum on Scottish independence. A highlight of the seminar was a session on UK devolution, where views from members from Scotland, Wales, and Northern Ireland were heard. Another theme was the changing role of the back benches in the UK Parliament and their relationship with the members in government and senior opposition roles.

The seminar was a valuable experience for both first-term and more experienced MPs. We were impressed with the organisation of the programme and the number of MPs and parliamentary officials who gave up their valuable time to provide their analysis of the principles of the Westminster system.

Trevor Mallard MP  
Head of Delegation

Richard Prosser MP  
Delegation Member
Programme

Monday, 5 March

Seminar Briefing: Welcome and delegate introductions

Rt Hon Sir Alan Haselhurst MP (Conservative), Chair, CPA UK

Executive Committee:
Mr Andrew Tuggey DL, Secretary, CPA UK
Mr Crispin Poyser, Clerk of the Overseas Office, House of Commons

Session 1: Introduction to the UK Parliament

Structure of UK Parliament, historical background, recent reforms; defining features; current issues/recent debates

Mr David Natzler, Director General, Department of Chamber and Committee Services
Mr Todd Landman, Director, Centre for Democratic Governance, Essex University
Chair: Mr Andrew Rosindell MP (Conservative)

Session 2: The Legislative Process

Where do bills originate; what are Private Members’ Bills; who drafts the bills and how do they become law?

Ms Jacqy Sharpe, Clerk of Legislation
Ms Kate Emms, Clerk of Private Members Bills
Chair: Mr Adrian Sanders MP (Liberal Democrat)

Session 3: The Role of an MP

What does a constituency MP do and how does it vary from country to country; how is the constituency office run; the relationship between the party and the MP; List MP and constituency MP – different perceptions

Dr Roberta Blackman-Woods (Labour)
Sir Peter Bottomley MP (Conservative)
Chair: Mr Andy Love MP (Labour)

Session 4: The Role of the Opposition
What is the role of the opposition parties in scrutinising the Executive; how are opposition parties financed; life in opposition and co-operation with Members from other parties

Mr Hugh Bayley MP (Labour)
Ms Pat Glass MP (Labour)
Mr Tony Lloyd MP (Labour)
Mr Angus MacNeil MP (SNP)
Chair: Miss Anne McIntosh MP (Conservative)

Tuesday, 6 March

Session 5: Running Parliament

How is the UK Parliament administered and managed? Interaction between Houses?

Mr Robert Rogers, Clerk of the House of Commons
Mr David Beamish, Clerk of the Parliaments
Chair: Rt Hon Lord Foulkes of Cumnock (Labour)

Session 6: Bicameralism: The Work of a Second Chamber

Advantages and disadvantages of a bicameral system; work of the House of Lords and its relationship with the Commons; role of the Lord Speaker; future reforms

Rt Hon. Baroness D’Souza CMG, Lord Speaker
Rt Hon. Lord Grocott (Labour)
Chair: Rt Hon. Lord Dholakia PC OBE DL (Liberal Democrat)

Session 7: Party Discipline within Parliament

How do the Whips operate as a channel of communication between the front and back benches; how is party discipline maintained; how do the government and opposition interact to deliver parliamentary business; how are Whip’s Offices organised?

Rt Hon. John Randall MP, Government Deputy Chief Whip (Conservative)
Ms Rosie Winterton MP, Opposition Chief Whip (Labour)
Chair: Rt Hon. John Spellar MP (Labour)

Session 8: The Working Parliament

View Ministerial Questions in the Chamber
View a Committee in Session

View House of Lords in the Chamber

Session 9: The Committee System

The scrutiny role of committees; how committees function: taking evidence, committee visits, reports; what is the role of the committee chair; how are they monitored

1530–1630 – Background from a Clerk

Mr Andrew Kennon, Clerk of Committees

Chair: Rt Hon. Lord Anderson of Swansea DL (Labour)

1630–1730 – Committee Chairs and their clerks: experiences

Mr Tim Yeo MP, Chair of the Energy and Climate Change Select Committee (Conservative)

Ms Sarah Hartwell-Naguib, Clerk of the Energy and Climate Change Select Committee

Wednesday, 7 March

Session 10: The Role of the Leader of the House

The management of the House of Commons; Parliament/Government relations;

Mr David Heath CBE MP, Deputy Leader of the House of Commons (Liberal Democrat)

Chair: Rt Hon Baroness Taylor of Bolton (Labour)

Session 11: UK Devolution

Has devolution been successful in the UK; what are the continuing challenges; is there an end point

Mr Peter Wishart MP (SNP)

Rt Hon. Elfyn Llwyd MP (Plaid Cymru)

Rt Hon. Paul Murphy MP (Labour)

Chair: Rt Hon. Jeffrey Donaldson MP (DUP)

Session 12: Holding the Prime Minister to Account

What is the purpose and procedure of PMQs and how effective is it; how is the Prime Minister held to account aside from PMQs
Mr Liam Laurence-Smyth, Clerk of Journals

Prime Ministers’ Question Time followed by questions

Session 13: The Role of the Media in Parliamentary Oversight

How do media and MPs interact?; how to build successful relationships with national and local media; relationships with lobby/investigative/parliamentary journalists; media training for MPs; maximising modern technology (FB, Twitter)

Mr John Whittingdale OBE MP, Chair of the Culture, Media and Sport Select Committee (Labour)

Mr Jim Sheridan MP, Member of the Culture, Media and Sport Select Committee (Labour)

Mr Nicholas Jones, Council Member, Campaign for Press and Broadcasting Freedom

Chair: Ms Rita Payne, International President of the Commonwealth Journalists Association

Session 14: Parliamentary Questions and Motions

Different types of motions and how are they are tabled; what rules govern parliamentary questions

Mr Paul Evans, Principal Clerk of the Table Office

Chair: Mr John Robertson MP (Labour)

Session 15: Broadcasting Parliament

Should Parliament be broadcast? How has the broadcasting of Parliament evolved? How can viewing figures be increased?

Mr John Angeli, Director of Parliamentary Broadcasting

Mr Peter Knowles, Controller, BBC Parliament

Chair: Sir Roger Gale MP (Conservative)

Thursday, 8 March

Session 16: Women in Politics and Parliament

Current numbers of women in Parliament; how an increase has been achieved; continuing challenges and how to address them?

Ms Mary McLeod MO (Conservative)

Ms Dawn Primarolo MP (Conservative)
Ms Jo Swinson MP (Liberal Democrat)
Chair: Rt Hon Baroness Hayman GBE (Crossbench)

Session 17: Parliament and Non-Governmental Organisations (NGOs)

Since 2008 all UN members are reviewed every four years on their human rights records and practices via a mechanism called the Universal Periodic Review. This session will explore how NGOs can influence the outcome of the reviews and ultimately contribute to improving the situation of human rights in every country.

Ms Jean Candler, Head of Policy and Public Affairs, British Institute of Human Rights
Professor Jane Cowan, Professor of Social Anthropology, University of Essex
Ms Davinia Ovett Cowan, Advocacy Manager, Child Rights Governance Initiative
Dr Purn Sen, Director, programme for African Leadership, London School of Economics

Chair: Lord Dubs (Labour)

Session 18: Standards and Privileges

The role of the Standards and Privileges Committee; the role of the Parliamentary Commissioner for Standards; what are Parliamentary Standards

Rt Hon. Kevin Barron MP, Chair of the Standards and Privileges Committee (Labour)
Mr John Lyon CB, Parliamentary Commissioner for Standards
Ms Eve Samson, Clerk of the Standards and Privileges Committee

Chair: Mrs Heather Wheeler MP (Conservative)

Session 19: The Role of the Speaker

How is the Speaker elected – should he/she renounce party affiliation?; should the Speaker be a serving Parliamentarian; what is the role of the Speaker and is there a role outside Parliament

Rt Hon. John Bercow MP, Speaker of the House of Commons

Chair: Rt Hon. David Hanson MP (Labour)

Session 20: Parliamentary Information Services

How are Parliamentary Information Services structured in a modern Parliament; what other information services are available to Members; the challenges of the internet

Mr John Pullinger, Director General, Information Services
Ms Tracy Green, Head of the Parliamentary Web and Intranet Service

Chair: Ms Lyn Brown MP (Labour)

Friday, 9 March

Constituency Visits

Session 21: Report Back on Constituency Visits

Round table discussion on points of interest

Session 22: Young People and Parliament – Engaging the Next Generation

Engaging young people with politics and parliament; practical ways of engagement – youth parliaments

  Dr Emma-Jane Watchorn, Education Service Manager, Education Unit

  Miss Elizabeth Murray, Tasmanian 2011 Commonwealth Youth Parliamentarian

  Miss Cui Yin Mok, Singaporean 2011 Commonwealth Youth Parliamentarian

Summing up session, feedback and presentation of certificates

  Chair: Baroness Hooper CMG, CPA UK Executive Committee Member (Conservative)

Optional tour of the Houses of Parliament
Participants

Mr Paul Arditti, Alderney
Mrs Sarah Elizabeth Kelly, Alderney
Mr Michael Tatham, Northern Territory, Australia
Hon Carmel Zollo ML, South Australia
Hon Craig Farrell MLC, Tasmania
Mr Michael Philip Murray MLA, Western Australia
Hon John Boyce, Barbados
Hon Marc Bean MP, Bermuda
Ms Jinny Sims MP, Canada, Federal
Mr John Williamson MP, Canada, Federal
Mme Marie Danielle Vachon, Canada, Federal
Mr Daniel Bernard MNA, Quebec, Canada
Hon Dr Barry Elsby MLA, Falkland Islands
Hon Ahmed Ibrahim MP, Ghana
Mrs Linda Gyekye-Boadu, Ghana
Hon Kwok Hung Leung MLC, Hong Kong
Hon Starry Lee MLC, Hong Kong
Mr Kwok Cheong Lau, Hong Kong
Shri Modan Lasam Arunachal, Pradesh, India
Mr Pasang Sona MLA, Arunachal, Pradesh, India
Mr Satya Narayana Sahu, India
Deputy Michael Roderick Higgins, Jersey
Hon Prof. Philip Kaloki MP, Kenya
Hon Millie Odhiambo-Mabona MP, Kenya
Mr John Mutega, Kenya
Hon Dr Mareko Tofinga MP, Kiribati
Mr Eni Tekanene, Kiribati
Hon Clement Mlombwa MP, Malawi
Mr Emmanuel Desiderio Liwimbi, Malawi
Hon Lee Kim Sin MLA, Selangor, Malaysia
Hon Weng San Lau MLA, Selangor, Malaysia
Hon Mohamed Hussain MP, Maldives
Hon Ibrahim Mohamed Solih MP, Maldives
Hon Dr Louis Deguara MP, Malta
Ms Pauline Abela, Malta
Hon Trevor Colin Mallard MP, New Zealand
Mr Richard Prosser MP, New Zealand
Mr Peter Carr, New Zealand
Hon Salim Al-Kamyani MP, Oman
Hon Mohammed Al-Mahruqy MP, Oman
Mr Muhammad Afzal Sandhu MNA, Pakistan
Mr Malik Kamran Azam Khan Rajar, Pakistan
Mr Mir Nasir Khan Jam Ali MPA Balochistan, Pakistan
Mr Maqsood Ahmad Malik, Punjab, Pakistan
Mr Malik Nosher Khan Anjum Lungerial MPA, Punjab, Pakistan
Hon Evariste Bizimana MP, Rwanda
Hon Nichole Stella Bernadette Barbe MNA, Seychelles
Ms Sandra Debbie Giovana Hall, Seychelles
Mr Ibrahim Sulaiman Sesay, Sierra Leone
Hon. Mohamed Orner Adan MP, Somaliland
Hon Bashir Sheek Hussein Tukaale MP, Somaliland
Hon Siphiwo Sam Mazosiwe MP, South Africa
Hon Jacobus Marthinus Bekker MP, South Africa
Ms Constance Mhlambiso, South Africa
Hon Arundika Fernando MP, Sri Lanka
Hon Ajith Perera MP, Sri Lanka
Hon Fatma Mbarouk Said MP, Zanziba, Tanzania
Hon Saihouna Sanneh, The Gambia
Mr Daniel Cardos, The Gambia
Hon Rudranath Indarsingh MP, Trinidad and Tobago
Ms Marlene McDonald MP, Trinidad and Tobago
Hon Charles Angina MP, Uganda
Mr Louislordnay Bakyenga, Uganda
Mrs Julia Keutgen, Observer, UNDP
Commonwealth Parliamentary Seminar  
**Apia, Samoa**  
24–30 May 2012

Head of Delegation—Jonathan Young

**Introduction**

The Commonwealth Parliamentary Association (CPA) is a network of Commonwealth parliamentarians representing 30 percent of the world’s population, who share a commitment to strengthening the institution of Parliament. It seeks to build an informed parliamentary community capable of deepening the Commonwealth’s democratic commitment, and of furthering co-operation among its parliaments and legislatures. It pursues its aims through activities aimed primarily at members of parliaments and legislatures, and at parliamentary officials.

CPA programmes provide the sole means of regular consultation among members of the Commonwealth, fostering co-operation and understanding, and promoting the study of and respect for good parliamentary practice.

The seminar is an annual event arranged by CPA for its members throughout the Commonwealth, this year being hosted by the Samoan Parliament. The location of the seminar held special resonance as 2012 marks the 50th anniversary of Samoa gaining independence from New Zealand trusteeship, which lasted 1919 to 1962.

**Delegation members**

Jonathan Young MP was the sole New Zealand delegate. The following jurisdictions were also represented:

Samoa, Saskatchewan – Canada, Quebec – Canada, Jersey, Sri Lanka, Lok Sabha – India, Haryana – India, Kerala – India, Western Australia, New South Wales, Tasmania, Singapore, South Africa, United Kingdom, Malta, Trinidad – Tobago, Solomon Islands, Vanuatu, Kiribati.

**Event programme**

The conference was opened by His Excellency Tuilaepa Neioti Aiono Sailele Malielegaoi, Prime Minister of Samoa, after receiving a homily by Pastor Viliamu Mafoe.

The format of the seminar was a series of moderated sessions, where a member of Parliament gave a 10–15 minute presentation followed by moderated dialogue between members of the seminar.
These were the sessions presented:

- **Session 1**: The Commonwealth and the Role of CPA
- **Session 2**: The Inherent Functions of Parliament – the Varied Roles and Responsibilities of MPs
- **Session 3**: Oversight Role of Parliament – Constitutional Prescriptions v Political Realities
- **Session 4**: Parliament and Political Parties – Parliamentarians’ Roles as MPs and Committee Members v MPs’ Party Obligations.
- **Session 5**: The Offices of Parliament – the Relationship between the Office of the Speaker and the Office of the Clerk
- **Session 6**: Parliamentary Institutional Strengthening
- **Session 7**: Professional Development of MPs
- **Session 8**: The Secretariat – MPs’ Support
- **Session 9**: Parliament and Gender

Sessions provided rich points for dialogue. It was valuable to understand the differences in views between the various Westminster parliamentary systems operating throughout the Commonwealth.

CPA provided two resource people: Dr Margaret Wilson (former Speaker of the New Zealand Parliament and current Professor of Law at Waikato University), and Professor Dr Richard Herr (University of Tasmania).

There was significant dialogue throughout the seminar on the subject of increasing female participation in the parliaments of the Commonwealth. Discussion demonstrated this is an increasing issue of interest. It was interesting to note that the Samoan Parliament is considering constitutional change, whereby at least five seats – or 10 per cent – of the members of Parliament will be female.

I delivered presentations on the relationship between Parliament and civil society and Parliament and the media, and moderated a session on support for members of Parliament.

**Parliament and civil society**

Regarding the subject of Parliament and civil society, I took a completely different approach than might otherwise have been expected.

Modern media news is more instant than ever before, so the public can be engaged in political processes as they happen. As this new world has emerged, there has been increasing demand in different jurisdictions, particularly those that are not democratic, for an increased level of participation. We have seen the popular uprisings in the Middle East (Arab Spring), as a result of people, essentially wanting a new political process and to be actively involved in that process.

I spoke on how Parliament can work to keep society civil through enabling greater participation by that society in the democratic process.
The parliamentarian and the media

Freedom of speech is inherently the basis of democracy; it is the right of every man and woman to have a view and be able to express it, and all that this entails.

Key points I covered were:

1. The media has an important part to play in the democratic process.
   - The media, for many people, is the only interface they have with politics and the people who make decisions affecting them, therefore, the media is essential to their being informed, and equally important is it therefore that they are informed accurately.
   - Parliament should have a healthy grasp of the democratic purpose of the media and work to protect it, by ensuring and demanding high standards – so it is not tempted to control it, thereby protecting its independence. The public too through natural market forces is also responsible to ensure media standards are high.
   - There is a balance that has to be found between freedom of speech and fundamental standards of responsibility, decency and quality.
   - There is a balance between the right to privacy and the right to investigate.
   - It takes an experienced editor to judge what is in the public interest and what just interests the public.
   - Does being a politician mean you give up elements of your privacy and where do you draw the line.
   - Press Council published an article on the increasing tabloid nature of reporting, which may increase readership, but which does not serve the public or politicians well.

2. People rely on the media to get the story out.
   - The press will give bigger headlines to protagonists. The rebuttal gives a second leg to the story because the media must report the rebuttal if they have reported the original allegation.
   - Disenfranchised people will often go to the media. Problems will often turn up in the media. Use the media as a tool – like a scout that informs you of the issues that you might otherwise miss.
   - The media can become the unofficial Opposition if the official Opposition is not offering a strong alternative to the Government of the day. Therefore, the editorial content of the newspaper may appear to turn against a Government, whereas they are acting as a watchdog, when the usual watchdog is inactive. Whether that is a conscious or an unconscious act, the Westminster style of Government is adversarial and if a strong Opposition is not present, the media becomes the Opposition by default.

3. The media is in a competitive business so its altruistic purposes can be thwarted by readership and financial considerations.
• Owners of media must recognise that ownership does not justify profits as being the principal purpose of the company. The obligation to INFORM is equally as important as the goal to earn a PROFIT.

• A proliferation of media outlets under different ownership is better than a proliferation under single ownership that can lead to the opinions or prejudices of a few journalists forming public opinion when spread through a number of outlets. There is no such thing as “Public opinion”, only “Published opinion”. Reliance on a single source has never been a good thing.

• There is a temptation for Politicians, ambitious and hungry for media attention, to depart from the principle of selfless service and try to become a celebrity in order to engage more media attention. Attempts at attracting media attention do not really help politicians. It comes across as self-serving and insincere.

• There is a real hunger for in-depth investigative journalism and editors ought to encourage their journalists to have a depth of understanding of the issues before they send journalists out to cover a story.

4. There needs to be mutual respect between politicians and journalists if both are going to serve the same constituents with integrity.

• Accountability is of the foremost importance in democratic government and part of that accountability is achieved through the media’s reporting. But the media and journalists must ultimately be accountable to the public too and they, like politicians, must live up to standards that ensure their integrity.

• There is a natural tension in a politician-media relationship. Both parties must be willing to accept that usually the other side is trying to do an honest job.

Meetings outside the event programme

A welcoming reception and dinner was held for all delegates on Friday, 25 May 2012 from 7:30pm at the Maota Tofilau Eti Alesana. The closing dinner and ceremony was held in the meeting hall of the House of Parliament and provided outstanding entertainment by Samoan performers.

Conclusion

The delegation visited the area of the main island that was devastated by the 29 September 2009 tsunami. New Zealand scientists determined that the waves measured 14 metres (46 feet) at their highest on the Samoan coast. Twenty villages on Upolu south side were reportedly destroyed.

Jonathan Young
Member of Parliament
43rd Presiding Officers and Clerks
Conference of the Australian and Pacific Regions
Honiara, Solomon Islands
24–27 July 2012

Head of Delegation – Lindsay Tisch

Introduction

The 43rd Presiding Officers and Clerks Conference of the Australia and Pacific Regions was held in Honiara, Solomon Islands from 24 to 26 July 2012, followed by a one-day Twinning Conference on the parliamentary twinning arrangements in the region. Presiding Officers and Clerks from the Parliament of the Commonwealth of Australia, Australian state and territory parliaments, the New Zealand Parliament, and Pacific parliaments, including the autonomous region of Bougainville, the Cook Islands, Kiribati, Nauru, Norfolk Island, Samoa, the Solomon Islands, Tuvalu, and Vanuatu attended the conference.

Lindsay Tisch MP, Assistant Speaker and Debra Angus, Deputy Clerk of the House of Representatives represented the New Zealand Parliament. Averil Taylor, Parliamentary Officer (Parliamentary Relations) also attended for the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association Pacific region management meeting in her capacity as acting regional secretary.

We were met on our arrival at Honiara Airport and later welcomed at a reception hosted by the Speaker of the Parliament of the Solomon Islands, Sir Allan Kemakeza in the Festival of Pacific Arts Village. Conference delegates were treated to a lively performance of tribal dances and songs by some of the Solomon Islands performers from the recent Festival of Pacific Arts.

The New Zealand delegation with the Speaker and Clerk of the Solomon Islands Parliament, (from left) Lindsay Tisch, Taeasi Sanga, Hon Sir Allan Kemakeza, Debra Angus and Averil Taylor.
Conference programme

This conference provides a rare opportunity for professional development for presiding officers and clerks in a regional context. Participants can share their knowledge and experience of developments in parliamentary procedure and the operation of their parliaments. They also used this opportunity to hold a number of regional meetings. Including Commonwealth Parliamentary Association (CPA) management meetings for Australia and the Pacific regions, followed by the first joint meeting of the CPA Australia and Pacific regions, and a conference on the parliamentary twinning arrangements in the region.

The conference commenced with delegates giving a brief overview of important recent events and procedural developments in their parliaments. These reports highlighted the significant challenges faced by many parliaments, especially those in the Pacific because of their small size, lack of resources, limited community engagement, and low representation of women. While the Australian and New Zealand parliaments are generally larger and better resourced than those of our Pacific neighbours, many common themes emerged concerning the impact of technology, the need to build the capacity of members of Parliament and parliamentary staff, and measures to enhance select committee scrutiny. Minority governments and coalition arrangements present particular challenges for presiding officers and it was also interesting to hear from jurisdictions where the Speaker is appointed or elected from outside the House of Representatives.

A wide range of topics were covered in the presentations by delegates, including parliamentary autonomy and financial independence, private members’ business, parliamentary committees, developments in procedure, parliamentary privilege, enhancing scrutiny at question time, and the challenges of a post-conflict Parliament.

Parliamentary autonomy

Tom Duncan, Clerk of the Legislative Assembly for the Australian Capital Territory, presented a paper entitled “Enshrining Independence—the Establishment of the Office of the Legislative Assembly”. In it he outlined recent moves in the ACT to develop stronger, more clearly defined set of arrangements to enshrine the independence of the organisation that supports the legislature as separate from executive government. The enactment of legislation was seen as a milestone in establishing a robust legislative and administrative framework for the legislature’s support agency, giving effect to the separation of powers doctrine within the ACT’s constitutional system.

Private members’ business

“Private Members’ Business in a Minority Parliament”, a paper by David Elder, Deputy Clerk of the Australian House of Representatives, highlighted recent changes in the House of Representatives to the conduct of private members’ business. Reform of private members’ business was central to wide-ranging reforms to House practice and procedure implemented during the formation of a minority government in the House of Representatives following the Australian election in August 2010. In summary, the changes have resulted in:

- more time being allocated to private members’ business;
- the opportunity to vote on private members’ business matters;
- a significant increase in private members’ bills being presented to the House for consideration; and
• the establishment of a selection committee to oversee private members’ business.

The paper noted that the significant increase in time available for debate on private members’ business, from 2½ hours in the last Parliament to 8½ hours in the current Parliament, has elicited mixed views as to whether the additional time is necessary and being used effectively. There has also been a dramatic increase in the number of private members’ bills presented to the House, from 20 in the last Parliament, to 42 in the first 21 months of the current Parliament. Before this Parliament the last private member’s bill to be passed was in 1999; but in the current Parliament, of the 15 private members’ bills that have come to vote, six have been passed. The great increase in private members’ bills has resulted in additional resources being allocated to drafting, including the secondment of an experienced drafter from the Office of the Parliamentary Counsel.

The greater prominence of private members’ business has led to a culture change, this business now being regarded as an important component of House proceedings allowing individual members to influence debate. This reform has shifted the balance between the House and executive government, and enhanced the influence of private members on the business of the House.

Committee scrutiny

Rob Hansen, Research Director, Committee Office of the Parliament of Queensland, delivered a paper entitled “Queensland’s Portfolio-Based Committee System”. He explained the context and reform processes that led to the Queensland Legislative Assembly adopting a system of portfolio-based committees, and integrating their work into the core legislative functions of the Assembly. The Queensland Parliament is the only unicameral state legislature in Australia. With an entrenched party system, the Parliament of Queensland has had little representation of minor parties and independents for many years. Scrutiny of government portfolios by committees was patchy and there was no committee scrutiny of the broader policy implications of legislation. In 2010 a select committee was established to conduct an inquiry and report on how the parliamentary oversight of legislation and accountability in the parliamentary committee system could be enhanced.

The committee examined a number of different committee systems and visited the New Zealand Parliament, as well as the Canadian Upper and Lower Houses and several provincial legislatures with unicameral parliaments. Following the committee’s review and its report, a new committee system has been established, introducing portfolio committees. Their primary functions are to examine and report to the House on bills and subordinate legislation, and on portfolio appropriations in the state budget; they perform the role of public accounts and public works committees in respect of entities within their portfolios.

The paper concluded that, in practice, the new portfolio-based committee system has worked well and afforded unprecedented scrutiny of bills, with public hearings and broadcasting of proceedings making parliamentary processes more open and accessible.
Presiding Officers and Clerks from Australia and Pacific regions meet in the Solomon Islands Parliament debating chamber.

**New Zealand papers**

Our papers focused on the review by the New Zealand Standing Orders Committee conducted in each parliamentary term to ensure that the House and its committees continue to operate effectively and that Parliament remains relevant. The review in 2011 recommended a package of proposals to improve the effectiveness of the House in various ways:

- increasing the availability of House time to allow the Government to implement its legislative programme with less frequent resort to urgency
- improving the scrutiny of legislative proposals, with time for informed, open policy deliberation
- ensuring the quality of legislation, with maximum opportunities for consideration of bills and amendments, and observance of fundamental rights and freedoms
- making more effective use of sitting hours, while giving members opportunities to debate matters that are important to them
- providing incentives for the Government and non-government parties to negotiate more actively in the Business Committee to plan the House’s business, and
- promoting openness, transparency, and accessibility, and public participation in parliamentary processes.

I presented a paper, entitled “Parliamentary Procedures: remaining relevant by effective use of House time and streamlining House procedure”. I outlined the changes that had been made to Standing Orders for new ways to arrange House business, covering engagement in the Business Committee, extended sittings, cognate bills, changes to procedures during the committee of the whole House, the grouping of amendments, instructions to select committees, the members’ bill process, and the reading of speeches. I examined the impact of the changes since the new Standing Orders were adopted in 2011. While it is still early days, the signs are promising that with provision for extended sittings, there will be less use of urgency to progress government business.
Debra Angus, Deputy Clerk, presented a paper, entitled “Openness, transparency and maintaining mutual respect between Parliament and the courts”. It examines a number of issues raised by the review by the Standing Orders Committee concerning openness and transparency. The paper focused on the recommendations of the Standing Orders Committee on a revised sub judice rule and the Law Commission’s review of the Official Information Act 1982 (OIA). The review made initial proposals for the OIA to apply to Parliament, but not to parliamentary proceedings. The Law Commission released its final report shortly before the presentation of our paper, allowing Debra Angus to provide an update on the proposed application of the OIA to the parliamentary agencies.

Lindsay Tisch (back left) with New Zealand High Commissioner Mark Ramsden, (front row from left) Debra Angus, Averil Taylor and Leonie Tisch.

**CPA Region Management meetings**

The conference also provided an opportunity to hold separate meetings of the CPA Region Management for Australia and the CPA Region Management for the Pacific. The delegations from Bougainville, the Cook Islands, Kiribati, Nauru, New Zealand, Samoa, the Solomon Islands, Tuvalu, and Vanuatu were present at the Pacific Region meeting. Reports were received on the CPA Executive Committee meeting held in Tonga in April 2012 and on the CPA Working Party Meeting recommendations from Moana Mackey MP (Chairperson of the Working Party). The replacement for Niue as the Pacific Region representative on the CPA Executive Committee for the period 2012 to 2015 was also discussed.

The separate region management meetings were followed by a joint CPA Australia Region and Pacific Region meeting. This was the first time that such a joint meeting had been held. Delegates heard about a proposal led by Australia to review the arrangements for regional conferences and seminars. The Australian Region had agreed at its meeting in 2011 to review these arrangements and, once it had formed its position, to seek Pacific Region input. The review was prompted by concern on the part of Australian members that the distinction between conferences and seminars, which are held in alternate years, had become blurred. There is a wish to increase participation in the meetings and the opportunities for personal and professional development with the region. Changes are also proposed to the funding arrangements, so that Australian and Pacific branches would meet their own travel and accommodation costs. In recognition of differing financial circumstances in the Pacific, it was proposed that the Pacific branches, except for
New Zealand, could have half the total costs for their branch-nominated representatives met each year by the sponsoring branches. This proposal is to replace the current arrangements where financial support is available for attendance by the Pacific branches every second year at a regional seminar.

The Australian proposal for review raised a number of wider issues:

- the appropriate format for regional seminars and conferences
- the reasons for declining attendance, particularly by Pacific members
- how participation should be funded
- the implications of expanding attendance beyond the region and
- the impact of twinning arrangements, which are also used for capacity building within the region.

It was agreed that the Australian proposal should be circulated for discussion and to add delegates from New Zealand and the Pacific (Kiribati) to the working party. It was further agreed that the proposal would be finalised at a joint CPA Australia Region and Pacific Region meeting to be held during the next Presiding Officers and Clerks Conference in the Australian Capital Territory in July 2013.

**Working group on model for future Presiding Officers and Clerks Conferences**

Following agreement at Australian regional management meetings in 2011, it was agreed to establish a working party on the location, format, and funding model for future Presiding Officers and Clerks’ Conferences. The working group initially comprised ACT, Queensland, and Northern Territory representatives, and New Zealand and Vanuatu were added to the group. The working group’s recommendations were discussed at the end of the conference in the Solomon Islands, and it was agreed to develop a rolling roster with standby legislatures for the hosting of each conference.

**Twinning Conference**

At the Presiding Officers and Clerks Conference held in the Cook Islands in July 2007, a proposal to establish twinning arrangements between the Australian and Pacific branches was discussed among CPA branches and formalised at the conference the following year. The purpose of twinning is to foster parliamentary co-operation between branches in the Australian and Pacific regions, through the exchange of information, assistance with training, and exchanges of visits between parliaments. The list of twinned parliaments is as follows:

- Australian Capital Territory and Kiribati
- New South Wales and Bougainville and the Solomon Islands
- Northern Territory and Niue
- Queensland and Papua New Guinea and Vanuatu
- South Australia and Tonga
• Victoria and Nauru and Tuvalu
• Tasmania and Samoa
• Western Australia and the Cook Islands.

It was decided that the Commonwealth of Australia and New Zealand branches would manage twinning arrangements jointly, providing advice and support as required. They would also continue to exchange information and assist with training and exchanges of visits between Pacific parliaments and the Australian and New Zealand parliaments.

Twinning arrangements between the Australian state and territory parliaments and parliaments in the Pacific region have developed rapidly, but not always consistently, over the past few years. In particular, the parliaments of New South Wales, the Solomon Islands, and the autonomous region of Bougainville House of Representatives have actively pursued twinning arrangements and benefited greatly from them. These parliaments proposed holding a twinning conference, following the Presiding Officers and Clerks Conference, to share their experiences with other parliaments in the region and learn from other parliaments about their arrangements.

The New South Wales Parliament received $AUS800,000 in funding to support the partnership arrangements from the Australian Agency for International Development (AusAID), under its Pacific Public Sector Linkages Programme. The funding, which is provided for a three-year period to April 2013, allows practical support for strengthening the parliaments of Bougainville and the Solomon Islands through staff placements, secondments, and other activities. The primary purpose of the twinning project is to strengthen the Solomon Islands and Bougainville parliaments to improve their institutional capacity to support the legislative, representative, and scrutiny and oversight functions of Parliament.

Participants heard from the presiding officers and clerks of the Solomon Islands, Bougainville, and the New South Wales parliaments about the activities and achievements under the twinning project so far. To be effective, twinning arrangements between parliaments call for understanding of the needs of developing parliaments, the expectations of all parties, and the different contexts in which the parliaments operate. A good relationship between the clerks of the parliaments is important, and support from the presiding officers is essential. Co-ordination of activities is also important to ensure a good match for priorities and capacity building.

Participants in the twinning workshop had the opportunity to share their experiences and arrangements, including the oversight and co-ordination role played by the New Zealand House of Representatives and the Australian Commonwealth Parliament. The Australian Parliament (also known as the Commonwealth Parliament or Federal Parliament) recently successfully applied for funding through AusAID to support twinning activities between the parliaments of Kiribati, Tonga, Tuvalu, Samoa, the Cook Islands, and Vanuatu and their Australian partner parliaments. The experience of the Bougainville, Solomon Islands and New South Wales parliaments with twinning will provide a useful source of information and guidance for these new activities. The key to the success of the twinning programme is to build a network of support between Australian state and territory parliaments and their Pacific twins, the New Zealand Parliament, the Australian Commonwealth, and other development agencies.
Participants agreed that similar twinning conferences associated with a regional forum, such as the Presiding Officers and Clerks Conference, will be important to provide oversight to ensure effective use of funding, and ensure good communication about twinning activities.

Joint presentation on twinning arrangements: David Blunt (NSW), Robert Tapi (Bougainville), Ronda Miller (NSW), Taeasi Sanga (Solomon Islands), and Hon Sir Allan Kemakeza (Solomon Islands).

Meeting with New Zealand–RAMSI assistance

The Regional Assistance Mission to Solomon Islands (RAMSI) is a partnership between the people and Government of the Solomon Islands and 15 contributing countries of the Pacific region to help the Solomon Islands achieve long-term stability, security, and prosperity. The overarching goal of RAMSI is a peaceful, well-governed, prosperous country, to be achieved through a programme of international support. New Zealand Defence Force and Police personnel currently contribute to the mission; their withdrawal is planned to take place over the next few years.

Accompanied by the New Zealand High Commissioner, Mark Ramsden, we met with the Deputy Special Co-ordinator, Wayne Higgins and Deputy Commander, Major Syd Dewes, and discussed the assistance and support given by New Zealand Defence Force and Police personnel to help the Solomon Islands develop their own stability, governance, and prosperity.

Cultural performance for delegates given by youth group participating in a strengthening programme.
Conclusion

This conference provides a valuable opportunity for the professional development of Presiding Officers and Clerks of the Pacific and Australia regions, and for them to share experiences of developments in parliamentary procedure and law. It also works towards a long-term objective of building parliamentary capacity, particularly in the Pacific. The issues discussed were topical and very relevant to our Parliament.

We thank the Parliament of the Solomon Islands for its generosity in hosting us. We would like to pay tribute to the organisers of the conference, particularly for overcoming daunting challenges to conclude the conference on the final day, after Honiara was shaken by a magnitude 6.5 earthquake.

We look forward to continuing to work to develop the capacity of national parliaments in the Pacific region, particularly through the twinning arrangements. In our capacity as the CPA’s regional secretariat in the Pacific, we will continue to focus on effective co-ordination and communication to assist partners working in the Pacific.

Lindsay Tisch MP
Assistant Speaker
Programme

Monday, 23 July 2012

Welcome reception

Hosted by Speaker of National Parliament of Solomon Islands – Hon Sir Allan Kemakeza

Tuesday, 24 July 2012

Official opening

Official photographs

Jurisdictional reports (Chaired by Conference Chair)
- Solomon Islands
- New South Wales
- Autonomous Region of Bougainville
- Queensland
- Vanuatu
- Australian Capital Territory
- Kiribati
- South Australia
- Victoria
- Nauru

Jurisdictional reports (Chaired by Conference Deputy Chair)
- Tuvalu
- New Zealand
- Northern Territory
- Norfolk Island
- Tasmania
- Samoa
- Western Australia
- Cook Islands
- Australia
Conference papers

Autonomy and Strategy (Chaired by Conference Deputy Chair):

Hon Allan Kemakeza (Speaker, National Parliament of Solomon Islands): Parliament autonomy

Tom Duncan (Clerk, ACT Legislative Assembly): Enshrining Independence: the establishment of the Office of the Legislative Assembly


Welcome dinner

Hosted by Prime Minister of Solomon Islands – Hon Gordon Darcy Lilo

**Wednesday, 25 July 2012**

Education Trust Fund Executive Meeting

Conference papers

Committees and Private Members’ Business (Chaired by Conference Chair):

Hon Don Harwin (President, NSW Legislative Council): NSW Legislative Council Committees: current trends

David Elder (Australia House of Representatives): Private members’ business under minority government

Jan Davis (Clerk, South Australia Legislative Council): “I want to be heard”: private members’ business

Conference papers

Procedure (Chaired by Conference Deputy Chair):

Hon Shelley Hancock (Speaker, NSW Legislative Assembly): Open to change: testing and tweaking procedures

Shane Rattenbury (Speaker, ACT Legislative Assembly): Reviewing Latimer House Principles: the ACT experience

Paul Grant (Clerk Assistant (Procedure), Western Australia Legislative Council): Review of Standing Orders

Lindsay Tisch (Assistant Speaker, New Zealand House of Representatives): Parliamentary Procedure: remaining relevant by effective use of House time and streamlining House procedure
Kirsten Robinson (Western Australia Legislative Assembly): Question time

CPA Pacific Region Management Committee meeting and CPA Australian Region Management Committee meeting (simultaneous)

Conference papers

Various (Chaired by Conference Chair):

Taeasi Sanga (Clerk, National Parliament of Solomon Islands): Parliament strategy plan

Wayne Tunnecliffe (Clerk, Victoria Legislative Council): Reporting deadlines and the termination of committee inquiries

David Blunt (Clerk, NSW Legislative Council): Time limits on debate on legislation

Tim Morris (Deputy Speaker, Tasmania House of Assembly): Evolution of a parliamentary committee system in a smaller Parliament: impact of a minority Government

Thursday, 26 July 2012

Conference papers

Various (Chaired by Conference Deputy Chair):

Hon Andrew Miriki (Speaker, Bouganville House of Representatives): Challenges of a post-conflict parliament

Debra Angus (Deputy Clerk, New Zealand House of Representatives): Openness, transparency and mutual respect for institutions: issues of Parliament

Michael Tatham (Acting Clerk, Northern Territory Legislative Assembly): Managing the business of the Legislative Assembly with a minority Government since August 2009

Hon Barry House (President, Western Australia Legislative Council): Shortening Parliament’s arms: legislative development in Western Australia impacting on parliamentary privilege

Conference papers

Various (Chaired by Conference Chair):

Hon Ken Smith (Speaker, Victoria Legislative Assembly): Restoration of a significant heritage asset

Hon Robin Adams (Parliament of Norfolk Island): Creating leaders for the future:
youth in the Commonwealth

Peter Alcock (Clerk, Tasmanian House of Assembly): Ministerial arrangements in the Tasmanian House of Assembly

Hon Laauli Leuatea Polataivao Fosi (Speaker, Parliament of Samoa): (Title of paper to be advised)

Michael Sutherland (Speaker, Western Australia Legislative Assembly): The Estimates process in the Legislative Assembly of Western Australia

Robert Hansen (Research Director, Queensland Parliament): Queensland’s portfolio–based committee system

Conference papers

Various (Chaired by Conference Chair):

Dr Rosemary Laing (Clerk, Australia Senate): Matters of privilege and the role of Presiding Officers

Anna Burke (Deputy Speaker, Australia House of Representatives): A Parliamentary Budget Office for the Australian Parliament

Hon Ludwig Scotty (Speaker, Parliament of Nauru): (Title of paper to be advised)

Tom Duncan (Chair, Presiding Officers and Clerks Conference Working Group): Future of the Presiding Officers and Clerks Conference

Presiding Officers workshop and Clerks workshop (simultaneous)

Joint CPA Australia Region and Pacific Region meeting

Farewell dinner

Hosted by Speaker of National Parliament of Solomon Islands – Hon Sir Allan Kemakeza
Pacific Mission
Tonga, Niue, and New Caledonia
23–27 July 2012

Head of the Parliamentary Delegation - Rt Hon Winston Peters

Introduction

The 2012 Pacific Mission, led by Foreign Affairs Minister Murray McCully, visited Nuku’alofa, Alofi, and Noumea from 23 to 27 July 2012.

The Pacific Mission is undertaken annually, and is always led by the Minister of Foreign Affairs, reflecting New Zealand’s commitment to development in the Pacific region.

Delegation members

Participants in the Pacific Mission include members of Parliament and representatives of non-governmental organisations and government agencies with interests in development projects around the region. The members of Parliament who accompanied Mr McCully were the Rt Hon Winston Peters, John Hayes, Jan Logie, S’ua William Sio, and Alfred Ngaro.

Event programme

The programme devised by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade for the Pacific Mission included meetings with heads of state, members of Parliament, and agencies of regional interest, the re-opening of hotels in Tonga and Niue (after New Zealand-funded refurbishment), and the official opening of the Maama Mai Solar Power Plant in Tonga.

The 2012 Pacific Mission had four objectives:

• To showcase New Zealand development assistance in the Pacific through the opening of two large-scale projects supported under the New Zealand Aid Programme, the Tongatapu Solar Power Plant in Tonga, and the Matavai Resort extension in Niue.

• To allow delegates to witness first-hand the issues and challenges facing the countries visited, and the opportunities available to them.

• To identify specific commercial and development opportunities for New Zealand businesses, decision-makers, and non-governmental organisations, particularly in the fields of tourism, renewable energy, and infrastructure development in general.

• To give participants an opportunity to develop personal relationships with their political and community counterparts, and contacts in the commercial and development sectors.
Tonga

On arrival in Tonga the delegation attended a reception hosted by the New Zealand High Commissioner at the High Commissioner’s residence. This event was fairly informal, but was attended by diverse Tongan dignitaries, including the Prime Minister Lord Tu’ivakano, Cabinet Ministers, members of the Royal family, and various government and private sector representatives. The atmosphere was warm and jovial, with Mr McCully and the Tongan Prime Minister exchanging jokes and commenting on the strong relationship between the two countries. Following this event, the New Zealand parliamentarians were invited to dinner with the Tongan Prime Minister and his Cabinet.

The following day’s itinerary began with a meeting between Mr McCully, the New Zealand MPs, and the Tongan Cabinet. The MPs all took the opportunity to raise issues of interest and ask questions of their Tongan colleagues. Areas of discussion included renewable energy, climate change mitigation, fisheries management, infrastructure projects, public health topic, education, and issues relating to the Pacific Island Forum. Su’a William Sio also raised the issue of the Arms Trade Treaty and expressed a desire to see Tonga support the treaty in the Inter-Parliamentary Union and other forums. The Recognised Seasonal Employer scheme was also discussed, including visa overstaying by a small number of Tongan participants.

The delegation was on hand to witness the opening of the Maama Mai Solar Power Plant. This project is New Zealand’s largest-ever infrastructure investment in Tonga and New Zealand is the first development partner to fund a major activity under the Tonga Energy Road Map. Maama Mai is the second largest photovoltaic plant in the Pacific and represents a significant first step towards Tonga achieving its goal of 50 percent renewable energy. The event was attended by their Majesties King Tupou VI and Queen Nanasipau’u Tuku’aho, along with the Prime Minister, senior Tongan Cabinet Ministers, and officials. The MPs were privileged to have the opportunity to speak with their Majesties, setting aside the usual highly formal protocols.

The whole New Zealand delegation was present at a working lunch, at which Joyce Mafi, the Governor of the Reserve Bank of Tonga, presented an overview of the Tongan economy. Time did not allow many questions, but the overview provided a clear, concise, and informative snapshot of economic conditions in Tonga and was much appreciated by the members.

A number of site visits were undertaken to view projects in progress, including the New Zealand-funded Tonga Village Network Upgrade Project, the Houma blowholes viewing platform (a key piece of tourism infrastructure), and the Tonga Forest Products Limited processing plant. This last visit exemplified the practical contributions that New Zealand is making to Tongan capability to grow their economy, with NZ$620,000 allocated to recruit a forestry manager and a production manager to restore forestry operations on the island of ‘Eua and re-invigorate the timber processing plant on the island of Tongatapu. It is hoped that this will significantly reduce the need to import foreign milled timber, and lead eventually to a sustainable export market for Tonga.

The delegates then met with the leader of the non-government members of Parliament, ‘Akilisi Pohiva. Mr Pohiva indicated that it was a time of some tension in Tonga,
expressing the opinion that the Government was using questionable tactics to stall a vote of no confidence until it had sufficient numbers to defeat that vote. Mr Pohiva indicated that he was seeking legal advice from his lawyer based in New Zealand on this matter. He also expressed concern at the lack of air time given to the opposition in the national media, noting that Radio Tonga talked to him regarding the no-confidence vote but did not air the interview. Su’a William Sio noted that the current political situation in Tonga was being keenly watched by the Tongan community in New Zealand and there was much interest in the outcomes of any no-confidence vote. I asked for clarification on the process that had led to delaying the vote, and Mr Pohiva indicated that he thought that a decision had been made by Cabinet to use the votes of non-elected members to carry the motion to delay. He felt that this highlighted a possible flaw in the Tongan Constitution. This was an unfamiliar tactic to the New Zealand members, some of whom expressed surprise and wondered if there had been any precedent elsewhere in the Commonwealth. Mr Pohiva suggested that New Zealand could provide more guidance on good governance and transparency, and also expressed his hope that New Zealand will maintain a critical eye and interest in the ongoing democratic reforms in Tonga.

The visit to Tonga concluded with the official opening of the Scenic Hotel after a refurbishment by its New Zealand owners. The hotel is considered a key piece of tourism infrastructure, being located next to the international airport, and also a good example of the Tonga–New Zealand relationship in action. The event was attended by members of the Royal family, as well as parliamentarians, officials, and business people. Thus it was another good opportunity for the New Zealand MPs to engage with their Tongan colleagues.

Niue

On arrival in Niue the delegation attended a presentation by the Premier, Hon Toke Tufukia Talagi, in the Fale Fono. The presentation focused on Niue’s economy and current efforts to improve tourism on the island. Mr Talagi highlighted that he appreciated the free and frank discussions he is able to have with New Zealand and that Niue, while being conscious and grateful of New Zealand’s aid programme, was now looking to lead the way in terms of its destiny. He also highlighted a need to attract young people back to Niue from New Zealand so that they could contribute to future success for the country.

Site visits to the Niue Visitor Information Centre, the Alofi wharf, and the new site of the AusAID funded Niue Primary School followed. The delegation then moved on to the Matavai Resort for an official lunch to celebrate the $10.1 million upgrade and extension to this facility.

This occasion also allowed the New Zealand MPs to meet with a group of four Niuean politicians who were visiting New Zealand the following week for a study programme based at the New Zealand Parliament. The Niuean Speaker, Hon Ahohiva Levi, also engaged with the delegation, noting that he would very much like to see closer working ties between MPs and officials from the respective Parliaments.
New Caledonia

The delegation’s last stop was New Caledonia, our closest neighbour and third-largest trading partner in the Pacific. High-level engagement with President Martin, President of Congress Mr Wamytan, members of government and congress, and the French High Commissioner reinforced political and parliamentary links. An invitation was reissued by Mr McCully for a New Caledonian presidential delegation to visit New Zealand, and positive messages were exchanged on closer economic engagement.

A number of infrastructure-themed site visits were made by the delegation, which served to highlight both current trade relationships and opportunities for closer engagement. A business roundtable chaired by President Martin raised opportunities for greater commercial exchanges with New Caledonia as well as a possible entry point into the European Union. Infrastructure, energy, and education were particularly highlighted and the New Zealand MPs took the opportunity to comment on these and other areas of interest.

New Caledonia continues to seek full membership of the Pacific Island Forum. The Government and the High Commissioner’s Office are keen that membership and the terms of reference for the Forum Ministerial Committee that will consider this application are defined quickly so that dialogue can begin.

Conclusion

The annual Pacific Mission is a unique event, which grants cross-party members of Parliament access to a wide range of people and sectors, giving them an insight into the issues facing countries in the Pacific region and also demonstrating where assistance from New Zealand might be offered.

The 2012 Pacific Mission achieved its objectives and illustrated that bilateral relationships are in good shape with ample business and development opportunities to pursue, particularly in the renewable energy, infrastructure, and tourism sectors.

Rt Hon Winston Peters
Head of Parliamentary Delegation
Australasian Study of Parliament Group annual conference  
Parliament House, Darwin  
3–5 October 2012  

Head of Delegation – Charles Chauvel

Introduction

The Australasian Study of Parliament Group (ASPG) has the objective of encouraging and stimulating research, writing, and teaching about parliamentary institutions in Australia, New Zealand, and the South Pacific. It holds an annual conference that rotates around the Australian states and New Zealand. This year the conference was hosted by the Legislative Assembly of the Northern Territory in Darwin, and took as its theme “Constitutions”, partially in recognition of the Northern Territory’s bid for statehood.

Delegation members

The two members of the New Zealand delegation were Charles Chauvel MP and Louise Upston MP, who are both members of the executive committee of the New Zealand Chapter of ASPG. Both attended all sessions of the conference and jointly presented a paper, “The New Zealand Constitutional Review”. Louise Upston also presented a paper, “Closer Economic Relations and Productivity Commissions”.

Event programme

The conference consisted of the annual general meeting on 3 October, followed by presentations on 4 and 5 October. A copy of the programme is attached.

Presentations on the theme of constitutions included the following:

- Race and the Australian Constitution  
- The Australian Parliament’s Joint Human Rights Committee  
- Over 21: How about the keys? Reviewing the ACT constitution  
- The New Zealand Constitutional Review  
- Northern Territory Statehood (several presentations).

There were no meetings outside of the event programme.
Conclusion

We found the conference a useful opportunity to hear about contemporary constitutional developments in Australasia from other elected officials, as well as advisers and academics.

ASPG is a valuable provider of those opportunities and we record our ongoing support for the organisation.

Charles Chauvel MP
Head of Delegation

Louise Upston MP
Delegation Member
Programme

Day 1  Wednesday 3 October

ASPG Annual General Meeting
Litchfield Room, Level 3, Parliament House

Welcome Reception
Main Hall Parliament House
Welcome by the Chief Minister, the Hon Terry Mills, MLA

Day 2  Thursday 4 October

Welcome by ASPG President, the Hon Kevin Rozzoli, AM

Session 1 – The National Stage – facilitated by the Hon Kevin Rizzoli AM

George Williams – Race and the Australian Constitution

Trish Crossin – The Australian Parliament’s Joint Human Rights Committee

Session 1 – The National Stage (cont)

Paul Kildea – Expert Panels as a Mechanism for Constitutional Reform

Mary Crawford – Where are the women MPs?

Session 2 – The States – facilitated by Dr Harry Phillips

Ken Coghill – Constitutions of the Australian Federation: Rigid Legal Framework v Complex, Evolving Centralizing System

Gerry McInally – The role and influence of committees: a comparative study across a range of parliamentary constructs

Tom Duncan – Over 21: How about the keys? Reviewing the ACT Constitution

Session 3 – International – facilitated by Jennifer Aldred

David Solomon – Guarding MPs’ integrity in the UK and Australia

Charles Chauvel and Louise Upston – The New Zealand Constitutional Review
Day 3  Friday 5 October

Session 5 – The state of the Northern Territory – facilitated by Professor Clem Macintyre

Michael Tatham – Northern Territory Statehood: the Lasseter’s Reef of Constitutional Development?

Anne Twomey – The Dilemmas of drafting a Constitution for a New State

Kezia Purick – Statehood 2011: Contributing Factors to its Second Failure

Session 6 – Panel Discussion – The Future of the Federation

Anne Twomey – The High Court’s recent approach to Federalism

Clem Macintyre – Policy imbalance: the rise of Canberra and decline of the States

Louise Upston – Closer Economic Relations (CER) and Productivity Commissions

Head of Delegation – Nicky Wagner

Introduction

This was a combined conference hosted by the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association UK (CPA UK) and the British Group Inter-Parliamentary Union (BGIPU).

It is part of a continuing discussion about gender equality to ensure effective representative democratic institutions, with the aim of establishing a Parliamentary Gender Reference Group. This group would operate through AGORA, the United Nations Development Programme’s (UNDP’s) portal, and is designed to facilitate dialogue among women in political life, to raise awareness of gender issues, and to encourage informal peer exchanges and mentoring.

Delegation members

There were 49 delegates from 44 parliaments from around the world. There was a strong representation from Africa, and from Europe and the Middle East. I was the only representative from Australasia.

I attended the full three-day conference. I was invited to speak on the topic of “Gender Quotas for Parliaments” and was involved in creating a video record of the conference proceedings for the AGORA portal. I was also part of the Communiqué Working Group which crafted the final statement from the conference.

Event programme

The conference consisted of a series of plenary sessions and workshops. It encouraged participation with case studies, a parliamentary-style debate, and networking events. The main theme was increasing the participation of women in parliaments. New Zealand is seen as forward-thinking and very progressive in this area (on 1 January 2012, 32.2 percent of our parliamentary representatives were women, and 22 percent of our Ministers). We are in 23rd place out of 189 parliaments in this respect, and our women are elected on merit without the application of quotas or manipulation of the vote. However, MMP allows political parties to consider gender balance in drawing up their party lists. The hosts of the conference were disappointed that the UK was at 53rd place among the world’s parliaments at 22.3 percent. The conference programme is attached.
Discussion highlighted the discriminatory treatment of women in many parts of the world, the need for economic empowerment of women, the importance of educational opportunities for girls, and the need for women to challenge cultural barriers.

**Meetings outside the event programme**

A series of networking events organised outside the main plenary sessions proved extremely interesting and useful. A dinner with business and finance leaders hosted by the City of London Corporation allowed us to meet top businesswomen. A reception with UK MPs promoting mentoring in parliament showed us a model that could be developed in New Zealand. A reception and dinner with youth representatives provided an opportunity for us to support the next generation of women leaders.

**Conclusion**

Discussion among the delegates from 44 parliaments highlighted how difficult being a female elected representative can be in some countries. We heard about the barriers created for women by the structure of some parliaments (for example, having to be away from children for three months at a time), lack of education, (one in three girls are denied an education by poverty, discrimination, or violence), lack of economic control (the property of married women belonging to their husbands), and regular violence towards and abuse of women in the public arena.

New Zealand women would like to see larger numbers of women MPs, more female MPs becoming Ministers, and a more women-friendly environment in parliament. However, New Zealand is internationally considered one of the world leaders in gender balance because we were the first nation in the world to give women the vote and because our level of female participation in parliament is achieved without manipulation.

Nicky Wagner MP
Member of Parliament
Programme

Tuesday, 6 November 2012

09:00 Welcome and Introduction to the Conference
   Introducing the focus and proposed outcomes of the conference programme
   Robert Walter, MP Chair of the British Group Inter-Parliamentary Union
   Rt Hon Sir Alan Haselhurst MP, Chair of the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association UK Branch

09:15 Opening Plenary: Gender Representation – The International Debate
   Setting the scene internationally and raising key issues
   Dr Nurhayati Ali Assegaf, President of the IPU’s Coordinating Committee of Women Parliamentarians
   Hon Alix Boyd-Knights MP, Speaker of the Parliament of Dominica, Chair of Commonwealth Women Parliamentarians
   Begoña Lasagabaster, Chief – UN Women Leadership and Governance Section
   Chaired by: Rt Hon Baroness D’Souza CMG, The Lord Speaker

10:30 Case Studies followed by Plenary Discussion
   A series of testimonials from Members of Parliament in different regions on their experience of being elected and achievements since
   Delegate representatives from different regions to deliver case studies
   Chaired by: Dr Roberta Blackman-Woods MP, Chair of the Conference Steering Committee

12:00 Gender and Politics: Theory and Research
   Mechanisms to encourage women into parliament; fostering and maintaining a life in politics. What works? Why?
   “How we increase the number of women” – (women in pipeline professions and in party structures) (equality guarantees, quotas, shortlists and parity clauses in constitutions)
   Additional soft barriers (parliaments)
   “What women politicians do when they are in parliament”
   Professor Sarah Childs, University of Bristol
   Dr Joni Lovenduski, Birkbeck University
   Chaired by: Emily Thornberry MP
14:30 Parliamentary Style Debate
Open debate on the motion: Do quotas make a positive difference?
Chaired by: Rt Hon Rebecca Alitwala Kadaga, Speaker of the Parliament of Uganda
Assisted by: Philippa Helme, Clerk at Table, House of Commons

16:30 Parallel Sessions
Empowering parliamentarians through building communication skills
Media Skills A session to cover press, radio and TV coverage of parliamentary affairs from an insider's point of view and tips for new women parliamentarians
Scarlett McGwire (Media Adviser)
Polly Toynbee (Guardian)
Sheila Gunn (Media Adviser)
Social Media Skills Using social media as a tool for campaigning and developing constituent relationships
Tom Harris MP
Kerry McCarthy MP
Committee Skills Effective scrutiny: research and debating skills, developing inquiries and asking investigative questions
Rt Hon Margaret Hodge MBE MP (Chair of the Public Accounts Committee)
Adrian Jenner, Clerk of the Public Accounts Committee

18:30 Reception and Dinner with Business and Financial Leaders
Hosted by the City of London Corporation

**Wednesday, 7 November 2012**

09:00 Plenary: The Role of Parliamentarians in Achieving Representative Democracy
Seminar - style session for parliamentarians to share achievements in improving equal gender representation within parliament, discuss best practice in promoting gender equality through legislation and policy, and the role of women’s caucuses in supporting women entering politics and each other once elected
Rt Hon John Bercow MP, Speaker of the House of Commons
Mary Macleod MP, Chair, Women in Parliament, All-Party Parliamentary Group
Seema Malhotra MP, Founder of the Women’s Network
Representative Delegate
Chaired by: Fiona MacTaggart MP

11:00 Plenary: Gender, Media and Politics
Panel of journalists and academics to discuss from an experience-based approach the portrayal of women parliamentarians in the media and the social, policy and equality impacts of negative and positive depiction
Professor Toril Aalberg, Norway (gender comparison of MPs, relations with the media)
Rt Hon Baroness Williams of Crosby, former Minister of State, former Leader of the Liberal Democrats in the House of Lords
Chaired by: John Whittingdale OBE MP

12:30 Paths to Political Influence

Political Parties
Focused discussion on recruiting and supporting the best from business, industry and communities. Political parties as mechanisms for access to representation such as gender guarantees, mentoring and leadership programmes
Lorely Burt MP, Chair, Parliamentary Liberal Democrat Party
Kate Green MP, Shadow Minister for Equalities
Chaired by: Rt Hon Baroness Corston QC

Local Government
Focused discussion on the experiences of promoting, supporting, mentoring and lobbying women to support the development of meaningful local democracy and increasing gender representation in local politics; the path to national politics
Baroness Hamwee, President, Women’s Local Government Society
Councillor Claire Kober, Leader, Haringey Council
Nan Sloane, Centre for Women and Democracy
Chaired by: Baroness Eaton DBE

Third Sector
Focused discussion on the role of civil society organisations in mobilising the electorate and raising women’s profile in political representation
Jackie Ballard, CEO, Womankind
Emily Brown, Global Programme Coordinator – Raising Her Voice at Oxfam Great Britain
Ceri Goddard, CEO, Fawcett Society  
Chaired by: Ann McKechin MP  

Parliaments  
Focused discussion on making parliamentary careers appealing for women; the challenges in making sitting patterns and facilities family-friendly in parliament  
Dame Joan Ruddock MP  
Dr Ruth Fox, Director, Hansard Society Parliament and Government Programme  
Chaired by: Bridget Phillipson MP

14:00 Gender Equality in Policy - Making and Legislation  
Panel discussion on the anticipated impacts and unintended consequences of policy legislation on women and men  
Winnie Byanyima, Director of the Gender Team, United Nations Development Programme  
Kate Green MP, Shadow Minister for Equalities  
Chaired by: Rt Hon Baroness Royall of Blaisdon

16:00 Workshops on Gender and Policy  
A discussion on shared best practice on mainstreaming equal gender access to healthcare, particularly in HIV/AIDS prevention and maternal health  
Dr Edward Fottrell, University College London, Centre for Global Health (Maternal and Newborn Health)  
Charlotte Watts, Director of Gender, Violence and Health Centre, London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine  
Chaired by: Pamela Nash MP  
Discuss effective methods for gender-responsive budgeting  
Dr Claire Annesley, The Women’s Budget Group  
Begoña Lasagabaster, Chief – UN Women Leadership and Governance Section  
Rachel Reeves MP  
Chaired by: Baroness Thornton  
A discussion on the special needs of women and girls during conflict and peace building and their protection from discrimination in repatriation and resettlement, rehabilitation, reintegration and post-conflict reconstruction  
Professor Christine Chinkin, London School of Economics
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Chaired by</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Justice Policy</td>
<td>A discussion of the treatment of women in the justice and penal system and the legal discrimination in policies that affect women’s economic security including land tenure, property and inheritance rights</td>
<td>Nicola Blackwood MP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kemi Ogunsanya, Human Rights Lawyer with the Justice and Peace Commission</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Baroness O’Loan DBE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chitra Nagarajan, Gender Action for Peace and Security network</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chaired by: Nicola Blackwood MP, Chair of Women, Conflict and Peacekeeping, All-Party Parliamentary Group</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Rights</td>
<td>A discussion of women’s rights as human rights and Protection policies concerning domestic and gender-based violence, human trafficking, female genital mutilation and forced marriage</td>
<td>Baroness Verma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Professor Shaheen Sardar Ali, Warwick University, Professor of Law and Vice-Chair, United Nations Working Group on Arbitrary Detention</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Isha Dyfan, Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights Gender and Women’s Rights Adviser</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dr Purna Sen, LSE, former Head of Human Rights for Commonwealth Secretariat</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chaired by: Rt Hon Ann Clwyd MP, Chair of Human Rights</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>All-Party Parliamentary Group</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

17:45 Meeting of communiqué working group

Postgraduate student interview opportunities

18:00 Networking reception with UK MPs on the occasion of promoting mentoring in parliaments

Host: Dr Roberta Blackman-Woods MP

**Thursday, 8 November 2012**

09:00 Plenary: Women, Leadership and Public Life

A panel discussion with eminent panellists on the particular challenges faced by women in different work sectors at all levels and the link between representative democracy and equality in the workplace
Siobhan Benita, former Officer for Civil Service Governance, Cabinet Office
Kate Grussing, Founder of Sapphire Partners
Norma Jarboe, Director of Women Count
Baroness Kinnock, Opposition spokesperson for International Development
Chaired by: Annette Brooke MP

10:15 Plenary: Economic Empowerment
A panel formed by non-governmental organisation representatives and academics to discuss strategies to provide women with economic opportunities (skills training, microfinance, rights to land, livelihoods and social protection) and the benefits of women’s economic independence and empowerment
Lindi Hlanze, Lead on Economic Empowerment of Women and Girls, Department For International Development, UK
Dr Nicola Jones, Overseas Development Institute Lead on Gender
Professor Naila Kabeer, Professor of Development Studies, School of Oriental and African Studies
Chaired by: Rt Hon Sir Malcolm Bruce MP, Chair of International Development Select Committee

12:15 Plenary: Investing in Education for All – A Global Commitment
A panel of experts to discuss ways of holding governments to account in reducing gender inequality in education policies, particularly in the area of secondary education. The discussion is envisaged to go beyond contemplating the cultural barriers girls face, such as early marriage and domestic roles, and focus on ways in which parliamentarians can help tackle poverty through education for girls and young women
Elaine Unterhalter and Jo Heslop, Institute of Education, Transforming for Girls in Education in Nigeria and Tanzania
Caroline Harper, Chronic Poverty Research Centre, Overseas Development Institute
Chaired by: Fabian Hamilton MP, Chair of Education, All-Parties Parliamentary Group

14:00 Presentation on online resources: The Agora Portal and iKNOW Politics
Lotte Geunis, United Nations Development Programme

14:30 The Conference Legacy
Feedback from the conference; agreeing the communiqué and continuing the dialogue
Dr Roberta Blackman-Woods MP
16:00 Closing Plenary

17:30 Youth Networking Event: Removing Barriers to Participation for Young Women And Girls

Reception and dinner with youth representatives
Australia and Pacific Regional CPA Conference
Rarotonga, Cook Islands
17–24 November 2012

Head of Delegation – Hon Dr Nick Smith

Introduction

I attended this Commonwealth Parliamentary Association (CPA) conference in November 2012 at short notice when Jacqui Blue MP could not attend, jointly with Moana Mackey MP.

The conference was very ably hosted by the Cook Islands Parliament and was attended by all the Pacific nations. Australia was represented by each of its state parliaments, as well as the Federal Parliament. It was particularly interesting that Australian states were twinned with Pacific Parliaments, which proved a very effective way to assist the work of the CPA.

Event programme

The conference included presentations on marine law, climate change, emergency management, parliamentary procedure, education, and health.

I gave a presentation on the New Zealand experience with the 2011 Rena disaster. I encouraged our fellow Pacific nations to ensure their parliaments ratified the latest international conventions on oil spills, or they might find themselves short-changed in the degree to which they could reclaim costs from shipping companies. There was wide interest in the disaster experience and what to learn from it.

We got a good feel for the practical difficulties of our Pacific neighbours of running a parliament in these very sparsely-populated massive ocean island states. It was a real shock to note that the cost of a northern island MP coming to Rarotonga return could be as much as $15,000 because of the large distances and very low volumes involved. These costs help explain why the Cook Islands Parliament sits for such short periods each year.

It was very encouraging that the Opposition parties were given a platform at the CPA conference and were colourfully critical of the Government. This showed for me a maturing democracy that was capable of accepting criticism, even if it was a bit unfair and over the top. A number of Opposition delegates from other Pacific nations were also pleasantly surprised by the banter.

The hospitality of the Cook Islands Parliament and Government was outstanding and gave us a unique feel for the culture and friendliness of this small Pacific country.

The Queen’s Representative and a number of Cook Islands MPs raised concerns with me over the status of Cook Islands resident servicemen and the fact that they are ineligible for
a veterans’ pension unless they reside in New Zealand. This does seem anomalous in the context of the unique constitutional relationship with the Cook Islands where we are responsible for their defence and security.

Conclusion

The CPA regional conference was an excellent opportunity to better understand the unique challenges of our parliamentary colleagues in the Pacific. It is highly valued by them as they find their way as parliamentary democracies and provides the opportunity for them to learn from our experiences. I would commend the CPA for its organisation of the conference and the Cook Islands for its wonderful job as hosts.

Hon Dr Nick Smith MP
Delegation Member
3 Inward Programme

The official Inward Inter-Parliamentary Relations Programme includes hosted and self-funded visits.

Up to 10 parliamentary delegations per year visit the New Zealand House of Representatives at the invitation of the Speaker. These visits are accorded Guest of Parliament status and are fully funded, with a comprehensive programme organised according to the objectives of each visit.

Self-funded visits are primarily organised by the diplomatic representatives of the visiting country or other New Zealand agencies, while the New Zealand Parliament offers assistance with organising the parliamentary components of the visit. Because of the reputation of the New Zealand Parliament, many overseas parliaments express an interest in visiting to learn first-hand about our parliamentary practices and procedures.

A number of visitors came to New Zealand in the year 2012 at the invitation of the Speaker and were accorded Guest of Parliament status, including:

- Samoan Parliamentary Delegation
- Srimati Maira Kumar, Honourable Speaker of the Lok Sabha of India
- Delegation from the Italy - New Zealand Parliamentary Friendship Group of the Inter-Parliamentary Union
- Guest of Parliament - Delegation for relations with Australia and New Zealand from European Parliament
- Australian National Broadband Select Committee exchange.

The Inter-Parliamentary Relations Secretariat also provided some support to the programmes of the following visitors:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Visitor(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Australia (Western Australia State Parliament)</td>
<td>Hon Barry House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>President of the Legislative Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hon Grant Woodhouse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Speaker of the Legislative Assembly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European Parliamentary Union</td>
<td>Richard Ashworth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Giles Chichester</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Michael Cramer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Alajos Mészáros</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>Jürgen Herrmann</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rolf Hempelmann</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Dr Claudia Winterstein
Sabine Zimmermann
Dr Egon Jüttner
Dr Christina Ruck
Dagmar Freitag
Josef Winkler

Indonesia
Ledia Hanifa Amaliah
Muhammed Oheo Sinapoy
Michael Wattimena
Popong Otje Djundjunan
Endang Agustini Syarwan Hamid

IPU Deputy Secretary General
Mr Martin Chungong

Norway
Gjermund Hagasæter
Ingalill Olsen
Geir Jørgen Bekkevold
Lise Christoffersen
Håkon Haugli
Trond Helleland
Hilde Magnusson
Michael Tetzschner
Heidi Greni

Sweden
Bengt-Anders Johansson
Rune Wikström
Helén Pettersson
Johan Hultberg
Jan-Olof Larsson
Pyry Niemi
Irene Oskarsson
Josef Fransson
Christina Karlsson
Kew Nordqvist

Turkey
Yüksel Özden
Ahmet Duran Bulut
Dilek Yüksel
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>Hülya Güven</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rt Hon Francis Maude</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Viet Nam</td>
<td>Nguyen Van Hien</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nguyen Dinh Quyen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nguyen Manh Cuong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hon Van Nam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dang Cong Ly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nguyen Danh Tu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Viet Nam</td>
<td>Ms Truong Th. Mai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chair of the Committee on Social Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wales</td>
<td>Mr Theodore Huckle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Counsel General for Wales</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Visit to New Zealand by Hon Laauli Leuatea Polataivao Fosi Schmidt, Speaker of the Legislative Samoan Assembly and the Parliamentary Delegation
31 March – 7 April 2012

Background

The delegation of predominately new members of Parliament was invited by Mr Speaker as a Guest of Parliament. They were interested in gaining knowledge from their New Zealand counterparts and colleagues and to strengthen ties between the two parliaments. A copy of the programme for the visit is attached.

The delegates were as follows:
Hon Laauli Leuatea Polataivao Fosi Schmidt MP
Speaker of the Legislative Assembly and Leader of the Delegation

Mr Maualaivao Pat Ah Him MP
Associate Minister for Health

Mr Ifopo Matia Filisi MP
Associate Minister for Revenue

Mr Alo Fulifuli Taveuveu MP
Associate Minister for Revenue

Mr Lenatai Victor Faafoi Tamapua MP
Associate Minister for Agriculture

Mr Tufuga Gafoaleata Faitua MP
Associate Minister for Natural Resources and Environment

Mr Toeolesulusulu Cedric Pose Salesa Schuster MP
Opposition Member

Mr Aveuo Nikotemo Palamo MP
Opposition Member

Mr Fepuleai Attila Manutoipule Ropati
Clerk of the Legislative Assembly

Mr Tiatia Graeme Tualaulelei
Clerk Assistant – Parliamentary Select Committees
The delegation’s areas of interest included:

- Parliamentary Institutional Strengthening Programmes
- Public Engagement roles and responsibilities of MPs towards the media, civil society, and constituencies
- Parliamentary Education programmes
- MPs’ Powers and Privileges
- Secretariat support – professional development programme, research
- Question Time
- Roles of Opposition Members and Backbenchers.

**Meetings within Parliament**

A call on Dr the Hon Lockwood Smith, Speaker of the House of Representatives, gave the delegation an opportunity to discuss the changes within parliamentary procedure and how to hold the government to account, explanations about the role of Mr Speaker at Question Time, primary and supplementary questions and the allocation of them amongst parties and how time is allocated within the House. Hon Schmidt advised that many of the Standing Orders which were developed by New Zealand are still in force in Samoa as he continues to find out what works best. He also expressed his wishes to preserve the parliamentary history of Samoa.

A meeting was scheduled with David Shearer MP, Leader of the Opposition and members of the Labour Party Caucus. Discussions took place on the topics of select committees, why the Opposition need to hold the Government to account, supplementary questions, the role of the media for the Opposition and the use of social media, Facebook and Twitter. There was also interest relating to the leader’s, whips’ and electoral/list MP budgets and what the biggest challenges were around voter turnout in the 2011 election.

The delegation also met with Hon Murray McCully, Minister of Foreign Affairs to discuss the strong Samoan connections within Parliament, the Defence Force visit to Apia, tightening our relationships with regard to trade, the building of Samoa’s first Parliamentary Museum and how they could obtain archived material. A request was also received relating to the possibility of a number of the newer MPs coming to New Zealand for a week-long study programme.

Additional meetings took place with Hon Hekia Parata, Rt Hon Winston Peters, the Government Administration Select Committee, and the National Crisis Management Centre and a luncheon was held with the Pacific New Zealand Parliamentary Friendship Group.

**Meetings outside of Parliament**

An opportunity was given for the delegation to visit Archives New Zealand, where they met with the senior Archives Leadership Team, received a tour of the Constitution Room to see the Treaty documents, Declaration of Independence and Women’s Suffrage Petition
and also met with an archivist working on the digitisation of Samoan/German Bundes archives.

The delegation visited Associate Professor Hon Luamanuvao Winnie Laban, Assistant Vice-Chancellor (Pasifika) at Victoria University and some of her senior academic team to discuss how to encourage more Pasifika students to the university. They were then given the opportunity to talk to some of the students and to watch them perform a number of cultural songs and dances.

Visiting the Pasifika exhibits at Te Papa and partaking in a sightseeing tour of Wellington city before their departure was a highlight for the delegation.

**Conclusion**

The programme allowed the delegation to increase their knowledge of the proceedings of Parliament and he voiced a hope that there would be a continued sharing of information between New Zealand and Pacific parliaments.
Programme

Monday, 31 March
Visit to National Archives

Associate Professor Hon. Luamanuvao Winnie Laban, Assistant Vice-Chancellor (Pasifika)

Te Papa tour

Hon Murray McCully, Minister of Foreign Affairs
David Shearer MP, Leader of Opposition and Members of the Labour Caucus

Tuesday, 1 April
Tour of the National Crisis Management Centre, David Coetzee

Call on Dr the Hon Lockwood Smith, Speaker of the House of Representatives

Hon Laauli is introduced to the House, observe question time

Meeting with Mr Hele Ei Matatia, Acting High Commissioner and Mrs Fiona Lene-Samoa, First Secretary, Samoa High Commission

Round table meeting with members of the Government Administration Select Committee
Official dinner hosted by Dr the Hon Lockwood Smith, Speaker of the House of Representatives

Wednesday, 2 April
Meeting with Ministry of Foreign Affairs Pacific Division and Emergency Task Force officials

Lunch with Pacific New Zealand Friendship Group

Observe the Select Committee process

Minister of Pacific Island Affairs, Hon Hekia Parata
Labour Party MPs

Thursday, 3 April
Meeting with Maori MPs
Visit to New Zealand by Mrs Meira Kumar, Honorable Speaker of the Lok Sabha, India, and the Indian parliamentary delegation
13–17 April 2012

Background

Hon Meira Kumar, a member of the ruling Congress Party, led a cross-party delegation of members of Parliament from the Lok Sabha. Hon Kumar’s visit to New Zealand was the first leg of an itinerary that culminated in her delegation attending the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association Mid-Year Executive Meeting in Tonga on 17–21 April 2012. A copy of the programme is attached.

New Zealand and India have a warm relationship founded on historic ties and shared Commonwealth heritage. Both sides recognise the potential to do more in the relationship, politically and economically. The Prime Minister’s visit to India in June 2011, with the Minister of Trade and a high-level business delegation, was a milestone that put the relationship on a more strategic footing.

Mrs Kumar was focused on building the parliamentary relationship between India and New Zealand on this visit. As she was unfamiliar with aspects of the bilateral relationship, she requested that the programme also focus on political dialogue, and include a Maori cultural element and some time outside within the urban areas of Wellington.

Delegation from the Lok Sabha, India

Srimati Meira Kumar
Honourable Speaker, Lok Sabha and Leader of the Delegation

Shri T K Viswanathan
Secretary-General, Lok Sabha

Shri Mukhtat Abbas Naqvi
Member of Parliament (Rajya Sabha), Bharatiya Janata Party

Shri Radha Mohan Singh
Member of Parliament (Lok Sabha), Biju Janata Dal Party

Professor Ram Gopal Yadav
Member of Parliament (Rajya Sabha), Samajwadi Party

Shri Tarun Mandal
Member of Parliament (Lok Sabha), Independent

Shri Bhartruhari Mahtab
Member of Parliament (Lok Sabha), Biju Janata Dal Party
Meetings within Parliament

On 16 April the delegation visited the New Zealand Parliament, where they first met with Dr the Rt Hon Lockwood Smith, Speaker of the House of Representatives. Discussions centred around broadening relationships between New Zealand and India, in particular in the areas of trade, bilateral investment and skills exchange. Mrs Kumar congratulated Mr Speaker on his unanimous re-election and mentioned India’s commitment to combating terrorism and supporting New Zealand’s bid for a seat on the United Nations Security Council.

An official luncheon was then hosted by Mr Speaker and attended by Kanwaljit Bakshi MP, Dr Rajen Prasad MP, Hon Annette King MP and the Deputy Clerk Debra Angus.

A meeting with the Hon Bill English, Acting Prime Minister of New Zealand was held during the afternoon.

Meetings outside of Parliament

On arrival into Auckland Hon Kumar and the delegation met with representatives of the Commonwealth Women Parliamentarians (CWP), Louisa Wall MP and Asenati Lolotay MP (as it was a non-sitting week). That evening they were hosted by the India-New Zealand Business Council at the Langham Hotel.

As the delegation arrived in Wellington over a weekend, they were invited to take a tour of Wellington, visit the Museum of New Zealand Te Papa Tongarewa and take a tour of the Zealandia Wildlife Sanctuary. Her Worship the Mayor of Wellington, Celia Wade-Brown hosted the delegation for a morning tea and a dinner was hosted by the Indian High Commission.

Conclusion

Hon Meira Kumar and the Indian Parliamentary delegation expressed their gratitude for the parliamentary programme and were particularly pleased to have been able to meet with the Speaker of the New Zealand Parliament and the Acting Prime Minister. They were also grateful for the opportunity to visit Zealandia and experience the world’s first fully-fenced...
urban eco sanctuary which is a successful and safe haven for some of New Zealand’s rarest native animals.

Mrs Meira Kumar, Honourable Speaker of the Lok Sabha and the Indian delegation accompanied by staff of the Indian High Commission and Kanwaljit Singh Bakshi MP.
Programme

Friday, 13 April
Arrival into Auckland

Meeting with the New Zealand Branch representatives of the Commonwealth Women Parliamentarians (CWP) Louisa Wall MP and Asenati Lole-Taylor MP

Reception and dinner hosted by the Indian-New Zealand Business Council

Saturday, 14 April
Travel Auckland to Wellington

Visit to Te Papa

Tour of Wellington

Dinner hosted by the Indian High Commission to New Zealand

Sunday, 15 April
Morning tea with Her Worship the Mayor of Wellington, Celia Wade-Brown

Tour of Zealandia Wildlife Sanctuary

Monday, 16 April
Meeting with Dr The Rt Hon Lockwood Smith, Speaker of the House of Representatives

Official lunch hosted by Mr Speaker

Tour of Parliament

Meeting with Hon Bill English, Acting Prime Minister

Meeting with Dame Sian Elias, Chief Justice, Supreme Court building (High Commission cancelled this meeting)

Tuesday, 17 April
Departed New Zealand
Guest of Parliament visit to New Zealand by the Delegation for Relations with Australia and New Zealand from the European Parliament
25 April – 4 May 2012

Background

The biennial visits to New Zealand and Australia on alternate years have traditionally been a highlight for the Delegation for Relations with Australia and New Zealand (DANZ). The New Zealand Parliament sends a delegation to Brussels on alternate years, although this did not occur in 2011 (partly due to the New Zealand General Election). As a result, this visit was a good opportunity for New Zealand to build support for our priority initiatives with the European Union (EU), notably the EU-New Zealand Framework Agreement.

The programme for the DANZ delegation was arranged around the following topics:

- Climate change and renewable energy
- Research and Technology
- Agriculture and Trade
- Indigenous Affairs
- Disaster recovery – economic recovery (CERA meeting and site visit in Christchurch).

A copy of the programme is attached.

Members of the European Parliament

Mr Richard Ashworth
Party: European Conservatives and Reformists Group, United Kingdom
Committee on Budgets
Committee on Agriculture and Rural Development

Mr Michael Cramer
Party: Group of the Greens/European Free Alliance, Germany
Committee on Transport and Tourism

Mr Alajos Mészáros
Party: Group of the European People’s Party – Christian Democrats, Slovakia
Committee on Legal Affairs
Committee on Industry, Research and Energy

Mr Hannu Takkula
Party: Alliance of Liberals and Democrats for Europe, Finland
Committee on Culture and Education
Meetings within Parliament

The parliamentary programme gave the delegation an opportunity to meet with counterpart Committee members including those from the Local Government and Environment Select Committee; and members of the Commerce Select Committee. The delegation also met with Hon Murray McCully, Minister of Foreign Affairs, caucus members from the National, Labour and Maori Parties and Dr The Rt Hon Lockwood Smith, Speaker of the House of Representatives. A luncheon with members of the New Zealand–European Parliamentary Friendship Group also took place.

Meetings outside of Parliament

On their first day in Auckland the delegation met with Auckland UniServices Chief Executive Dr Peter Lee, along with Mark Burgess, General Manager Research and Consulting and Will Charles, General Manager Technology Development. They then went on to a meeting with local Maori business leaders including Robert Hollis of Hollis Group Limited, Heta Hudson of Hudson & Associates, Dr Dean Kenny of Ewei Limited, Waikare Komene of Creative Native Limited, Jarrad McKay of Kmak Marketing Limited, Dr Himematau McNeill of the Auckland University of Technology; Zella Morrison of ZGroup/Haka Legend and Leisa Nathan of Ochre Business Solutions Limited.

After time spent in Wellington, the delegation travelled to Christchurch to visit the Antarctica Centre, Lincoln University’s dairy farm, and attend a meeting with Environment Canterbury and the Canterbury Economic Recovery Authority to discuss rebuilding efforts and economic recovery strategies.

Conclusion

A full and productive programme allowed the delegates from the European Parliament to focus on their requested areas of interest, visit the three main centres of New Zealand and helped to strengthen the relationship between the European and New Zealand Parliaments.
Dr The Rt Hon Lockwood Smith and Hon Amy Adams with the European delegation
Programme

Monday, 30 April
Auckland Chamber of Commerce

UniServices

Maori business leaders

Winery tour (their request to include as part of the programme)

Travel to Wellington

Tuesday, 1 May
European Commission

Dr the Rt Hon Lockwood Smith, Speaker of the House of Representatives

Lunch with New Zealand–European Friendship Group

Introduction to the House and observe question time

Ministry of Economic Development, Intellectual Property Policy Group

Wednesday, 2 May
Social Services Select Committee

Education and Science Select Committee

Tour of Archives New Zealand

Meeting with members of the Green Party caucus

Hon Murray McCully, Minister of Foreign Affairs

Commerce Select Committee

Local Government and Environment Select Committee

Meeting with members of the National Party caucus

Meeting with members of the Labour Party caucus

Meeting with members of the Maori Party caucus

Thursday, 3 May
Travel to Christchurch

Visit the Antarctica Centre
Lincoln University Chancellor, Tom Lambie and Associate Professor Stephanie Rixecker

Overview of the Faculty of Agriculture and Life Sciences and the links with Europe plus a visit to the university’s dairy farm

**Friday, 4 May**

Environment Canterbury

Canterbury Economic Recovery Authority

National Centre for Research on Europe, Canterbury University
Delegation from the Italy–New Zealand Inter-Parliamentary Union Friendship Group
12–16 June 2012

Background
A group of members of Parliament from the Italian Chamber of Deputies (lower house) representing the Italy–New Zealand Inter-Parliamentary Union (IPU) Friendship Group visited New Zealand at the invitation of the Speaker, Dr The Rt Hon Lockwood Smith from 12 to 16 June. The delegation was led by Hon Emerenzio Barbieri, President of the friendship group and member for Emilia-Romagna.

Areas of interest
The programme allowed the delegation to exchange experiences with their New Zealand counterparts on the following areas of interest:

- Primary industry: dairy, viticulture, youth engagement, market and brand protection, regional identifiers, European markets, new markets—particularly China
- Retirement and superannuation: eligibility and affordability
- Syria
- Earthquake issues
- New Zealand’s Parliament, its structure and operation.

Meetings with members of Parliament
The delegation’s programme began with a tour of Parliament, focusing particularly on the earthquake strengthening project, with a visit to view the base isolators. They then viewed the Debating Chamber, and were very interested in the voting process, including secret voting, and the remembrance wreathes relating to Italy.

Deputy Speaker Eric Roy meets with Hon Emerenzio Barbieri

The Speaker was unfortunately unavailable that day, so the delegation enjoyed a meeting with Eric Roy, the Deputy Speaker. The delegation then met with Hon Nathan Guy, Associate Minister for Primary Industries, and invited him to visit the Italian Parliament. They asked about the effect of the agriculture sector on New Zealand’s GDP, our ability to produce more food than is needed to feed our population, the effect of free trade agreements on our international trade, developing our markets, and our main
exports. Finally, they took the opportunity to encourage New Zealand to participate in the 2015 Expo Milano, where the theme is to be “Feeding the Planet, Energy for Life”.

Dr Paul Hutchison MP, Chair of the New Zealand–Italy Parliamentary Friendship Group, hosted a lunch for the delegation with cross-party members of the group before question time in the House. The delegation observed question time from the Speaker’s Gallery after being introduced to the House of Representatives. They were impressed by the lively atmosphere, and the transparency of New Zealand’s Parliament.

Hon Tau Henare, Permanent Delegate to the IPU, hosted the delegation and members of the New Zealand Parliament’s IPU group for afternoon tea. Italy and New Zealand are both members of the geopolitical group ‘Twelve Plus’ in the IPU.

Finally, the delegation met with John Hayes MP, in his role as Chair of the Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade Committee. The first issue raised with Mr Hayes was New Zealand’s view of the crisis in Syria. Mr Hayes outlined his opinions, and reminded the delegation of other crises closer to New Zealand, such as that in Bougainville, and the interventions New Zealand can undertake in our region. He noted that Italy is highly regarded in New Zealand. He also discussed New Zealand’s wine sales to Italy, noting that it is a tiny and relatively unprofitable market for us. Delegation member Hon Marco Fedi said that he would like to see an Asia-Pacific Research and Study Centre set up in Rome, like the Latin America Centre there, which is working well. He also asked about New Zealand’s ratification of a pension exchange agreement with Italy.

Meetings outside of Parliament

Trish Ranstead, representing the Ministry for Primary Industries, met with the group and answered questions on New Zealand’s agricultural sector and dairy industry. The delegation sought information on New Zealand’s export markets and our approach to the international protection of geographic indicator product names. New Zealand’s transformation from a protected/subsidised market to an open market was of particular interest to the delegation, as were our farmer-owned co-operatives, and their interaction with government. The New Zealand Government approach was summed up as seeking to foster the “best regulatory environment for business to do business”.

As the delegation had a strong interest in primary industries and youth engagement in agriculture, a visit to the Taratahi Agricultural Training College near Carterton was arranged. There the delegation discussed agricultural training for young people, and toured the facilities.
While the delegation was in the area, the Carterton District Mayor, Major (rtd) Ron Mark organised for the private Richmond Gardens and homestead to be opened to the delegation. Melanie Goodwood hosted the group in her house and discussed the inspiration for the Italian design of the gardens. Local media also covered the visit.

Finally, the delegation travelled to Martinborough, and had lunch at the Murdoch James winery. They discussed in detail the emerging markets for New Zealand wine, tariffs and taxes, and effective transportation of goods to distant markets. The delegation inspected the vines, the crushing and fermentation vats and barrels, and the subterranean wine barrel caves.
Conclusion

The links between the Italian Parliament and the New Zealand Parliament are warm, but still under-developed. The delegation sought to learn as much as they could about New Zealand’s primary industries sector and the results of the massive reforms of the 1980s, particularly the removal of farming subsidies. They sought information on engaging unemployed young people in the agricultural sector, both to revitalise their economy in this important traditional sector, and to reduce youth unemployment.

The strengthening of ties between the two Parliaments will assist with information sharing and developments for our two countries, which have little rivalry in the international market. The delegation looked forward to continuing to develop the relationship.
Members of the delegation

Hon Emerenzio BARBIERI

President of IPU Italy – New Zealand Friendship Group

Hon Marco FEDI

President of IPU Italy – Australia Friendship Group

Claudio D’AMICO

Member of IPU Italy – New Zealand and Australia Friendship Group

Ms Susanna RADONI

Italian IPU Group Secretariat, Chief of Protocol – Chamber of Deputies

Accompanied by:
His Excellency, Dr Alessandro Levi Sandri, Ambassador of Italy to New Zealand
Mr Donato Scioscioli, Deputy Head of Mission
Programme

Tuesday 12 June 2012

Official arrival day

1815 Dinner to be hosted by the Ambassador of Italy, Dr Alessandro Levi Sandri with Hon Christopher Finlayson

Wednesday 13 June 2012

0900 Depart hotel for Parliament
0915 Arrive main steps of Parliament
0930 Tour of Parliament
1015 Call on the Deputy Speaker of Parliament, Eric Roy MP
1130 Call on Associate Minister for Primary Industries, Hon Nathan Guy
1215 Buffet luncheon hosted by the Chair of the New Zealand–Italy Parliamentary Friendship Group, Paul Hutchison MP
1400 Question time commences, delegation introduced to the House
1440 Meet with Trish Ranstead, Manager International Relations, Ministry of Primary Industries
1530 Afternoon tea hosted by Hon Tau Henare, with the IPU Group
1615 Meet with John Hayes MP

Thursday 14 June 2012

0830 Depart Hotel for day trip to the Wairarapa
1015 Arrive at Taratahi Agricultural College, hosted by Miekes Buckley, Project Coordinator Business Development
1140 Visit to the Richmond Italian Gardens hosted Mayor of Carterton, Major (Rtd) Ron Mark and Melanie Greenwood, owner
1230 Depart for Martinborough
1300 Murdoch James winery, lunch and tour, hosted by founder, Roger Fraser and Nicola Belsham, marketing manager
1500 Depart for Wellington
Meeting with IPU delegates to the 126th IPU Assembly held in Kampala, Uganda–Hon Tau Henare, Louisa Wall MP and Jan Logie MP

Buffet dinner hosted by His Excellency, Dr Alessandro Levi Sandri, Ambassador at the Official Residence of the Republic of Italy

Friday 15 June 2012

Official departure day
Australia Select Committee Exchange
National Broadband Network Committee
24–28 September 2012

Introduction

Every year, the New Zealand and Australian Parliaments each select a committee to visit its parliamentary counterpart, either as part of an inquiry they are undertaking or in relation to a current item of business. The topic chosen will be relevant to trans-Tasman relations, and can be approached at either Commonwealth or state level.

This year, the Australian National Broadband Network Committee was selected for the select committee exchange visit to Wellington.

Their programme (copy attached) focused on the members’ expressed interest in the following topics:

• How New Zealand has managed the national rollout of broadband services
• The mix of technologies being used in New Zealand and the rationale for it
• Practical experience of the rollout in New Zealand
• The logistical, budget, and time implications of the different technologies and their possible impact on wholesale products and retail take-up
• Regulatory issues, particularly the experience of the structural separation of Telecom New Zealand into two entities
• Competition policy
• Pricing
• Private equity involvement (there appears to be a different emphasis in New Zealand)
• Community consultation and communication strategies
• Government, corporate, and community readiness
• Workforce, labour, and skills issues
• The effect of natural disasters on rollout
• The impact on rural and regional New Zealand communities
• The impact of 4G on broadband delivery
• Implications for the Closer Economic Relationship of the National Broadband Network (NBN) and UltraFast Broadband (UFB)/Rural Broadband Initiative (RBI) projects
Members of the delegation

Mr Robert Oakeshott MP, Delegation Leader
Member for Lynne (New South Wales), Independent

Mr Rob Mitchell MP, Deputy Delegation Leader
Member for McEwen (Victoria), Australian Labor Party

Senator Doug Cameron
Senator for New South Wales, Australian Labor Party

Senator Alex Gallacher
Senator for South Australia, Australian Labor Party

Mr Paul Fletcher MP
Member for Bradfield (New South Wales), Liberal Party of Australia

Mr Luke Hartsuyker MP
Member for Cowper (New South Wales), The Nationals

Ms Sussan Ley MP
Member for Farrer (New South Wales), Australian Labor Party

Mr Mike Symon MP
Member for Deakin (Victoria), Australian Labor Party

Event Programme

Meetings with members of Parliament

The committee met New Zealand members of Parliament from various political parties. The programme included meetings with the Speaker of the House, Dr The Rt Hon Lockwood Smith, the Spokesperson for Economic Development Hon David Cunliffe, the Minister for Communication and Information Technology Hon Amy Adams, the Minister of Commerce and Broadcasting Hon Craig Foss, members of the Commerce Committee, and members of the New Zealand–Australia Parliamentary Friendship Group.

During the meeting with Hon David Cunliffe, Hon Craig Foss, and Hon Amy Adams the delegation discussed the history of the broadband rollout and the transition from service-based competition to infrastructure-based competition. The committee also learnt about the priority rollout to hospitals, educational facilities and government agencies, and their relationships with telecommunication providers. Benefits to the students at Manaia Primary School were cited as an example of the success of the rollout.

At their meeting with the Commerce Committee, the delegation took the opportunity to exchange questions with their New Zealand counterparts, mainly concerning the prioritising of regions in the New Zealand rollout.
Meetings outside of Parliament

The Committee expressed an interest in meeting with a number of telecommunications providers and those involved in setting up the rollout.

New Zealand Engineering, Printing and Manufacturing Union

The committee met with Joe Gallagher, National Industry Organiser for Electro Comms, who explained he worked closely with the various companies involved in the rollout and regularly visited test sites. He said that New Zealand had a lack of skilled workers, especially drillers, as few could work successfully as owner-operators. Additional labour is therefore being sourced from overseas.

Crown Fibre Holdings, Vodafone New Zealand and Northpower Limited

Separate meetings with Crown Fibre Holdings, Vodafone New Zealand and Northpower Limited were held in Auckland with representatives of these organisations. The committee sought a wider understanding of the broadband rollout in New Zealand. They were briefed on the industry’s historical background, the reasons for the Government having chosen fibre rather than copper, and the launch procedure.

Wellington meetings:

Wellington Central Exchange
Mr Gerard Linstrom, Industry and Communications Manager Chorus.
Tour of Wellington Central Exchange and an offsite visit to Churton Park to view Fibre to the Network (TTFN) (Cabinetisation)

Commerce Commission
Dr Stephen Gale, Telecommunications Commissioner
Simon Thompson, Manager Telecommunications Team
John Gandy, Senior Analyst
David Rauscher, Senior Legal Counsel

Ministry of Education
Mr Howard Baldwin, Manager Sector, Engagement Network for Learning, Schools Infrastructure Group
Marg McLeod, Network for Learning (N4L) Change Manager

Chorus
Nick Manning, Government Relations Manager
Vanessa Oakley, General Counsel
Chris Dyhrberg, General Manager Network Build
Tonia Haskell, Head of Network Build
Craig Young, Head of Industry Relations
Kathy Wiltshire, Communications and Stakeholder Stakeholder Manager
Department for Ministry of Business Innovation and Employment (MBIE), National Infrastructure Unit (NIU), The Treasury and the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade (MFAT)
Bradley Ward, Manager Communications and IT Policy MBIE
Alan Hamilton, MBIE
Osmond Borthwick, MBIE
Kirstie Hewlett, MBIE
Robert Clarke, MBIE
Brian Hallinan, Team Leader NIU
Robert Barton, Senior Analyst Earthquake Coordination Team (former member of NIU during UFB policy formulation)
Heidi Giles, Senior Advisor Crown Ownership Monitoring Unit
Jeff Langley, Manager Australia Division MFAT

Conclusion

The committee was pleased with the variety and number of visits organised, with their programme allowing the delegation to take part in a series of informed discussions and site visits that will help to inform the Australian rollout of their National Broadband Network.

Delegation members: Mr Luke Hartleyker, Mr Mike Symon, Senator Alex Gallacher, Dr The Rt Hon Lockwood Smith, MP Mr Rob Mitchell, Mr Robert Oakeshott, Ms Sussan Ley, Senator Doug Cameron meet Dr The Rt Hon Lockwood Smith MP, Speaker of the House of Representatives.
(Paul Fletcher departed Wellington early)
Programme

Monday 24 September 2012
Meet at Auckland International Airport by VCO and PR representatives

Tuesday 25 September 2012
Meeting with Joe Gallagher, EPMU
Meeting with representatives from Crown Fibre Holdings Limited
Meeting with representatives of Vodafone New Zealand
Meeting with representatives of Northpower Limited
Flight Auckland to Wellington
Meeting with Hon David Cunliffe, Spokesperson for Economic Development
Attended New Zealand Telecommunications Forum cocktail function
Drinks and dinner in honour of the delegation hosted by Dr The Rt Hon Lockwood Smith, Speaker of the House of Representatives

Wednesday 26 September 2012
Tour of Wellington Central Exchange
Offsite visit to Churton Park to view FTTN (Cabinetisation) and FTTP (UFB rollout)
Lunch meeting with Hon Amy Adams, Minister for Communication and Information Technology
Meeting with Commerce Commission
Meeting with Ministry of Education
Friendship Group Cocktail hour

Thursday 27 September 2012
Meeting with Dr The Rt Hon Lockwood Smith, Speaker of the House of Representatives
Meeting with Hon Craig Foss, Minister of Commerce and Broadcasting
Meeting with Commerce Select Committee
Lunch with Commerce Select Committee
Meeting with Chorus
Meeting with representatives of the Ministry for Business Innovation and Employment (MBIE) the National Infrastructure Unit (NIU), the Treasury, and the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade (MFAT)

Dinner with HE Mr Michael Potts, High Commissioner, Australia

Friday 28 September 2012

Depart Wellington
4 Study Programmes and Conferences

The New Zealand Parliament hosted three events for members of the Pacific region in Wellington in 2012. The events hosted were as follows:

- Niuean members of Parliament Study Programme
- Speaker of the Cook Islands Study Programme
- Third New Zealand Parliamentary Study Programme.

These events reflected one aim of the Inter-Parliamentary Relations Programme, to support capacity-building in Pacific parliaments, as well as honouring our commitment to the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association.

The aim of the Niuean members of Parliament Study Programme, which was held from 30 July to 3 August, was to support the members in their governance leadership roles.

The purpose of the Speaker of the Cook Islands Study Programme, which was held from 15 to 19 October, was to support Madam Speaker in her new role as Speaker of the Cook Islands Parliament.

The 3rd Parliamentary Study Programme, which was held from 12 to 23 November, was designed to develop parliamentary staff in the Pacific.
Niue Members of Parliament Study Programme
30 July to 3 August 2012

Background

The Speaker of the Niue Legislative Assembly, Mr Ahohiva Levi, requested assistance from His Excellency Mark Blumsky with funding for four members of the Niue Assembly to travel to New Zealand and undertake a study tour. Funding for the visit was granted under the Pacific Partnership Facility Emerging Leaders’ Programme (via the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade), which aims to foster understanding of New Zealand among future Pacific leaders.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade’s Special Relations Unit and the Office of the Clerk’s Parliamentary Relations Secretariat together drew up a programme for the study tour. It included briefings on parliamentary processes and procedures relating to the House and select committees, and engagement with senior members of the New Zealand Parliament (initially the Speaker of the House of Representatives and Party Whips) and senior officials from various ministries.

Special relationship

Niue is a small, isolated country 550 kilometres south-east of Samoa, with about 1,500 people living in 14 villages. Village life remains the focus of Niue’s cultural and political organisation. Niue has a special constitutional relationship of free association with New Zealand, reflecting a long-standing historical and formal relationship. Niue is self-governing with the power to make its own laws, and its government has full executive powers. Niue remains part of the Realm of New Zealand and the Queen is its Head of State. Niueans hold New Zealand citizenship and therefore travel on New Zealand passports. There is no additional Niuean citizenship. All Niueans may freely choose to settle in New Zealand and access the full range of services and benefits available to New Zealand citizens.

Study programme

The study programme provided the delegation with opportunities to exchange experiences with their New Zealand counterparts and officials, with an emphasis on the following areas:

- good governance, with particular reference to social and economic development
- confidence and ability to undertake leadership roles
- representing constituents effectively and delivering desired outcomes
- strengthening relationships with New Zealand counterparts.
Meetings with members of Parliament

The delegation’s study programme sought to increase the parliamentarians’ understanding of parliamentary processes and good governance. The Niuean members of Parliament met the Speaker of the House of Representatives, Dr The Rt Hon Lockwood Smith, to discuss the role of the Speaker. The delegation also met representatives of the National, Labour, and Green Parties, and attended a lunch hosted by the New Zealand–Pacific Friendship Group.

The delegation observed the House in session and select committee meetings, and had an opportunity to discuss issues specific to Niue with the Finance and Expenditure Committee.

The delegation visited the electorate office of Kris Faafoi MP to discuss the role of a member of Parliament elected to represent a constituency, and the resourcing requirements of an electorate office. The office staff explained how their office assisted constituents.

Parliamentary process meetings

The delegation met Mary Harris, Clerk of the House of Representatives and Debra Angus, Deputy Clerk of the House of Representatives, and other Office of the Clerk officials to discuss New Zealand’s parliamentary procedures and processes.

Cross-cutting issues

The study programme also incorporated several cross-cutting issues.

Gender is an important consideration for leadership and participation in the Pacific. The Niuean members of Parliament met with the Co-Chairpersons of the Commonwealth Women’s Parliamentarian group to discuss the group’s cross-party activities.

Niue’s Assembly has a responsibility to ensure the human rights of the citizens of Niue are recognised and respected. The Niuean delegates met with the Human Rights Commission to discuss its objectives. They also discussed with Office of the Clerk staff the implementation of the New Zealand Bill of Rights Act 1990 and the role of the Regulations Review Committee, which examines all regulations, investigates complaints about regulations, and examines proposed regulation-making powers in bills (for consistency and for good legislative practice).

A clean, healthy environment is one of Niue’s principal assets and one of seven “development pillars” in its National Strategic Plan, over which the Assembly members have ultimate oversight. On visits outside Parliament the delegation was introduced to several projects seeking both sustainability and economic growth.
Meetings outside of Parliament

Ministry of Business, Innovation and Employment
The Ministry of Business, Innovation and Employment is intended to be a catalyst for a high-performing economy to ensure New Zealand's lasting prosperity and wellbeing. Representatives of the Ministry outlined the research it is currently undertaking.

Ministry of Youth Development
The Ministry of Youth Development promotes the interests of young people aged from 12 to 24 years. It encourages and helps young people to get involved in the social, educational, economic, and cultural development of New Zealand.

The delegation’s meeting with the Ministry of Youth Development focused on the Ministry’s development and implementation of youth initiatives in communities around New Zealand.

Ministry of Civil Defence and Emergency Management
The role of the Ministry is to provide policy advice and to oversee the establishment of structures to ensure New Zealand’s capability to manage and recover from the social and economic costs of disasters.

The delegation was briefed on the role of the Ministry and the function of the National Crisis Management Centre.

Grow Wellington
Grow Wellington aims to provide support to start or expand businesses in the region, and information about training and funding. It focuses on specialist fields of work in the Wellington region.

The delegation’s discussions with Grow Wellington focused on clean technology research initiatives in the Wellington region, particularly regarding water and energy sources.

New Zealand Treasury
The Treasury is the lead advisor to the New Zealand Government on economic, financial and regulatory policy. The delegation discussed the role of the Treasury regarding the financial scrutiny of bills.

Human Rights Commission
The Human Rights Commission works for a fair, safe and just society. The Niuean Delegation’s meeting with the Human Rights Commission included discussions about the role of the Asia Pacific Forum of Human Rights Institutions and other national human rights bodies, and associated reviews.
Wellington City Council

The delegation visited the Wellington City Council Southern Landfill to discuss the Council’s environmental initiatives at the landfill. Areas covered in the discussion included rubbish and recycling, producing electricity, sewerage and wastewater. The delegation appreciated the chance to observe these initiatives in action.

Local Government New Zealand

Local Government New Zealand represents the national interests of councils of New Zealand, providing policy advice and training to councils. Its representatives outlined the projects they had undertaken in the Pacific Islands and the support they could provide (if funding were available) to the Niue Parliament.

Ministry of Pacific Island Affairs

The Ministry of Pacific Island Affairs vision of ensuring “Successful Pacific peoples in New Zealand” was outlined to the delegates during the meeting.

Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade

The delegation discussed with the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade its role in the Pacific.

Conclusion

The programme allowed the delegation to take part in a series of informed discussions and site visits pertinent to their wide-ranging areas of interest. The delegation expressed appreciation for the study tour and noted the value of the visit.

Members of the Delegation

Hon Joan Viliamu, member of Parliament

Crossley Tatui, member of Parliament

Stanley Kalauni, member of Parliament

Dalton Tegelagi, member of Parliament
Programme

Monday, 30 July

Meeting with Ministry of Business, Innovation and Employment

Meeting with Clerk of the House of Representatives and Deputy Clerk of the House of Representatives

Meet with Education Services

Meeting with Manager (House Services), Office of the Clerk of the House of Representatives

Meeting with Ministry of Youth Development

Tuesday, 31 July

Meeting with Dr The Rt Hon Lockwood Smith, Speaker of the House of Representatives

Meeting with Parliamentary Library

Meeting with Clerk Assistant, Select Committee Services, Office of the Clerk of the House of Representatives

Meeting with NZ– Pacific Friendship Group

Observe the House during Questions for Oral Answer

Meeting with Commonwealth Women’s Parliamentarians Co-Chairpersons
Dr Jackie Blue MP and Louisa Wall MP

Meeting with Legal Services, Office of the Clerk of the House of Representatives

Reception hosted by Dr The Rt Hon Lockwood Smith, Speaker of the House of Representatives

Wednesday, 1 August

Meeting with Ministry of Civil Defence and Emergency Management

Observe the Select Committee process

Meeting with the Finance and Expenditure Select Committee

Meeting with Wellington Regional Council
Thursday, 2 August

Meeting with The Treasury

Meeting with Clerk of the Finance and Expenditure Committee, Office of the Clerk of the House of Representatives

Meeting with Senior Whip, National Party

Meeting with Human Rights Commission

Meeting with Deputy Clerk of the House of Representatives

Meeting with Wellington City Council

Friday, 3 August

Meeting with Local Government New Zealand

Meeting with Kris Faafoi MP

Meeting with Ministry of Pacific Island Affairs

Meeting with Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade

Programme concludes
Visit to New Zealand by Madam Speaker, Hon Niki Rattle from the Parliament of the Cook Islands 15–19 October 2012

Background
Madam Speaker from the Parliament of the Cook Islands was invited to attend a Study Programme by their twinning Parliament in Western Australia. As the New Zealand Parliament and the Cook Islands Parliament are both unicameral, Madam Speaker requested the opportunity to participate in a study programme in Wellington also.

Hon Niki Rattle was elected as (non-member) Speaker of the Cooks Islands Parliament in June 2012. Prior to this, Hon Rattle was Secretary General of the Cook Islands Red Cross since 1996 and chaired the 31st International Conference of the Red Cross Crescent Conference in 2011.

A programme was arranged for Madam Speaker by the Office of the Clerk on the basis of her request to observe, experience and increase her understanding of parliamentary procedures, covering the following topics:

- Parliament sittings under New Zealand Standing Orders, Question Time (primary and supplementary), rules regarding the use of laptops, mobiles, reading newspapers, etc in House
- Speaker’s relationships with Clerk, Deputy Clerk, staff and Government and Opposition members
- The meaning of impartiality, neutrality and independence
- Certification of legislation (readings, committee of the Whole, etc)
- Debate in Parliament—what is relevant, what is not relevant?
- Editing of the Hansard report
- Calendar of sittings
- Committees of Parliament
- Women in Parliament
- Decisions of Speaker on points of order.

Meetings within Parliament
Madam Speaker was delighted to be able to meet with Dr the Rt Hon Lockwood Smith, Speaker of the House of Representatives, to discuss the issues of keeping control of the House and said “I was most grateful to observe your expert manner in handling a difficult situation (during question time) that I hope to never face”.
Madam Speaker also met Dr Jackie Blue MP and Louisa Wall MP to discuss Women in Parliament; David Wilson, Clerk-Assistant (Select Committees), to discuss the role of Select Committees; Eric Roy MP to discuss the role of the Deputy Speaker and Assistant Speakers; Lindsay Tisch MP to discuss Government Orders of the Day; Michael Woodhouse MP to discuss the role of the Whips; James Picker, Finance and Expenditure Clerk of Committee, to discuss financial scrutiny. There was also a visit to Hansard. Madam Speaker attended a luncheon with members of the New Zealand–Pacific Parliamentary Friendship Group to enhance relationships between parliamentarians in the two countries.

Meetings outside of Parliament

Madam Speaker had the opportunity to meet with several staff of the Pacific Division of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade, the Ministry of Pacific Island Affairs, and Peter Lorimer from the Treasury to discuss the Public Finance Act 1989. She also visited Kris Faafoi’s electorate office in Mana.

Conclusion

Madam Speaker commented in her evaluation “I have reviewed the objectives of my visit since my return and they were all achieved. My multiple meetings with all the staff of various sectors was most enlightening”.

Madam Speaker, Hon Nikki Rattle, with Labour MP Kris Faafoi outside his electorate office
Programme

Monday, 15 October

Orientation and discussion about programme
Jessica Mutch

The role of the Press Gallery
David Bagnall

Tour of Parliament
Mary Harris

Introduction to New Zealand’s Parliament, Standing Orders and Speaker’s Rulings
Debra Angus

The role of the Clerk and lunch
Tim Workman

Certification of Legislation and Parliamentary Papers
Renato Guzman

Members’ bills and the scrutiny of legislation
Anton Ojala

Meeting with Pacific Division and International Development Group,
Daniela Rigoli

Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade
Maria Reynen-Clayton

Tuesday, 16 October

The role of the Parliamentary Library
Katherine Close

New Zealand–Pacific Friendship Group Lunch
Eric Roy

The role of the Deputy Speaker and Assistant Speakers
Deputy Speaker

Observe the Business Committee

Observe the Regulations Review Committee

Wednesday, 17 October

The role of select committees
David Wilson

The role of the Speaker
Dr The Rt Hon Lockwood Smith

Observe the Select Committee process

“Women in Parliament”
Dr Jackie Blue MP

Observe Question Time on Parliament TV and Parliamentary Privilege
Louisa Wall MP

Commonwealth Women’s Parliamentarians Group meeting
Debra Angus
Catherine Parkin  Parliament TV

Thursday, 18 October
Peter Lorimer  Public Finance Act 1989
James Picker  Financial Scrutiny
Michael Woodhouse MP  The role of Whips
Lindsay Tisch  Government Orders of the Day
Assistant Speaker  Observe the House during Question Time
Hon Annette King  Commonwealth Parliamentary Association
Moana Mackey MP
Charles Chauvel  Regulations Review Committee to discuss the role of the
MP  Regulations Review Committee from a members perspective

Friday, 19 October
Lynlee Earles  Hansard
Peter Hoare  Role of the Business Committee
Kris Faafoi MP  His Mana electorate office
Reno Paotonu  The role of the Ministry of Pacific Island Affairs in Regional
Partnerships
Third New Zealand Parliamentary Study Programme
Wellington, New Zealand
12–23 November 2012

Introduction
The Office of the Clerk hosted the third New Zealand Parliamentary Study Programme from 12 November to 23 November 2012. Clerks, deputy clerks and parliamentary officers from the Pacific region were invited to participate. The purpose of the programme is to contribute to building capacity and to strengthening relationships between parliaments in the Pacific. The cost of hosting the event was met through funding from the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade.

Delegation members
Eleven Pacific parliaments were invited to nominate one parliamentary officer each to participate in the programme; one deputy clerk and seven parliamentary officers attended. Those who had previously participated in the study programme were not permitted to attend. The Pacific parliaments represented at the programme were those of Bougainville, Kiribati, Nauru, Samoa, Tonga, and Tuvalu. The Kiribati and Samoan Parliaments each sent two participants. The extra participants were funded by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade and the Parliament of New South Wales, under the twinning arrangement between the parliaments of New South Wales and Kiribati.

Event programme
The first week of the programme focused on the New Zealand Parliament’s procedures and processes, providing the participants with practical experiences such as observing a select committee meeting and debates in the House. The second week of the programme gave participants a theoretical context.

The objectives of the two-week programme were to:

- allow the deputy clerk and other officials from the Pacific parliaments to observe the workings of the New Zealand Parliament
- help participants develop an understanding of the key features of a Westminster parliament and the relevance to their own systems
- help participants decide areas in which the New Zealand Parliament and their twinned parliaments could give them further support, and
- develop a network of contacts between the Pacific parliaments.

The study programme allowed participants to appreciate the links between departments and to improve their understanding of the parliamentary process in its entirety. It consisted of a mixture of presentations, workshops and practical exercises on topics pertaining to the structure of the New Zealand parliamentary system:

- introduction to the New Zealand parliamentary system
• New Zealand’s legislative process
• House business
• running Parliament
• scrutiny
• supporting Parliament
• public engagement and education
• scrutiny of bills (the select committee process)
• Members’ bills, and
• Pacific parliaments and twinning arrangements.

The programme also afforded opportunities for engagement with New Zealand members of Parliament including Dr The Rt Hon Lockwood Smith, Speaker of the House of Representatives and Su’a William Sio MP, as well as a site visit to the electorate of Grant Robertson MP.

Established twinning arrangements with Australian parliaments form an important regional network for Pacific parliaments that are members of the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association. Their purpose is to foster co-operation between branches in the Australian and Pacific regions, through the exchange of information and the provision of visas for relevant travel, and assistance with training.

To reflect the importance of the twinning project, two clerks from Australian state parliaments were invited to participate in a clerks’ panel discussion. Participants found this a valuable opportunity to discuss the twinning arrangements and to share the knowledge of experienced clerks.

**Conclusion**

Evaluating the study programme, participants said they had gained an in-depth understanding of the workings of the New Zealand Parliament. They rated the overall programme as excellent, and a number of them noted that they would apply the principles discussed in their own parliaments.

The evaluation of the programme asked participants to indicate areas where they would like further support or projects they would like to implement. The Office of the Clerk recommends that these responses form a basis for future training and support. The Office believes the success of the programme will become evident as these projects take shape and the Pacific parliaments develop the networks established during this event.

The Office of the Clerk would like to thank the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade and the Parliament of New South Wales for their funding support. Gratitude also goes to the Clerks from the Legislative Assemblies of the Parliament of New South Wales and the Australian Capital Territory for their contribution to this important regional event. It is hoped that this event will be held bi-annually and will continue to complement the parliamentary capacity-building activities of other agencies in the Pacific region.
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Clerk of the Legislative Assembly, Parliament of New South Wales
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Clerk of the Legislative Assembly, Capital Territory of Australia
Programme

Monday, 12 November

Introduction to the New Zealand parliamentary system
Complex overview and tour of Parliament
Mike Lee, Tours Supervisor
Electoral Commission: MMP and the electoral system
Richard Thornton, Communications and Education Advisor
Introduction to the New Zealand Parliament
David Bagnall, Senior Parliamentary Officer (Policy)

Introduction to New Zealand Parliamentary Study Programme
Debra Angus, Deputy Clerk of the House of Representatives
Averil Taylor, Parliamentary Officer (Parliamentary Relations)

Programme outline
Establishing a shared framework in which Pacific parliaments operate
Participant workshop
Participant discussion:
What are the key features of their Parliaments?
What are the main challenges facing their Parliaments?

Tuesday, 13 November

Running Parliament and constitutional arrangements
The role of the Speaker
Dr The Rt Hon Lockwood Smith, Speaker of the House of Representatives
The Legislative Process
Tim Workman, Manager (House)
New Zealand’s Constitutional Arrangements
Claudia Geiringer, Professor, Victoria University of Wellington
Observe Questions for Oral Answer in the House
The role of the Office of the Clerk
David Wilson, Clerk-Assistant (Select Committees)
Broadcasting in Action
Catherine Parkin, Manager (Public Information and Chamber Operations)
Wednesday, 14 November

The select committee process and holding the Executive to account

Overview of Select Committees
David Wilson, Clerk-Assistant (Select Committees)
Observe the proceedings of Select Committees
Observe the proceedings of the House of Representatives
Members’ bills workshop
Renato Guzman, Manager (Legal Services)
Elizabeth Grant, Legislative Counsel

Thursday, 15 November

Select Committee business

Observe the proceedings of the Regulations Review Committee
Public engagement and education

Education
Lynne Edmonson, Parliamentary Officer (Education)
Hayden Montgomerie, Ministry of Youth Development
Lisa Cameron, Youth Parliament Project Manager
Philippa Henwood, Visitor Services Manager
Discussion: public engagement initiatives in participants’ parliaments

Select Committee Submissions and Inquiries
Making effective submissions to Parliament
How to initiate a select committee inquiry
Helena Strange, Parliamentary Officer (Clerk of Committee)
Andy Gardner, Parliamentary Officer (Clerk of Committee)

Friday, 16 November

Pacific Parliamentary Activities and twinning arrangements
Group discussion on areas of interest
Project work for own Parliament
Clerk’s panel: role of the Clerk
Mary Harris, Clerk of the House of Representatives
Ronda Miller, Clerk of the Legislative Assembly, Parliament of New South Wales
Tom Duncan, Clerk of the Legislative Assembly, Australian Capital Territory
Commonwealth Parliamentary Association and Inter-Parliamentary Union
Regional activities and twinning arrangements
Debra Angus, Deputy Clerk of the House of Representatives
Ronda Miller, Clerk of the Legislative Assembly, Parliament of New South Wales
Tom Duncan, Clerk of the Legislative Assembly, Australian Capital Territory

**Monday, 19 November**

**Supporting Parliament**

**Website content**

Catherine Parkin, Manager (Public Information and Chamber Support)

**Hansard**

Lynlee Earles, Manager (Hansard)

John Greenlees, Parliamentary Officer (Team Leader Hansard Reporter/Editor)

Alyson Groves, Transcription Services Coordinator

Maureen Lee, Parliamentary Officer (Team Leader Hansard Editing)

Kezia Ralphs, Parliamentary Officer (Team Leader Hansard Reporting)

**Parliamentary Privilege**

Debra Angus, Deputy Clerk of the House of Representatives

Development of parliamentary procedure: Standing Orders, Speakers’ Rulings, Business Committee

Participant discussion:

How procedure is developed in participant’s own Parliament

Debra Angus, Deputy Clerk of the House of Representatives

David Bagnall, Senior Parliamentary Officer (Policy)

The role of the Parliamentary Counsel Office

Fiona Leonard, Acting Deputy Chief Parliamentary Counsel

Richard Wallace, Acting Drafting Team Manager, Resources and Treaty, Parliamentary Counsel Office

**Tuesday, 20 November**

**Scrutiny and supporting Parliament**

Overview of the Parliamentary Service

New members induction

Members’ expenses

Out of Parliament Support

Geoff Thorn, General Manager, Parliamentary Service

Parliamentary Library
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Report of the Parliamentary Delegation to the
22nd Annual Meeting of the Asia Pacific
Parliamentary Forum (APPF)
Puerto Vallarta, Mexico
12–16 January 2014

Introduction
The New Zealand delegation that attended the Asia Pacific Parliamentary Forum (APPF) comprised three members of Parliament:

- Lindsay Tisch MP, Assistant Speaker of the House of Representatives
- Hon Maryan Street MP
- Barbara Stewart MP.

During four days of deliberations in Puerto Vallarta the New Zealand delegation was able to make a substantive contribution to the APPF, the organisation and running of which were a credit to our Mexican hosts. The programme of the APPF is attached as Appendix 1 and a media release about the visit is attached as Appendix 2.

The delegation would like to acknowledge the assistance of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade, including the advice and support from the New Zealand Embassy in Mexico City, particularly in-country assistance from Deputy Head of Mission Amy Laurenson.

22nd Meeting of the Asia—Pacific Parliamentary Forum

General
The Asia—Pacific Parliamentary Forum (APPF) is a forum of national parliamentarians, that seeks to provide opportunities for national parliamentarians of the Asia—Pacific region to:

- identify and discuss matters of common concern and interest in a global context
- deepen their understanding of the policy concerns, interests, and experiences of the countries of the region
- examine the critical political, social, and cultural developments resulting from economic growth and integration
- encourage and promote regional cooperation at all levels on matters of common concern
- further in their respective countries a sense of regional cohesion, understanding, and cooperation.
The APPF acts to promote regional identification and cooperation, with particular focus on:

- cooperation for the further advancement of peace, freedom, democracy, and prosperity
- open and non-exclusive cooperation for the expansion of free trade and investment, and sustainable development and sound environmental practices
- non-military cooperation, giving due consideration to issues relating to regional peace and security.

The APPF expresses its views on these issues and the positions of the parliamentarians of the Asia-Pacific region through resolutions and a Joint Communiqué signed by all the heads of delegations.

To a great extent, the APPF acts as the parliamentary branch of Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation, and keeps close ties with other regional integration institutions such as the Association of Southeast Asian Nations, the South Pacific Forum, the Pacific Economic Cooperation Council, and the Pacific Basin Economic Council, even though it maintains an independent agenda. Twenty seven national parliaments are current members of the APPF.

22nd Annual Meeting of the APPF

Parliaments from twenty two member countries participated in the 22nd Annual Meeting of the Asia-Pacific Parliamentary Forum in Puerto Vallarta, Mexico. Brunei Darussalam participated as an observer, and El Salvador, Honduras, and Panama participated as invited guests.

The New Zealand delegation members all delivered speeches in the plenary sessions Hon Maryan Street and I participated in the Drafting Committee. I also attended the Executive Committee meeting.
Executive Committee

The Executive Committee met on Sunday 12 January and was chaired by Senator Teófilo Torres Corso on behalf of Senator Raul Cervantes Andrade, President of the 22nd APPF and Chairman of the Mexican Senate.

I represented the Oceania region (standing in for Papua New Guinea) along with Australia (the Oceania region’s other nominated representative).

The Executive Committee discussed and adopted the Forum’s agenda and programme of activities, the election of the Chair and Vice-Chair of the Drafting Committee, the time limit for speeches, and the location of the 23rd Annual Meeting. It also acknowledged the draft resolutions submitted by the national delegations. The report of the Executive Committee meeting is attached as Appendix 3.

Plenary sessions

The plenary sessions of the 22nd APPF took place from Monday 13 to Thursday 16 January. The delegates exchanged views on a number of agenda items, which were grouped in four broad categories:

1. political and security matters in the Asia-Pacific region
2. economic and trade matters in the Asia-Pacific region
3. regional cooperation in the Asia-Pacific region
4. the future work of the APPF.

Members of the New Zealand delegation presented their views in three of the plenary sessions. These sessions also allowed the delegation to become more informed on the major topics.

First plenary session: political and security matters in the Asia-Pacific region

The first plenary session concerning political and security matters in the Asia-Pacific region focused on:

- Peace and stability in the Asia-Pacific region: strengthening of democracy, respect for national sovereignty, and possibilities of building a collective system for regional security
- The fight against terrorism, drug trafficking, and organised crime
- Social and political movements in the Middle East and possible impact on world and regional security
- Achievements of the ASEAN regional forum
- Parliamentary initiatives for transparency and the fight against corruption.

Hon Maryan Street spoke on the topic of ‘Peace and Stability in the Asia-Pacific region’, and Barbara Stewart spoke on the topic of ‘The fight against terrorism, drug trafficking and organised crime’. Their speeches are attached as Appendices 4 and 5 respectively.
Second plenary session: economic and trade matters in the Asia-Pacific region

The second plenary session focused on:

- APEC 2013 (report by the Indonesian delegation on the results of the APEC Summit in Bali)
- The Green economy and sustainable tourism
- Food and energy security
- The knowledge economy and innovative growth
- The parliamentary dimension of trade and economic cooperation and integration processes in the Asia-Pacific region, taking into account the WTO rules and procedures.

I spoke on promoting ‘The parliamentary dimension of trade and economic cooperation and integration processes in the Asia-Pacific region’, and my speech is attached as Appendix 6.

Third plenary session: regional cooperation in the Asia-Pacific region

The third plenary session agenda topics were as follows:

- Cooperation to face climate change and the prevention and handling of natural disasters
- Cooperation for poverty eradication, strengthening social cohesion, migration flows, participation of youth in development projects, and empowering women
- From ODAs to the new development agenda post-2015
- Cooperation in education, culture, science, and technology
- Best practices in parliamentary diplomacy: cooperation in and amongst parliamentary assemblies.

Hon Maryan Street delivered a speech on the topic of ‘From ODAs to the new development agenda post-2015’, and Barbara Stewart spoke on the topic of ‘Cooperation in education, culture, science, and technology’. Copies of their speeches are attached as Appendices 7 and 8.

Fourth plenary session: Future work of the APPF

Ecuador was confirmed as the venue for the 23rd Annual Meeting of the APPF, which will be held in January 2015.

Adoption of resolutions and Joint Communiqué

The New Zealand co-sponsored resolution on trade and economic cooperation in the Asia-Pacific region was adopted as Resolution 8. It is included as Appendix 9. The Joint Communiqué was adopted and signed by the heads of delegations, along with 22 resolutions. The Joint Communiqué is attached as Appendix 10.
The closing ceremony followed, with speeches by Chairman Senator Raúl Cervantes Andrade and Senator Teófilo Torres Corzo thanking the participants for their enthusiastic engagement over the course of the Forum.

The New Zealand delegation.

Other meetings

Meetings of the Drafting Committee and Working Groups

The Drafting Committee meetings ran concurrently with the plenary sessions on Monday 13 to Wednesday 15 January. I undertook the role of New Zealand’s representative at the Drafting Committee. Hon Maryan Street attended the meeting in my place whenever I was required to speak in the plenary sessions or elsewhere.

A total of 38 draft resolutions were lodged, and subsequently referred to topical working groups, which developed an agreed version of each resolution before it was discussed at the Drafting Committee.

New Zealand sponsored a resolution on trade and economic cooperation in the Asia-Pacific region and I participated in the Working Group meeting to discuss this resolution, along with members of Parliament from Chile, Ecuador, Japan, Mexico, the Republic of Korea and the Russian Federation.

Bilateral Meetings

We met with Senators Teófilo Torres Corzo, Daniel Gabriel Ávila Ruiz and José Ascención Orihuela Bárcenas of the Mexican Senate on Wednesday 15 January.

The meeting centred mainly on the Trans-Pacific Partnership (TPP) negotiations, and the New Zealand Parliament’s processes for holding the Executive to account. It was very useful to have Hon Maryan Street, Chair of the Regulations Review Committee, present to help inform this discussion.

We took this opportunity to once again express our sincere gratitude for Mexico’s gracious hospitality and congratulated it on a highly successful 22nd APPF.
Conclusions

The 22nd APPF comprised a full programme of meetings and formal social activities. The New Zealand delegation contributed to all aspects of the Forum, including debate in the plenary, negotiations on draft resolutions in meetings of Working Groups, and the work of the Drafting Committee throughout.

The Forum provided a valuable opportunity for parliamentarians from the attending Asia-Pacific nations to work together to gain an understanding of each other’s perspectives on a wide range of international issues. It was my privilege to lead a delegation of experienced and committed members of Parliament, and their contributions to the Forum were a credit to the New Zealand Parliament.

On a personal note, I was honoured to receive a special medal recognising my efforts in strengthening relations between the New Zealand Parliament and the Federal Assembly of the Russian Federation. The medal was presented to me in a private ceremony by the head of the Russian delegation, Mr Iliyas Umakhanov, Vice Chairman of the Federal Assembly, on behalf of the Chairperson of the Federation Council of the Federal Assembly, H.E. Valentina Matvienko.

Notwithstanding the diplomatic delicacy of some matters, such as ongoing tensions over territorial disputes in North Asia and the South China Sea, there was considerable goodwill evident between participants and constructive efforts resulted in resolutions being adopted on all conference topics.

Participants also welcomed the opportunity to establish or renew contacts with elected (or appointed) representatives from delegations attending the APPF, and I believe that these connections will prove valuable in the future as other challenging international issues arise.

The warm hospitality of our Mexican hosts was greatly appreciated, and all members of the New Zealand delegation enjoyed our time in Puerto Vallarta.

Lindsay Tisch
Assistant Speaker of the House of Representatives
Appendix 1 – APPF Programme

Saturday, January 11, 2014
Arrival of the delegations to the International Airport “Lic. Gustavo Díaz Ordaz” of Puerto Vallarta
Transfer to the Hotels

Sunday, January 12, 2014
15:30 Briefing for Secretaries of Delegations
Venue: Ballrooms Hotel Marriot CasaMagna
18:00 Executive Committee Meeting
Venue: Ballrooms Hotel Marriot CasaMagna
20:00 Welcome reception hosted by delegation of Mexican Senate in honor of the participants and guests of the 22nd Annual Meeting of the APPF
Venue: Main Garden Hotel Marriot CasaMagna

Monday, January 13, 2014
(Dress code: formal attire, national dress)
09:00 Gather in the hotel lobby and transfer to the Puerto Vallarta International Conventions Center
10:00 Opening Ceremony
Venue: Vallarta Grand Conference Hall
Welcome address by Sen. Raúl Cervantes Andrade, President of the Mexican Senate, President of the APPF
Welcome message by Mr Yasuhiro Nakasone, Honorary President of the APPF
11:00 Statement by the Leader of the Russian delegation
Opening message by H.E. Enrique Peña Nieto, President of the Mexican United States (TBC)
Coffee Break
Venue: lobby

Photo Session (Leaders of delegations)
Venue: Forecourt

11:15–12:00 Courtesy Call paid to H.E. Enrique Peña Nieto, President of the Mexican United States
Venue: (TBC)

12:00 – 13:30 First Plenary Session
Section I: Political and Security Matters
Venue: Vallarta Conference Hall
13:30 – 15:00 Lunch
Venue:
Leaders of delegations – (TBC)
Participants
15:00 Drafting Committee Meeting
Venue: (TBC)
15:00 – 16:30 First Plenary Session (continued)
16:30 – 16:45 Coffee Break
Venue: lobby
16:45 – 19:00 First Plenary Session (continued)
Venue: Vallarta Conference Hall
20:00 Dinner hosted by Governor of Jalisco State in honor of participants and guests of the 22nd Annual Meeting of the APPF
Venue: (TBC)

Tuesday, January 14, 2014 (Dress code: formal attire, national dress)

09:00 – 10:30 Second Plenary Session
Section II: Economics and Trade Matters
Venue: Vallarta Conference Hall
09:00 Drafting Committee Meeting
Venue: (TBC)
10:30 – 10:45 Coffee Break
Venue: lobby
10:45 – 13:00 **Second Plenary Session**(continued)  
*Venue: Vallarta Conference Hall*  

13:00 – 14:30 **Lunch**  
*Venue: Leaders of delegations – (TBC)*  

*Participants of the 22nd Annual Meeting of the APPF (TBC)*  

14:30 **Drafting Committee Meeting**  
*Venue: (TBC)*  

14:30 – 15:45 **Second Plenary Session**(continued)  
*Venue: Vallarta Conference Hall*  

15:45 – 16:00 **Coffee Break**  
*Venue: lobby*  

**Media Briefing**  
*Venue: (TBC)*  

16:00 **Drafting Committee Meeting**  
*Venue: (TBC)*  

16:45 – 17:30  

17:30 – 17:45  

**Third Plenary Session**  
**Section III: Regional Cooperation in Asia Pacific**  
*Venue: Vallarta Conference Hall*  

**Coffee Break**  
*Venue: lobby*  

17:45 – 19:00 **Presentation of issues of cooperation in Asia Pacific by invited institutions**  
*Venue: Vallarta Conference Hall*  

20:00 **Dinner hosted by Sen. Raul Cervantes Andrade, President of APPF and President of the Mexican Senate, in honor of the participants and guests of the 22nd Annual Meeting of the APPF**  
*Venue: (TBC)*

---

**Wednesday, January 15, 2014** *(Dress code: formal attire, national dress)*
09:00 – 11:00 **Third Plenary Session (continued)**  
*Venue: Vallarta Conference Hall*

09:00 – 11:00 **Drafting Committee Meeting**  
*Venue: (TBC)*

11:00 – 11:15 **Coffee Break**  
*Venue: lobby*

11:15 – 13:45 **Third Plenary Session (continued)**  
*Venue: Vallarta Conference Hall*

11:15 – 13:45 **Drafting Committee Meeting (to complete drafting of final documents)**  
*Venue: (TBC)*

13:45 – 15:15 **Lunch**  
*Venue: Leaders of delegations (TBC)  
Participants of the 22nd Annual Meeting of the APPF (TBC)*

15:15 – 16:45 **Fourth Plenary Session**  
*Section IV: Further work of the APPF*

16:45 – 17:00 **Coffee Break**  
*Venue: lobby*

17:00 – 18:00 **Final Plenary Session**  
**Adoption of the Resolutions and Joint Statement**  
**Signature of the Joint Statement by Leaders of delegations**  
**Closing Ceremony**  
*Venue: Vallarta Conference Hall*

18:00 **Press Conference**  
*Venue: (TBC)*

20:00 **Farewell Dinner hosted on behalf of Mexican Chamber of Deputies in honor of the participants and guests of the 22nd Annual Meeting of the APPF**  
*Venue: (TBC)*
Appendix 2 – Press Release

New Zealand parliamentarians to attend regional parliamentary forum

New Zealand members of Parliament Lindsay Tisch, Hon Maryan Street and Barbara Stewart will attend the 22nd Asia Pacific Parliamentary Forum (APPF) in Puerto Villarta, Mexico.

The APPF is a forum for parliamentarians from the Asia-Pacific region who meet to identify and discuss issues of mutual concern, with the aim of strengthening understanding and encouraging regional cooperation. The APPF supports other regional cooperation vehicles such as APEC, and New Zealand hosted the annual meeting in 2008.

There are 27 member countries, and the discussion agenda focuses on regional political and security matters, economics and trade, and regional cooperation between the member states. All the New Zealand delegates hope to deliver speeches over the course of the event, and New Zealand is also sponsoring a draft resolution supporting trade in the region.

The Speaker of the House, The Rt Hon David Carter, said New Zealand’s attendance at the APPF is a valuable opportunity for the participating parliamentarians and of wider benefit to New Zealand.

“Inter-parliamentary relationships strengthen New Zealand’s international profile, build links between nations, and provide opportunities for New Zealand parliamentarians to engage on the global stage.

“The APPF is a significant international organisation that contributes to matters of regional importance, including supporting the work of APEC. I am sure that the delegates will represent New Zealand well at the upcoming deliberations in Mexico.”

The APPF is taking place from 12 to 16 January.

ENDS
Appendix 3 – Minutes of the Executive Committee Meeting

REPORT OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMISSION WORKING SESSION OF THE 22nd ASIA PACIFIC PARLIAMENTARY FORUM
Puerto Vallarta, Jalisco
Sunday 12, 2014

1.- WELCOME TO THE 22ND EDITION OF THE ASIA PACIFIC PARLIAMENTARY FORUM TO THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEMBER COUNTRIES.
Mr. Senator Teófilo Torres Corzo, on behalf of Mr. Senator Raúl Cervantes Andrade, Chairman of the Mexican Senate, and who would arrive in this Session later on, opens the work session welcoming the delegations member of the Executive Committee. He stresses the will of the Mexican Delegation to work arduously and to promote more extensive and better relationships among the participating members of Parliamentary so that “at the end of the 22nd Forum we have become better friends than when we arrived.”

2. RESULTS OF THE FORUM ORGANIZATION
Mr. Senator Torres Corzo describes the organization actions carried out to make the Forum possible. Of particular mention is that there are 334 participants of 33 countries and organizations, and 41 draft Resolution.

3. TOPICS IN THE AGENDA OF THE ANNUAL MEETING
After his presentation, Mr. Senator Torres Corzo reads the Agenda, inviting the participants to bring up their comments, if any.
The chairman of the New Zealand delegation wants to know how long the participants will have in the working sessions. Mr. Senator Torres Corzo answered that the interventions should last between 5 and 7 minutes.
Concerning the question when the Forum would conclude, he explains that it will end on Wednesday, January 15 at 6:00 p.m. with the Joint Communication execution.
Likewise, some delegations (China, Chile, Indonesia, and Japan) express their best wishes in this Forum, as well as their concern about the possibility that all the stakeholders have the opportunity to participate, considering that a list of interventions has already been determined.

Mr. Senator Torres Corzo explains that in the information meeting with the staffers, the delegations have already been instructed that, even though the program is very busy, participation requests are admitted. The final list of interventions will be delivered to the delegations later on so that the new participants are included, stressing the importance to respect and abide by the time available, in accordance with the procedures established by the APPF. The topics of the Agenda are approved unanimously.

4. ANNUAL MEETING AGENDA
Mr. Senator Torres Corzo explains that all the delegations have a copy of the current Agenda.
He says that the final version is also included in the Guide of Delegates, which acts as the basis for the work performed.
The Agenda is approved unanimously.
5.- PROPOSALS TO PRESIDE OVER THE PLENARY MEETINGS
Mr. Senator Torres Corzo submits the proposal of the individuals who will preside
over the working sessions and request its approval.
It is approved unanimously.

6.- LIST OF DRAFT RESOLUTION RECEIVED
The participants are told that their work binder contains the list of the 41 draft
resolutions received. Everybody has a copy of the list, which must be checked to
see if none of the projects sent is missing. In a notebook prepared for this Meeting,
the copies of each of the draft Resolution are found, with a copy of the last two
proposals sent by the Philippines delegation. (See Annex)
The participants are asked to review this list to corroborate that their proposals are
included, and that the projects sent have been actually taken into consideration.
No comments are made. Thus, the list of proposals submitted is accepted.

7.- CANDIDACY TO HOLD THE POSITION OF THE DRAFTING COMMITTEE
CHAIRMAN
The Chairman of the Executive Committee session submits the candidacy of Mr.
Senator Manual Cavazos Lerma to preside over the Drafting Committee of the 22nd
APPF.
The proposal is approved unanimously.

8.- VENUE AND DATE OF THE NEXT APPF MEETING
Information is given that the Honorary Chairmanship, in charge of Mr. Senator
Nakasone of Japan, has addressed the host country in writing under the following
terms: “As was determined in the 20th Annual APPF Meeting held in Tokyo, the
host countries, in the original rotation, will repeat the cycle in the next 20 years.
Therefore, I would like that this rotation system is added to item 4 of the Agenda so
that it is discussed in the Executive Committee meeting and is reconfirmed in the
general meeting.”

He also indicates that in the Honorary Presidency document, the following proposal
is submitted: “according to what was approved in Tokyo, the countries that have
not been hosts but that desire to do so, shall have priority in the rotation, with the
regular rotation following the normal order after the country that acts as the host for
the first time”.

The Honorary Presidency considers these issues of utmost importance because
since the APPF founding, the need to organize the structure of host countries has
been stressed so that it can proceed seamlessly and without any problems.
Ms. Deputy María Augusta Calle, chairwoman of the Ecuador delegation, reiterates
the interest of the Congress of her country to be the host country for the 23rd APPF
meeting to be held at the beginning of 2015.

The Executive Committee members approve the candidacy of Ecuador.
Mr. Senator Torres Corzo states that it will be important that Ecuador
communicates as soon as possible the place and date it would propose for the
2015 Forum.

Ms. Deputy Calle replies that she will provide details about her proposal in due
time and thanks, on behalf of her country, the candidacy approval.
Mr. Senator Jorge Pizarro, chairman of the Chile delegation, asks to be allowed to
speak to explain that the legislative periods of that country consider a recess in
their activities at the end of January. Thus, he requests that in the proposal.
Appendix 4 – Speech by Hon Maryan Street

Political and Security Matters

Mihi whakatau (Maori greeting).

The peace and stability of the Asia-Pacific region is a critical issue as the economic, political, and strategic importance of the region increases. New Zealand has a strong stake in regional peace and security. The region’s economic strength and growth prospects are underpinned by its political and security environment.

The Asia-Pacific region is arguably more secure and stable now than at any time in the last 80 years. Contributing factors include greater democracy, strong economic growth leading to significant drops in poverty levels, and the increasing pace of integration. But we also face modern threats which have the potential to destabilise the Asia-Pacific region. These include:

- Nuclear arms proliferation and threat of use;
- Climate change and rising sea levels;
- Natural disasters;
- Food security;
- Border security, terrorism, drug and human trafficking and transnational crime;
- Maritime security.

And we still have the old threats:

- Unbalanced economic growth;
- Corruption;
- An absence of democratic accountability structures;
- Disdain for the rule of law.

I put them in this order because unless we address and advance nuclear disarmament, all other human endeavour could be obliterated. Even the detonation of a small proportion of the current nuclear arsenal of one country could further alter our global climate forever, threatening crop production, food security, and water supply. [Reference to resolutions of Australia, Japan, Korea and recognition of Mexico’s role in this area in the past and present.]

Climate change is a modern challenge which requires leadership, courage and international cooperation. Transitioning to less fossil-fuel dependent economies is going to be difficult but it has to be planned for now so that our children can make it happen. There is great hope for cooperation over renewable, sustainable energy in our region. We need to advance that.

Disaster preparedness and resilience is also a challenge which requires intense cooperation and immediate responsiveness. Thailand and Japan have good draft resolutions in this respect. We who live on the fiery, volcanic Pacific Rim, from Chile and Mexico to Indonesia and Japan, and including New Zealand, know in dramatic and practical terms what this means.
Economic growth needs to be strong but also sustainable and balanced. Materially polarised societies with extremes of wealth and poverty produce unstable social conditions, which produce unstable countries.

New Zealand has put forward a draft resolution on trade. Obviously that is very important to a small, exposed economy such as ours. We also have a bipartisan approach to trade. That consistency is a reliable aspect of relationships with New Zealand. But if we do not reach further to establish security and stability in our region, trade is impossible. Without border or maritime security, or working anti-terrorism processes, trade cannot happen. Without the rule of law and corruption-free systems, trade is compromised. [Reference to draft resolutions of Indonesia, Chile and the Philippines which we support.]

The Asia-Pacific region has the apparatus to deliver solutions in each of these areas. We have an abundance of cooperative fora in our region. We have:

- ASEAN
- APEC
- The Shanghai Cooperation Organisation (SCO)
- ASEAN Regional Forum
- East Asia Forum
- Pacific Islands Forum
- Asia Cooperation Dialogue
- Asia-Europe meeting
- ASEAN Defence Ministers Meeting Plus Forum (ADMM+)
- Bilateral agreements
- Multilateral agreements.

We clearly do not lack mechanisms. But we need urgency and pace on these matters. Chile and Indonesia have excellent draft resolutions on transparency and combating corruption. We all need to start addressing this issue at home. The Transparency International Report on corruption in our region was damning. We must fix that with laws and institutions which provide accountability independently of governments.

We need to be bolder on climate change. New Zealand speaks up for small Pacific Island nations who are at greatest threat of annihilation from rising sea levels.

The nuclear threat needs to be addressed. Australia, Korea, and Japan have draft resolutions which cover this issue. There is no greater threat to peace and security in our region. We must build on the APPF resolutions of 2013 and add courage to them. We do not need to invent new mechanisms in the Asia-Pacific region – we just need to use the existing ones cooperatively and effectively.

Ours is the most dynamic region in the world. Nothing is more important to the welfare of all our peoples than peace and security. This conference can advance that goal. It is incumbent upon us as political leaders to push the broader agenda for peace and stability forward. The message from this conference should be urgency and cooperation.

Kia ora koutou katoa.
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New Zealand’s Role in Combating Terrorism, Drug Trafficking and Organised Crime

Mr Chairman/Madam Chair,

Buenos dias (good morning)/Buenas tardes (good afternoon)

E nga mana, E nga iwi, E nga reo, Tena koutou, Tena koutou, Tena koutou katoa.

I am pleased to address you on behalf of the New Zealand Parliament. The three areas for my focus are: anti-terrorism, drug trafficking, money laundering, and organised crime.

New Zealand recognises that the threat of international terrorism requires a multi-layered and long term response. We are committed to regional and international counter-terrorism cooperation and to improving counter-terrorism capability.

New Zealand is one of the most remote countries in the world. Our closest neighbour is Australia. Our geographical isolation once made us relatively immune from global threats.

Improvements in communications, reductions in the costs of air travel, and rapid advances in information technology, particularly the Internet, have made threats from terrorism, drug trafficking, money laundering and organised more significant in recent years.

Notwithstanding our remoteness, New Zealand has never been complacent about issues of international security or isolationism in its thinking or policies to combat terrorism.

Anti-Terrorism

Today, both globally and regionally, we share with others in the international community concern about the threat posed by a new generation of home-grown terrorist action. New Zealand has not been a primary target for terrorism but New Zealanders have been casualties along with others in the terrorist attacks on New York and in Bali.

One of the most pressing concerns with terrorism is the threat of terrorist groups using chemical, biological, radiological and/or nuclear devices to carry out an unconventional attack. This form of terrorism has become more pronounced recently.

We have ensured that our laws are geared towards countering terrorism. The New Zealand Parliament has responded by passing laws to deal with terrorism, in particular the:

- International Terrorism (Emergency Powers) Act 1987, and the

New Zealand has taken an active approach to countering bio-chemical threats. Since 2004, we have been an active member of the Proliferation Security Initiative, or PSI, to counter the illegal trafficking of weapons of mass destruction and related materials.

New Zealand is also seeking to build support for the PSI throughout the South Pacific. We have joined with Australia to promote regional participation in PSI activities.
We are party to all 13 United Nations anti-terrorism conventions and have provided powers to our intelligence, security, law enforcement, and border control agencies to deal with terrorist threats.

Terrorism is recognised by the international community as a critical issue, not only globally, but regionally as well.

Regional security processes continue to evolve and they continue to play an important role in providing a platform for dialogue and cooperation on a wide range of traditional and increasingly non-traditional security issues.

As experience has shown in Kenya and Tanzania, remoteness, peacefulness, and even neutrality do not guarantee security from terrorists.

The traditional image of New Zealand and the South Pacific has long been one of beautiful islands, peaceful people, and a benign environment.

However, the problem in our region is the potential for the South Pacific to present a tempting target, either for an attack like the one in Bali, or as a base from which terrorist cells could undertake the planning and resourcing for an attack elsewhere.

We are affected by terrorist acts wherever they occur. We also recognise the persistent threat faced in our wider Asia-Pacific region despite counter-terrorism successes over the last decade.

New Zealand and the small states of the South Pacific are dependent on tourism which relies on air and sea travel. A terrorist incident would have a devastating impact on tourism. New Zealand has therefore been active in counter-terrorism capacity building in the South Pacific.

Since 2005, New Zealand and ASEAN have had a comprehensive joint work programme in place on cooperative efforts to combat international terrorism and transnational crime. The work programme includes border control initiatives in the area of bio-security, legislative drafting assistance, and law-enforcement capability-building assistance.

New Zealand is closely engaged with the Pacific Roundtable on Counter-Terrorism. All South Pacific Forum members have the opportunity to discuss difficulties faced in meeting counter-terrorism obligations, and the assistance available to small states from international sources.

New Zealand is committed to the international campaign against terrorism. We have made significant military deployments of New Zealand Defence Force personnel to Afghanistan. We continue to contribute to the restoration of stability in Afghanistan via our Provincial Reconstruction Team in Bamyan, as well as through the provision of development assistance, and through training of the Afghanistan National Army.

We are working to ensure that our border security and supply chain regimes are rigorous and meet exacting standards. We have introduced the International Ship and Port Security Code to ensure we meet the International Civil Aviation Organisation’s baggage screening requirements.
New Zealand has exerted enormous energy and effort, domestically, regionally, and internationally to strengthen protection against the threat that terrorism poses to us and the world.

**Drug Trafficking**

The safety and health of our families and **young people** depend on our ability to counter drug trafficking. Our law enforcement agencies are at the front line in the ongoing battle against the importation of drugs and chemicals used in their manufacture.

While our law enforcement agencies are alert to emerging and existing drug smuggling trends, the volume and sophistication of drug trafficking through trans-national crime syndicates are rising.

**Methamphetamine (P)** is the single biggest illicit drug problem facing New Zealand. We are determined to stop it at the border.

Crimes related to methamphetamine are increasingly serious and there must be zero tolerance for those who deal in such drugs. Stopping the “mules” will not work as there will always be those who are desperate enough to take the risk of being couriers. Disrupting the supply at source and thereby eliminating the drug syndicates supply is potentially the most effective way of dealing with this.

We are always looking to exchange ideas, strategies, and opportunities to work in partnership with other countries to tackle this growing problem. For example, the New Zealand and China Customs services have agreed to work more closely together to combat the smuggling of pharmaceutical products used to manufacture methamphetamine (P).

**Money Laundering**

The issue of financial crime and money laundering is a global one. New Zealand has experienced the laundering of millions of dollars of criminal proceeds. Organised criminal groups in New Zealand use sophisticated commercial and financial tools as part of their criminal offending. Money laundering is one of the key strands in the terrorism and organised crime matrix.

Money laundering can have negative impacts on the financial sector and external stability of member states. Because of the negative consequences of money laundering on our economies and financial systems, concerted action to protect the integrity of markets and the global financial framework is needed.

We stand ready to assist countries in the region to combat money laundering through the Financial Action Task Force on Money Laundering (FATF), which was established by the G-7 Summit in Paris in 1989. New Zealand continues to work with other countries to combat money laundering.

New Zealand has tightened its laws around money laundering through the **Anti-Money Laundering and Countering Financing of Terrorism Act 2009**.
Organised Crime

Organised crime is a global threat, but local in its impact and damage to New Zealand society. It affects every community in New Zealand. It is widely recognised that the most effective way in which to combat this threat is through cooperation and collaboration.

Transnational organised crime is to be found in four key areas: people, drugs, environment, and goods.

While New Zealand has robust domestic laws and law enforcement, low levels of corruption and high levels of international engagement, it is not immune to domestically and trans-nationally generated organised criminal activity.

Criminal activity increasingly spans international borders, necessitating close cooperation and information-sharing between law enforcement agencies around the world.

New Zealand’s Organised and Financial Crime Agency of New Zealand (OFCANZ) is at the forefront of targeting organised crime. OFCANZ targets organised crime through taskforce operations that combine the collective investigative and intelligence resources of a range of government agencies including assistance from its international counterparts.

In July this year OFCANZ terminated its largest and most successful taskforce operation since it was established two years ago. The operation ended with raids on several properties including a financial exchange business operating in Auckland. Sixteen people are now facing drug dealing charges that carry heavy custodial penalties.

Organised crime has diversified, gone global and reached macro-economic proportions: illicit goods may be sourced from one continent, trafficked across another, and marketed in a third.

The transnational nature of organised crime means that criminal networks forge bonds across borders. Organised crime is not stagnant, but adapts to relationships between criminal networks to become both more flexible, and more sophisticated, with ever-greater reach around the globe.

Today’s world presents big challenges for a small country like New Zealand. Our ability to meet these challenges depends on our working together.

I give you New Zealand’s commitment to improving our joint efforts to secure our future well-being through maintaining constant vigilance against terrorist, drug trafficking and organised crime activities.

ENDS
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Promoting Economic Partnership and Free Trade

Of the twenty seven APPF members, twenty five are World Trade Organization (WTO) members and eighteen are Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation (APEC) members.

APEC

The 21st APEC Economic Leaders’ meeting in October 2013 recognised the importance of a strong multilateral trading system in safeguarding trade expansion as a source of economic growth, job creation and sustainable development. The leaders reaffirmed their commitment to fight against protectionist measures and to roll back protectionist and trade-distorting measures and their commitment to trade and investment liberalisation and facilitation in the Asia-Pacific region.

In New Zealand’s case it helps to advance our trade and economic interests by promoting trade and investment liberalisation, economic integration, structural reform and trade facilitation, counter-terrorism, and monitoring food security, and it provides significant capacity building assistance to developing economies.

Members’ economies are assisted by APEC to build the institutional capacity to implement and take advantage of the benefits of trade and investment reform. Leaders of APEC economies have a commitment to achieving a Free Trade Area of the Asia Pacific (FTAAP) and support the multilateral trade negotiations underway in the WTO. Work by APEC complements the goals of the G-20 Framework for Strong, Sustainable, and Balanced Growth in the Asia-Pacific region.

Bogor Goals

Since 1994 the Bogor Declaration has provided guidance on how to achieve economic cooperation and growth within APEC by adopting “the long-term goal of free and open trade and investment in the Asia-Pacific”, which is commonly known as the Bogor Goals.

A 2012 APEC review of progress towards the Bogor Goals found that APEC’s average tariff went down from 6.6 percent to 5.8 percent during the period 2008 to 2010. Tariffs in agriculture remained higher compared with other sectors. The average for agricultural products went down from 13.1 percent to 11.9 percent; whereas the average tariff for non-agricultural products declined from 5.7 percent to 4.9 percent. The 2012 review also found that non-tariff measures remain.

It is becoming evident that the region’s next growth increment will depend on reforms that go well beyond the further reduction of border protection. Attention is turning to an emphasis on business facilitation and structural reform including more efficient commercial and capital markets.

Regional Economic Integration Agenda

The Regional Economic Integration (REI) Agenda is a multi-year programme for APEC’s work towards the Bogor Goals of free and open trade and investment. As an ideal, APEC envisions a single, region-wide Free Trade Agreement. This is commonly known as the Free Trade Area of the Asia-Pacific (FTAAP).

The FTAAP is a long-term goal that will require extensive preparatory work. Nevertheless APEC believes that it is making significant progress. No less than 42 bilateral and regional free-trade agreements have already been established among the APEC member economies. The idea of enlarging, docking, or merging these agreements has been considered and next
steps recommended. APEC also has model measures in order to improve quality and transparency in trade agreements.

**The World Trade Organization**

With the Lao People’s Democratic Republic recently joining the WTO and Russia joining in 2012, the Marshall Islands and the Federation States of Micronesia are the only APPF members who are not WTO members.

At the October meeting APEC leaders reaffirmed their commitment to the strengthening of the multilateral trading system and to the successful outcomes of the 9th Ministerial Conference of the WTO in Bali on 3 to 6 December 2013. The leaders envision that the Bali outcomes will encompass an agreement on trade facilitation, and some elements of agriculture and development, including issues of interest to Least Developed Countries.

The Doha Development Round or Doha Development Agenda (DDA) is the current trade-negotiation round of the WTO which commenced in November 2001. Its objective is to lower trade barriers around the world, which will help facilitate the increase of global trade. Talks have stalled over a divide on major issues, such as agriculture, industrial tariffs and non-tariff barriers to service and trade remedies. New Zealand has been active in pursuing an ambitious and balanced conclusion to the negotiations.

**Trans-Pacific Partnership**

The P4 agreement concluded by New Zealand with Brunei, Chile and Singapore was instrumental in opening the way to the Trans-Pacific Partnership (TPP) negotiations which now include 12 Asian Pacific Countries – Australia, Brunei Darussalam, Chile, Japan, Malaysia, Peru, Singapore, the United States, Vietnam, Mexico, Canada, and New Zealand. New Zealand does not have a free trade agreement with Japan, Peru, Canada or Mexico, so TPP is very important to us.

Roughly half of international trade and more than 70 percent of New Zealand’s trade and investment flows through the Asia-Pacific region. Collectively the 12 TPP economies represent more than US$27 trillion in Gross Domestic Product. New Zealand sees our future in developing its economic relationships with Asia-Pacific countries.
Appendix 7 – Speech by Hon Maryan Street

From Official Development Assistance (ODA) to the New Development Agenda Post-2015

With the deadline for achieving the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) in 2015 closing upon us, it has been acknowledged that several regions are unlikely to meet the MDGs in the areas of child and maternal mortality, access to primary education, improved sanitation, and access to antiretroviral therapy for those living with HIV. The Millennium Goals report for 2013 also reported that in 2012, net aid disbursements from developed countries to developing countries had dropped 4 percent in real terms compared with 2011.

New Zealand’s overseas aid priority has been for a long time our nearest micro state neighbours in the Pacific. While we have seen some significant achievements in our region with respect to Millennium Development Goals, many Pacific nations remain far behind the goals with little chance of achieving many of them by 2015. The 40th Pacific Islands Forum held in Cairns in 2009 expressed concern that despite continued high levels of development assistance over the years, the Pacific region remains off track to achieve the MDGs by 2015.

The UNDP Administrator and former New Zealand Prime Minister, Rt Hon Helen Clark, said in a speech on moving beyond an overseas aid focus on the MDGs, that “in the face of today’s daunting global challenges, we cannot allow ourselves to be condemned by a collective failure to imagine a better world. Rather we should work for a world where poverty in all its dimensions is consigned to history and where we pull back from the brink of environmental catastrophe to a new, sustainable global equilibrium.” This remains the undeniable global challenge.

Poverty in the Pacific is characterised as hardship or an inadequate level of sustainable human development, evident in a lack of access to basic services, opportunities in the socio-economic life of the community, and adequate resources, including cash, to meet the basic needs of the household or the customary obligations to the extended family, village, or the church. Small island and developing Pacific states have unique vulnerabilities which make addressing inequality more difficult and complex, including geographical isolation, small size, remoteness, limited natural and human sources, aid dependence, and vulnerability to climate change and natural disasters.

As a result of these vulnerabilities, Pacific countries experience low economic growth and a lack of job opportunities. Stagnating economies with few employment opportunities constitute an underlying cause of poverty and broadening disparities, including gender inequality and youth unemployment. Poor people living with disabilities are doubly impacted. Gender equality and women’s empowerment is critical to sustainable economic development. Without contention any longer, gender equality provides a foundation for a fairer, healthier, more representative and safer society, increases productivity, and improves development outcomes for women and men, girls, and boys. It is also a core development objective and a human right.

Despite gains in girls’ education and some positive initiatives to address violence against women, overall progress towards gender equality in the Pacific is slow. In particular,
women’s representation in Pacific Parliaments remains the lowest in the world, violence against women is extremely high, and women’s economic opportunities remain limited.

I cover this background which is close to New Zealand’s aid efforts because I want to address the building of the post-2015 development agenda. This will be a major focus of work internationally over the next two years. New Zealand supports the emerging consensus on the broad shape of the post-2015 development framework, including a limited set of universal sustainable development goals, with a set of targets and indicators by which progress can be measured. The UN’s consultation process is trying to complete the unfinished agenda and aspirations of the MDGs, but also to tackle emerging issues which were not included in the original framework.

But I would like to take this opportunity to ensure that we as a region agree on the meaning of sustainable development. There has been a debate for some time in aid circles as to the meaning of sustainable economic development – the focus on economic development seems to some to downplay or minimise the ongoing need to provide access to good healthcare, especially in the area of sexual and reproductive health, and access to educational opportunities.

Of course, quality reproductive healthcare addressing maternal and infant mortality, and the provision of educational opportunities for women and girls, are causes of economic development, not products of it. In addition, the word ‘sustainability’ is also used a great deal with reference to climate change and environmental issues, and that has a particular resonance in our Asia-Pacific region as many delegates have mentioned. Discussions and goals in that regard usually focus on the reduction of GHGs, renewable energy production, and environmental protection and repair.

As part of our aid contribution in the Pacific, last year New Zealand committed funds over a three-year period to assist the Pacific Islands with 18 renewable energy projects. The use of solar power makes much more sense in the Pacific Islands than having them import expensive diesel to generate electricity. That specifically addresses the environmental component of sustainability. But it is very important that this region reinforces the triple sided nature of the unfolding post-2015 development agenda. The three sides are human, economic, and environmental sustainability. Each is critical for the survival of people, countries, and the planet.

This is why we endorse the resolutions from a number of member countries on this issue. Chile for example, explicitly refers to the need for understanding that the new global development goals do not mean that the commitment to poverty eradication will be neglected. They go on to stress the need to pay special attention to poverty and inequality, as well as the improvement of basic services and infrastructure and the development of clean technologies. Indonesia refers to development targets including social integrity, peace, and security as well as environmental sustainability and economic development. Mexico includes income equality, equal opportunities and social and financial inclusion, and the right to adequate housing in their consideration. Thailand has an excellent resolution in this area including indigenous peoples and vulnerable groups in the discussion about the post-2015 agenda and stressing the need for gender equality.

My point in drawing attention to all of these resolutions is to underscore the necessary breadth of the post-2015 agenda. Sustainable human development means improving sexual
and reproductive health access for women and girls so that maternal and infant mortality can be addressed. And more besides.

Sustainable economic development means investing in education and training for jobs which can be created for more highly skilled work forces. And more besides.

Sustainable environmental development means addressing GHG reductions, clean technologies, disaster risk reduction, and preparedness. And more besides.

Finally, there is one more important point I wish to make. That is that an active, effective, and resilient civil society is a critical part of countries and regions progressing any development agenda after 2015. Finance for implementing the future agenda will come from governments’ aid budgets, but also from remittances, the private sector, charitable organisations, and other civil society movements. Their inclusion in the development of the post-2015 agenda will be essential. An active civil society sector is a hallmark of a progressive and inclusive society. They have a role in global human, economic, and environmental development. They can also provide checks and balances against corruption and the misuse of aid funds, together with governments. An ethical private sector can make a useful contribution by investing with care into aid and infrastructure projects.

New Zealand stands ready to contribute to the building of the post-2015 development agenda, in its broadest definition. Practical and measurable goals will be essential. New Zealand is prepared to play our part in cooperation with other countries, especially in the Asia-Pacific region, to global improvement post-2015.

Thank you for your kind attention.
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Cooperation in Education

Mr Chairman/Madam Chair,

Buenos días (good morning)/Buenas tardes (good afternoon)

E nga mana, E nga iwi, E nga reo, Tena koutou, Tena koutou, Tena koutou katoa.

New Zealand supports the goals of the APPF set out in the Vancouver Declaration of 1997 in the field of education and cultural exchanges.

Education is a key building block of national resilience in any nation. It is the driver for health, wealth, and prosperity. Education helps build a sustainable world with just societies that value knowledge, promote peace, celebrate diversity, and defend human rights.

Education and training for knowledge and skills specifically targeted to the key growth sectors in the economy is one of the critical prerequisites for reducing unemployment at a time when the global economic situation remains fragile.

Despite the economic growth in the last couple of years, the global recovery has done little to reduce unemployment in the most affected countries.

Ensuring that the right type of education is provided is pivotal to ensuring economic growth.

Of 32 developed countries surveyed by the OECD in 2012, New Zealand devoted the highest percentage of public expenditure to education.

The London-based think tank The Legatum Institute goes further.

Its 2012 Prosperity Index survey of 142 countries rates New Zealand first in the world for education.

Our New Zealand education system values both academic and practical skill-based achievements. Young people are encouraged to be questioning, and flexible and to seek their own answers. Outdoor recreation and sport plus a safe learning environment produce resourceful and confident young adults.

Having a good education is an important requisite for finding employment. On average in New Zealand, girls outperformed boys by 15 points, higher than the average OECD gap of 9 points.

The foundation for New Zealand’s education system was laid in 1877 when the Education Act was passed.

We have state funded schools; ‘state-integrated’ schools based on religion (particularly Catholic) and private schools. Schooling is free at state and state-integrated schools although parents are expected to meet costs for books, school outings, etc. Private school fees range from $4,000 to $28,000 a year, which parents meet.
Schooling is compulsory for all children in New Zealand aged 6 to 16. Children usually go to a primary school from 5 to 12 years old, then secondary school (also known as college, high school, or grammar school).

There is a national curriculum and all schools, state and private, are measured against it every three years by the Government’s Education Review Office (ERO).

There are eight universities located in Auckland, Hamilton, Palmerston North, Wellington, Christchurch and Dunedin. There are also 18 institutes of technology and polytechnics in all the main centres and leading provincial cities as well. There are in excess of 600 private training establishments, including English language schools focusing on international students located throughout the country.

**International Education**

A significant aspect of New Zealand’s education sector is the international education segment. A new Crown Agency – Education New Zealand (ENZ) – was established in 2011 to take New Zealand’s education experiences to the world. ENZ contributes to the philosophy that the education system is a major contributor to economic prosperity and growth.

New Zealand has been successful in attracting a small but significant slice of the international student market. Nearly all of the global growth in international education until 2025 is expected to come from China and India and to occur in the non-compulsory education sector. Demand from education markets in Africa, the Middle East, Asia, Central America, and South America is expected to exceed 3 percent per year.

The value of international education to the New Zealand economy continues to grow with a new report released recently showing it contributed $2.6 billion and 28,000 jobs in 2012/13.

Education New Zealand has reported that the valuation of international students studying in New Zealand in 2012 was $2.5 billion and the sale and delivery of New Zealand’s education services and products offshore was $104 million.

Economic contribution was led by universities at $901 million, followed by private training establishments at $583 million. International students in New Zealand schools contributed $361 million to the economy, English language schools contributed $343 million, and Institutes of Technology contributed $304 million.

For the 2012–2013 year:

- 15,645 international fee-paying students were enrolled in primary and secondary schools, a three percent decrease from 2011
- 47,700 international students were enrolled in tertiary education
- $404 million in income from international fees was received from tertiary education institutions
the largest contingent of international fee-paying students in New Zealand education providers came from China (27%), followed by India (12%) and South Korea (11%).

International education includes a wide range of activities – not only are we focused on encouraging more international students to study in New Zealand, but we are working to boost educational exchange and collaboration to enhance the teaching, research and job-generation activities of our university sector.

We have further increased our cooperation in international education with other international partners.

This cooperation takes a variety of forms from exporting our education services overseas to the establishment of reciprocal sharing of education knowledge on a long-term basis.

There are currently many government approved secondary school to school exchange programmes between NZ and APPF member countries, with hundreds of students exchanging annually through these programmes.

**Mexico**

We have an overarching education cooperation agreement with Mexico.

Many New Zealand universities and polytechnics, including Auckland, Otago, Auckland University of Technology, Massey University, and Wellington Technical have formed relationships with Mexican counterparts, opening up opportunities for cooperation and student and staff exchanges. An increasing volume of university agreements (18 in total) reflects the educational interests between Mexico and New Zealand.

**China**

China is our second largest trading partner and the bilateral trade and economic relationship is important. Trade between our countries has increased by 50 percent since the New Zealand–China Free Trade Agreement was signed in 2008.

China is now the largest source of international students in New Zealand and appears likely to remain so for some time.

Two new agreements have been signed and are set to boost cooperation in science and technology and in education between New Zealand and China.

New Zealand’s Ministry of Business, Innovation and Employment and China’s Ministry of Science and Technology also agreed to increase funding over the next five years to 2016 to enhance and support bilateral science and technology cooperation, totaling NZ$10 million (US$8.32 million).

A separate agreement to increase education cooperation and enhance business opportunities for New Zealand tertiary education institutions has also recently been established with China.
Indonesia

Indonesia is an important emerging international education relationship for New Zealand. In 2011, New Zealand and Indonesia signed an Arrangement on Education Cooperation. The arrangement provides a framework for engagement between the New Zealand and Indonesian Ministries of Education and more generally tertiary institutions and education providers. In 2011, around 600 full fee-paying Indonesian students attended New Zealand educational institutions.

Our education assistance to Indonesia contributes to Indonesia’s political, social, and economic development. A strong, democratic, and prosperous Indonesia is in New Zealand’s interest.

New Zealand has committed to increasing scholarships for Indonesian students from 15 to 50 annually in the coming years to increase the number of postgraduate scholarships available for Indonesians, including masters, PhD and non-degree postgraduate qualifications. In return, Indonesia will host New Zealand diplomats for training at the Foreign Ministry in Jakarta.

We are also seriously considering providing double degree programmes with Indonesian universities based on a model where a student could spend one or two years at a New Zealand university and receive a degree from both the New Zealand university and the Indonesian university.

India

We have an Education Cooperation Arrangement with India. This provides focused attention on collaboration in the exchange of research materials, publications, educational literature, teaching aids, organization of joint conferences, exhibitions, and seminars; organisation of joint research programmes and publications; arrangements between institutions of higher learning, and other areas of mutual education benefit.

Education in the New Zealand Aid programme

The New Zealand Aid Programme invests in education (and health) in order to promote human development and support sustainable development.

Education is fundamental to ensuring that people have the basic skills and ability to fully contribute to sustainable economic growth and leadership for their countries.

New Zealand is re-focusing its support for education on what really makes a difference in the classroom; effective teachers, strong leadership, and quality learning materials. Programmes focus on getting children into school, helping them stay there, and providing effective teaching and learning opportunities in a well-managed environment.

New Zealand’s support for education aims to:

- increase the number of children able to read, write and do basic maths,
- train effective teachers and principals,
• have all children in schools completing basic education, particularly girls,
• increase the number of people appropriately skilled to participate in the labour market.

New Zealand recognises higher education as a prerequisite to sustainable development. It is vital for delivering basic services, developing and maintaining infrastructure, achieving economic growth, attaining and maintaining international competitiveness, achieving and maintaining social cohesion, and delivering transparent and accountable governance.

New Zealand Aid Programme support for higher education includes funding for tertiary education services, technical and vocational training, and merit based scholarships.

New Zealand supports Official Development Assistance scholarships for study in New Zealand education institutions and most of these scholarships are awarded to recipients in South Asia, Southeast Asia, and the South Pacific.

New Zealand places a high priority on education and takes cooperation in education with other countries seriously.

Education is the key to political and economic stability and prosperity while reinforcing social justice issues.

ENDS.
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ECOMONY AND TRADE

Draft Resolution Sponsored by New Zealand

THE TWENTY-SECOND ANNUAL MEETING OF THE ASIA PACIFIC PARLIAMENTARY FORUM (APPF)

Noting the “Resolution on Economy and Trade” which was adopted in the 20th Annual Meeting of the Asia Pacific Parliamentary Forum in January 2012 and the “Vladivostok Declaration” adopted at the 20th APEC Economic Leaders’ Meeting in September 2012;

Affirming that the world economy as a whole is experiencing a weak recovery and that pressures on the financial system pose downside risks;

Reconfirming that our priority task is supporting sustainable and balanced economic growth both in the region and the world as a whole and ensuring the effectiveness of the international financial regulatory and supervisory system;

Confirming that, at a time of heightened tensions and significant downside risks for the global economy, protectionist measures in trade and investment create further downside risks for the world economy;

Welcoming each country’s commitment toward realising stability of growth, employment and financial markets in international meetings such as the G20 Summit and the APEC Economic Leaders’ Meeting;

RESOLVES TO:

1. Call upon countries to continue to implement effective fiscal and financial policies in order to respond to downside risks and ensure the stability of economies and employment;

2. Confirm that member countries should exchange views on the occasion of the annual meetings of the APPF aiming at policy co-ordination in the region, and continue to oversee policy in each country in order to correct imbalances in economies and monetary and financial markets and thus ensure their soundness;

3. Request APPF member countries to commit themselves to the fight against protectionism and to complete the Doha Round negotiations in order to facilitate economic growth through free trade and investment;
4. **Reaffirm** the commitment made in the Bogor Declaration which was adopted by the APEC Leaders in 1994, to achieving the long-term goal of free and open trade and investment in the Asia-Pacific region, recognise significant progress toward achieving the goal, and hope for the full achievement of the goal by all APEC economies by 2020;

5. **Call upon** member countries and concerned regions to continue to make efforts toward realization of a Free Trade Area of the Asia-Pacific (FTAAP), as a means not only to further promote regional economic integration in the Asia-Pacific region, but also to complement and strengthen the multilateral trading system centred on the WTO in a transparent and globally beneficial way; [reordered]

6. **Affirm** that the recent announcement by EAS leaders of the launch of negotiations towards a Regional Closer Economic Partnership current efforts is an important step in this direction along with other regional economic integration processes including the Trans-Pacific Partnership;

7. **Emphasise** that efforts toward the realisation of trade liberalisation and economic integration ought to be made taking into account the facilitation of such activities as improvement of trade rules related to intellectual property rights and investment, implementation of good practices of regulation, food security, environmental protection and stabilisation of society;

8. **Encourage** businesses to utilise bilateral and regional trade agreements and member countries to explain the benefits and opportunities they provide through domestic outreach programmes.
Appendix 10 – Joint Communiqué

THE 22nd ANNUAL MEETING
OF THE ASIA PACIFIC PARLIAMENTARY FORUM

JOINT COMMUNIQUE

1. At the invitation of the Mexican Senate of the Mexican Republic, the Twenty-Second Annual Meeting of the Asia Pacific Parliamentary Forum (APPF) was held on January 12 - 16 2014 in Puerto Vallarta, Mexico. 151 Delegates from 21 APPF Member Countries and 1 Observer Country, Brunei Darussalam attended the Annual Meeting. Also, attended the Representatives of the Parliaments of 3 invited countries (El Salvador, Honduras and Panama) and of the following invited organizations: PARLACEN, FOPREL and the University of Colima, México. The full list of participants is attached in Appendix 1.

2. The APPF Executive Committee convened on January 12th 2014 to approve the Agenda and Program of Work of the Annual Meeting. The report of the Executive Committee meeting is attached in Appendix 2.

3. On January 13th 2014 the President of APPF and President of the Mexican Senate, His Excellency Senator Raúl Cervantes Andrade, delivered a warm and deeply felt speech to all the participants. He declared the Annual Meeting open and highlighted that it is clear that our own destiny as well as major global issues weave ties that bond us together with a peaceful and respectful coexistence, as well as a strong cooperation that should make each one of us a reliable partner for the development and welfare of our nations.
5. A special message from His Excellency Mr. Yasuhiro Nakasone, Honorary President of the APPF, was delivered by Takuji Yanagimoto. And then, Honorable Mr. Iliyas Umakhanov addressed the delegates as leader of the delegation of the Russian Federation, the country of the preceding APPF Presidency.

6. On behalf of the President of the United Mexican States, Mr. Enrique Peña Nieto, the Secretary of Economy, Mr. Idefonso Guajardo Villarreal delivered some remarks to the delegates, in which he stressed the importance, the Asia Pacific region in boosting global economy.

7. At the opening plenary session the report of the Executive Committee was adopted and approved by the Annual Meeting.

8. At the First Plenary Session on Political and Security Matters, delegates discussed, among other issues, how to strengthen peace and stability in the Asia Pacific region, considering in this respect important issues like cooperation in combating terrorism, drug and human trafficking and organized crime. It was also considered some parliamentary initiatives for transparency and fight against corruption. Special attention was also paid to social and political movements in the Middle East and its possible impact on world and regional security.

9. At the Second Plenary Session on Economic and Trade Matters, delegates discussed about trade and economic cooperation in Asia Pacific as well as the importance of key measures to consolidate the global economic recovery. Parliament delegates also welcomed the APEC 2013 Report by Indonesia. From the parliamentary point of view they underlined the importance of considering parliamentary best practices in the process of enhancing new legal frameworks that promotes food and energy security. Knowledge economy and communication technology in the knowledge society were also considered.

10. At the Third Plenary Session on Regional Cooperation in Asia Pacific the participants discussed on important issues related to
regional cooperation for the implementation of the decisions made at the COP 19, considering main issues like disaster risk reduction and prevention and handling of natural disasters in Asia Pacific. The delegations also considered main aspects of a regional cooperation for poverty eradication, strengthening of social cohesion, migration flows and further participation of youth in development projects and women’s empowering. Also of great interest was the discussion on the parliamentary momentum for the compliance of the Millennium Development Goals and Cooperation to identify new Post-2015 Sustainable Development Goals in Asia Pacific Region. Cooperation in education, culture, science and technology received due consideration.

11. At the Fourth Plenary Session delegates discussed the future activities and work of the APPF to enhance Parliamentary Regional Cooperation in Asia Pacific, they also considered the implementation of the Resolution adopted at the 21th Session of APPF in Vladivostok, Russia and considered some aspects regarding the organization of the 23rd Annual Meeting of the APPF.

12. The 22nd Annual Meeting of the APPF adopted 22 resolutions based on the topics mentioned in the preceding paragraphs. The full list of resolutions adopted is attached in Appendix 3.

13. Delegates also accepted Ecuador’s kind proposal to host the 23rd Annual Meeting of the APPF in the city of Quito in January 2015.

14. At the conclusion of the Annual Meeting the Delegates thanked the Working Groups and the Drafting Committee for their efforts in developing the Joint Communiqué with related resolutions, which contributed to the successful outcome of the Meeting.

15. The Delegates expressed heartfelt gratitude and sincere appreciation to the Chairperson of the Mexican Senate, Senator Raúl Cervantes Andrade for his wise and effective presidency of the 22nd Annual Meeting of the APPF, to the people of Mexico, the citizens of Puerto Vallarta in particular for their hospitality, and to the Secretariat, the translators, and the staff for their hard work, efficiency and excellent arrangements.
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