

Witness Name: The Most Rev'd Philip Richardson
and The Most Rev'd Donald Steven Tamihere

Statement No.: [WITN0265168 & WITN0266006]

Exhibits: [WITN0265169-WITN0265174]; [WITN0266007-WITN0266012]

Dated: 5 October 2022

ROYAL COMMISSION OF INQUIRY INTO ABUSE IN CARE

WITNESS STATEMENT OF THE MOST REVEREND PHILIP RICHARDSON (ARCHBISHOP OF TIKANGA PAKEHA OF THE ANGLICAN CHURCH) AND THE MOST REVEREND DONALD STEVEN TAMIHERE (ARCHBISHOP OF TIKANGA MĀORI OF THE ANGLICAN CHURCH)

We, **The Most Reverend Philip Richardson**, of New Plymouth, Archbishop of New Zealand, and **The Most Reverend Donald Steven Tamihere**, of Gisborne, Archbishop of Aotearoa say in response to the Royal Commission of Inquiry's questions contained in Notice to Produce No. 519 of 6 September 2022 as follows:

INTRODUCTION

- 1 This statement comes from the two Archbishops of Tikanga Māori and Tikanga Pākehā who, together with Tikanga Pasifika, jointly form the Primacy of the Anglican Church in Aotearoa, New Zealand and Polynesia, *Te Hāhi Mihinare ki Aotearoa ki Niu Tireni ki Ngā Moutere o te Moana Nui a Kiwa*. We acknowledge the passing of the Archbishop of Tikanga Pasifika, Archbishop Fereimi Cama, and note that this position has remained vacant since his passing in July 2021. Therefore, the leadership of this Church is currently shared by us as Archbishops of Tikanga Māori and Tikanga Pākehā, and the statements that follow are expressed by us together.
- 2 We acknowledge and refer to the witness statements previously provided on behalf of the Church by Archbishop Philip Richardson, Archbishop Don

Tamihere and together, as the Primates of the Anglican Church of Aotearoa, New Zealand and Polynesia.

LOOKING BACK

From 1950 until present, please explain:

With the benefit of hindsight, what are the biggest mistakes the Church has made that enabled abuse against children, young people and vulnerable adults in the care of the faith to occur? Why were these mistakes not identified and addressed sooner?

- 3 Any form of abuse suffered by survivors within Anglican institutions was, and is, abhorrent and inexcusable. The Anglican Church is deeply apologetic to all survivors who have suffered through the failures and deliberate actions of those who were meant to care and protect for them.
- 4 The experiences of survivors must also be framed by the broader societal context. Survivors have provided testimonies to the Royal Commission describing a time where corporal punishment was legal, bullying within schools was normalised, and Māori and Pasifika culture was suppressed.
- 5 We acknowledge that the Anglican Church may have perpetuated these attitudes through our institutions, but the Church has not acted in isolation. Many failures of the Anglican Church during this period are too failures of the State.
- 6 In saying that the role of the Church is to speak, and act, the gospel. By accepting and perpetuating the usual societal attitudes the Church failed in that core task.
- 7 Abuse is intolerable in any shape and form. We are particularly ashamed by the evidence before the Royal Commission that members of our Church covered up instances of abuse. We reiterate the sentiment in our past statement: to have ignored or covered up abuse is deplorable. There has been a failure by the Church to protect those in its care and hold offenders to account. For that, we are deeply ashamed.

- 8 On reflection, the Anglican Church failed to protect its people by following the 'Pākehā secular line'. Our focus should have been on adhering to the Gospel, as abusive behaviour is antithetical to the values and beliefs that the Anglican Church endeavours to uphold.
- 9 Our experiences with the Royal Commission have also taught us a sharp lesson: that we were too trusting of individuals. It was this trust and presumption that everyone within the Church is good at heart that contributed to the failure to address our mistakes sooner. We failed to identify the entire sphere of power and influence that our leaders have as well as the inherent danger in such a power.
- 10 It was a mistake to leave the responsibility of risk management up to individual leaders, without any institutional monitoring.
- 11 It was also a mistake to leave allegations and complaints to be handled by those who knew the alleged offenders well. Poor handling of complaints in some cases allowed abuse to continue. The lack of independence in our processes was a significant mistake.
- 12 Perpetrators were protected by the sanctity of their role within Anglican institutions. A Bishop must have confidence that vulnerable people receiving care are safe. However, the evidence has shown there was an unwillingness to accept that a fellow clergy member could be an abuser as the relationships of trust and confidence were so entrenched.
- 13 It is with regret that we acknowledge that the Church has failed to listen to our own voices. What has stood out in this respect is the predominant source of these voices: women in our Church.
- 14 We see two matters arising from this: first the power of patriarchy within the Church and secondly a failure to connect the issues being raised throughout New Zealand with solutions. The siloing of information within the Episcopal units was a contributing factor to the latter issue. We have seen evidence that offending was reported on, and remedies were identified, but there were significant gaps and delays with the implementation of remedies.

- 15 We now understand that implementation was hindered by episcopal separation between streams and the Dioceses. Bishops had significant autonomy within their Diocese, and there were very few mechanisms for cross-Diocese collaboration. If a report was not published provincially, it was at risk, and sometimes did, get lost within each diocese.
- 16 This lack of co-ordination and action was amplified by a lack of reporting on the more serious levels of abuse like what occurred within Dilworth School, and some of the homes run by the Anglican Trust for Women and Children which if addressed at the time may have prevented later instances of abuse within our Church. Abuse occurred which was systematic and involved significant complicity and cover-up by key staff members of some institutions. Better controls should have been in place to protect children and vulnerable people.

With the benefit of hindsight, what are the biggest mistakes the Church has made in relation to responding to reports of abuse? Why were these mistakes not identified and addressed sooner?

- 17 As we have mentioned in our previous statements, prior to the changes to Title D processes in 2020, the complaints process was very decentralised. Responses to reports of abuse historically lacked objectivity and distance. Leaving it up to each Diocese and Bishop to handle its own complaints has led to a lack of consistency and transparency across the Church in this space.
- 18 The lack of overarching Church policy or procedure to guide the handling of complaints of abuse is a mistake that we have previously identified. Regretfully, the focus of the Church has been on issues of discipline rather than on survivors. The decentralised nature of our structure has also been a contributing factor to why survivors have had such differing experiences within Anglican institutions.
- 19 The way that the Church handled Peter Taylor's offending is an example of the failures of the Church when responding to reports of abuse. Despite knowing of the abuse he committed at Dilworth he was not subject to a disciplinary process nor reported to Police. Indeed he was later given other positions. No

attempt was made, either, to investigate if he had offended in the positions he held before Dilworth.

- 20 Similarly, the way that the Church dealt with Ms C's report of abuse was wrong. Complaints regarding the Vicar were handled by the Bishops of Wellington and Waikato, with a mediation process ultimately adopted. At the very least, the complaints about the Vicar should have resulted in a Title D process.
- 21 As we have reflected in previous statements, the way that the Anglican Church handled both of these situations is unacceptable. It demonstrates the lack of independence and objectivity when complaints were responded to. Bishops retained a critical role at all times, even when they may have been conflicted.
- 22 An unfortunate consequence of the sacrosanct belief that office holders within the Church could be trusted unconditionally is that survivors who came forward (often women or children) were often deemed to be untrustworthy or deceitful. The Anglican Church asks people to trust it and its clergy, yet we failed to justify that trust. We failed to prioritise belief of the survivor at the first instance.
- 23 Part of the challenge for us here is around patriarchy. It is troubling that conversations within the House of Bishops were driven, and to some extent are still driven, by male perspectives, despite over half of the Anglican Church membership identifying as female and the fact that women have been ordained since 1978. The evidence from women in Church leadership positions at the Royal Commission underscores that concern and challenge.
- 24 Since the ordination of women (over 40 years ago) we have seen practical evidence of the balance of perspective that female leaders bring across the whole range of discourse and action with the Church. However, we have not yet addressed the mechanisms by which we elect people to Episcopal leadership. The lack of diversity within Bishops and senior leadership within the Church must be addressed.
- 25 One illustration of the patriarchal systems of the Church is one result of a survey of members of the College of St John's that was conducted in 2021 and is published in the Independent Review of the Culture of St John's Theological

College.¹ When members were asked to respond to “I feel safe to be vulnerable at the college” there was a stark gender disparity. While 47 per cent of women surveyed felt safe to be vulnerable at the College, 53 per cent of women do not feel safe. This is compared to 77 per cent for their male peers. This highlights the extent of work that Anglican institutions have to do with addressing patriarchal ideologies in the Church.

- 26 We also acknowledge that until the changes to Title D processes in 2000 there was little recognition of the relevance of different cultural approaches. Anglican institutions now give special recognition to role of tikanga in our Church and this must be prioritised going forward.

LOOKING FORWARD – PREVENTION/RESPONSE/MONITORING AND OVERSIGHT

What are the most important changes that need to be made by the Church to protect children, young persons and vulnerable adults in the care of the faith from abuse?

- a) How would you design and implement these changes?***
- b) What changes are needed to ensure there is adequate monitoring and oversight to ensure relevant safeguarding policies and practices are delivering the intended outcomes?***
- c) What are the timeframes for such changes?***

Response

- 27 The starting point for change is that safeguarding must be viewed as an absolute priority for the Church and its entities. We need to establish a best practice approach and have already began implementing certain changes to respond to reports of abuse, including the creation of the Ministry Standards Commission.

¹ Dean KC, Miriam and Martin, Doug in *Arotakenga Motuhake Nō Te Ahurea O Te Kāreti O Hoani Tapu Mō Ngā Take O Te Whakapono Karaitiana – Independent Review of the Culture of St John’s Theological College* (9 August 2021).

- 28 The role of the Ministry Standards Commission, through its Registrar, is to review complaints about people in licensed Anglican ministry who may be subject to a Title D disciplinary process.
- 29 The formal complaints process involves the Registrar assessing complaints and deciding whether a complaint is classed as unsatisfactory conduct, misconduct or dismissed. The Commission also has the power to make recommendations or determinations should there be a finding of misconduct. Although it is called a 'recommendation', Bishops are required to implement the recommendation. This could lead to admonition, suspension, deprivation of office or deposition.
- 30 The Ministry Standards Commission also has a role in providing guidance to Bishops and the Church on issues of ministry standards more broadly.
- 31 We are still in the process of fine-tuning this mechanism, but it is a significant change to how we hold our office holders accountable. However, it does not provide redress to a survivor and except when the Ministry Standards Commission provides forward looking guidance the process are entirely reactive in responding to complaints.

Monitoring

- 32 Adequate monitoring requires an all-of-Church response. We are looking to create a database of information about our leaders, with the outcome being the creation of a centralised entity for information management. This will hopefully place a greater scrutiny on training, selection, monitoring and capability.
- 33 Updating our monitoring systems requires a critically urgent response and the Anglican Church is committed to that. However, because the Church has a diffusion of power in our structure, we will need time to foster relationships and consult our Dioceses to ensure that we are building a co-ordinated mechanism.
- 34 We plan to begin work immediately, but it may be a couple of years away before we start seeing outcomes.

Discernment

- 35 We have previously acknowledged that the Anglican Church needs to be more careful in discerning (deciding) who is to be ordained and more carefully consider the threshold for Deposition from Holy Orders.
- 36 There has been a considerable development in the sophistication in the discernment processes. The bar has been raised, but there remain inconsistencies between Dioceses, both in terms of how high the bar is and in how the bar is defined. The issue of fragmentation by Episcopal units in this regard is something that must be addressed.
- 37 We recognise that the culture of the clergy needs to be changed. The Church is proposing to make it significantly more difficult to become clergy. For example, we are looking at Australia where federal-level child-safe requirements have been implemented. Clergy must meet regular compliance targets and failing to do so, means that a candidate will not be verified. We would like to introduce these kinds of measures into the culture of the Anglican Church in New Zealand.
- 38 Another significant challenge in Church leadership is apathy. Going forward, we need our leadership across the board to be alive to the real and present risk of abuse. It is not just a historic issue. It would be dangerous for Church leaders to believe that everyone is safe and good now. Many of our current leaders have only experienced the accounts of survivors at a 'second hand' level, particularly those within Dioceses that have recorded low numbers of instances of abuse.
- 39 Although we may not have had a systemic culture of abuse within the Church, the fact that we had any perpetrators of abuse is an issue. This requires a systemic and structural response, and the Church seeks to be a part of creating a "united wall" against abuse.
- 40 While the Church has previously been silent in these discussions, the fact that we are now having a Church-wide response is massive.

Care organisations and schools

- 41 Our Anglican care organisations are currently operating at very high standards. The standard of care and transparency in terms of monitoring staff and behaviour is promising. We understand that Anglican schools are operating under similar transparent frameworks. From our experience, any instances of bullying, for example, are now identified and addressed promptly.
- 42 We are aware that some schools have identified a need to ensure consistency across all Anglican schools, regardless of how well-resourced they are. If a school identifies a vulnerability and ask for resources from funders, we need to ensure that this need is prioritised. The interests of the child must be at the heart of this decision-making. We cannot risk further institutional deafness where people are not alive to risks involved.

Constitutional change

- 43 Our experience with the Royal Commission has been one of immense learning. We are striving for an institutional commitment to embed our knowledge into the DNA of the Anglican Church. Cultural reformation is an ongoing process, and we are confident that the Church will get there in time. Change comes in ebbs and flows but of course, there is a risk that in society's view we are taking too long to change.
- 44 As the Archbishops of the Anglican Church of Aotearoa and New Zealand, our toolset is one of influence and advocacy. We cannot just push a button and effect instant change. We recognise that we have significant work to do with educating, cajoling and persuading Anglican institutions to make these proposed changes. We are confident we will succeed, but when our main lever is influence, change can take some time.
- 45 Our biggest concern regarding the above is how to achieve consistency. We recognise that what is appropriate within a New Zealand Diocese may not be appropriate in, for example, Tonga. We cannot have a "siloes" approach, but it must be acknowledged that there also cannot be a one-size-fits-all approach.

What are the most important changes that need to be made to the way the Church responds to reports of abuse?

a) How would you design and implement these changes?

b) What changes are needed to ensure there is adequate monitoring and oversight of responses to reports of abuse?

c) What is the timeframe for such changes?

46 The Anglican Church recognises that it did not do, and has not done, enough to respond to reports of abuse. As discussed above, one of the important changes to our responses to abuse is the creation of the Ministry Standards Commission. We now have an independent body for people to bring their complaints to and a clear process for Title D complaints, to hold license holders accountable.

47 The changes to Title D have taken the responsibility away from the Bishop and into the hands of independent professionals.

48 However, despite these constructive revisions to Title D, we have also recognised that we are still not meeting some critical needs. For example, if a person makes a disclosure of abuse, there is not an immediate framework of support that can currently be offered by the Church to sustain them. Similarly, there is currently no support offered for the respondent. The Commission will look to create a list of suitable support people who can provide support to both parties. We expect these sorts of shortcomings to be able to be addressed in a relatively short timeframe.

49 The Church is regularly being informed by survivor response and survivor networks, particularly throughout the development and utilisation of redress processes. We are focusing on learning, adapting and evolving through implementation.

50 Going forward, the Church needs to move proactively with creating a holistic redress response. Our approaches have traditionally been monocultural which has reflected who has made disclosures.

- 51 A challenge for us is compiling dialogue from survivors and feedback received thus far and incorporating it into any proposed holistic redress programme. The Anglican Church strives to have a redress programme which reflects who we are as a society and empowers our Church, and especially Tikanga Māori. Our engagement with survivors needs to have a depth of humanity and faith, so that we can endeavour to have an almost universal positive response from survivors. Positive experiences with survivors give us empirical evidence that our more recent approach to redress is working.
- 52 We reiterate the sentiments in our past statements about an overarching redress programme that is consistent, uncomplicated, and swift. Above all, it must be survivor focused. Any redress system should also seek to reflect Anglican values (such as the Gospel and mātauranga Māori) to create an epistemological framework to serve interconnectedness.
- 53 We believe the current Western epistemological approach is not working. For healing and restoration to take place, we want to return to principles of our whakapono and faith with full integrity. We acknowledge that it will take time to unwind entrenched concepts like eurocentric and patriarchal ideology, which are both products of colonisation.
- 54 Any mechanism must allow for nuance, as a one-size-fits-all response is not appropriate. We need a mechanism to ascertain the veracity of the conversation, to provide transparency and fairness, and to allow the Church to respond objectively. A redress process will need to independently sift through the circumstances and find an objective outcome for survivors.
- 55 It will also be important for the Anglican Church to promote a culture in our leadership where people can flourish and feel valued. This will lead to a cohort of leaders who are much more attentive to dissonance when things are not right, and they will be able to see bullying and abuse. We need to build a leadership team who are equipped to notice these things and we hope to grow this through professional development. The more society as a whole is attuned to that, the better. We believe intentional education is a huge part of breaking down these barriers.

***What barriers to disclosure continue to stop survivors from reporting abuse?
How do you intend to reduce or eliminate these barriers?***

- 56 We understand some of the current barriers to disclosure as:
- (i) Survivors may still have fears that their claim will not be taken seriously by an Anglican institution. For example, there are notable differences in the availability of documentary records, financial and human resources, policies and processes, and the use and approach of external advisors (i.e. lawyers).
 - (ii) Survivors were never historically encouraged to come forward and share their experiences of abuse and this attitude may have persisted into present day. Some survivors may feel the need to remain silent or 'tough it out' for fear of being seen as weak. Some do not wish to take steps which they believe may reduce the mana of the Church.
 - (iii) Accessibility concerns. The Ministry Standards complaint process predominantly operates online which may be a barrier to elderly or some disabled complainants. We need to ensure there are offline avenues for survivors to come forward, and that these are adequately promoted and advertised.
 - (iv) There continues to be a sense of shame, embarrassment or stigma when it comes to sharing experiences of abuse.
- 57 It is our hope that our work to improve the culture within Anglican institutions will enable survivors to come forward to share their experiences of abuse. But at the same time, some barriers are informed by larger cultural issues. We understand from the evidence that low numbers of Māori and Pasifika survivors have shared their stories. We cannot comment on whether this is a cultural misunderstanding or perhaps because not all survivors are interested in making a complaint or seeking personal redress, but rather they are focused on ensuring that this type of abuse does not happen again.
- 58 For the survivors that do want their experiences to be addressed, we strive to be open and approachable. Survivors should know that the door is always open

and justice is always available for those who feel comfortable to share their stories.

RECORD KEEPING

What issues, if any, have you identified with the Church's record keeping policies and practice relating to reports of abuse? How do you intend to improve current record keeping policies and practice?

- 59 The evidence (or lack thereof) has shown that Anglican institutions in general suffer from a lack of documentary records, gaps in knowledge from the many changes in staff at institutions at the time, and a general mishandling of complaints.
- 60 The Anglican Church has not previously had overarching, comprehensive policies or institutional practices of recording complaints of abuse. Traditionally, record-keeping was left to the Bishops to manage, which led to significant inconsistencies between the Dioceses.
- 61 There is a need to ensure there are consistent document retention policies across all of our Dioceses and organisations.

There has been poor recording of ethnicity of survivors reporting abuse by faiths (and the State). What changes are you planning to make in relation to recording survivors' ethnicity?

- 62 The Anglican Church has never had an obligation to record ethnicity data about our members in the past. We have present concerns about using ethnicity as a measurement, because the three Tikanga are not an ethnic arrangements, they are spiritual and cultural arrangements.
- 63 The streams of the Anglican Church are cultural streams, rather than being ethnically defined. For Tikanga Māori especially, our congregation is not homogenous and has always been iwi-driven. Tikanga Pasifika similarly incorporates a wide range of Pacific nations and does not look to account for

its community ethnically. A more appropriate marker may be to look at which cultural stream a person identifies with.

- 64 We would need to require more guidance from the Crown before implementing a recording system for ethnicity.

Does the Church collect data about its members who have a disability or mental health condition? If not, what changes are you planning to make in relation to collection and/or recording of such data?

- 65 We understand that the Church has never collected information on the mental health condition or disabilities of our members. We do not view this as a relevant dataset, unless of course we are talking about accessibility to our Church, in which case we would rely on demographics generally to inform our decisions, as opposed to personalised accounts. The latter may risk being discriminatory.

- 66 There are privacy and confidentiality concerns that must be complied with, as well as our obligations under the Privacy Act 2020. Our discernment processes currently require psychiatric screening, but there are many cultural differences to consider with viewing and treating mental health conditions.

- 67 Holding records of deeply personal health matters is antithetical to the Church ideas of family and community. At the risk of sounding evasive, it may change the character of the Church if we want to collect and store personal information about our congregation.

GOVERNANCE / RANGATIRATANGA

What do you consider is the role and responsibility of faith-based governance and management bodies in ensuring that Māori can exercise their rights as guaranteed by Te Tiriti o Waitangi in Aotearoa New Zealand? Does the answer change if faith-based governance and management bodies are exercising powers that the Crown has delegated to them or are funded by the Crown to deliver?

- 68 Te Tiriti o Waitangi guarantees Māori the right to exercise tino rangatiratanga over all their taonga. This includes but is not limited to our tikanga, our whakapono, our wairuatanga, and our mātauranga, in their ancient, modern, and developing forms, and all in their fullest sense. These particular taonga have yet to be addressed by the Waitangi Tribunal or the Courts to the extent that other taonga have – such as whenua, Te Reo Māori me ōna tikanga, etc – but they are taonga nonetheless, and deserve to be afforded the same value and mana motuhake.
- 69 Māori, including survivors, have the right to access and exercise taonga such as whakapono and wairuatanga. We see, therefore, that faith-based governance and management bodies have a particular role and responsibility to ensure that the right to taonga such as whakapono and wairuatanga is nurtured, protected, and maintained. We don't see that Crown delegations or funding would change that fundamental underlying role or responsibility. We would hope that Crown involvement would support and enhance those things.

To what extent can tino rangatiratanga be exercised by Māori in the Church's governance structure? What needs to change to ensure that Māori can fully exercise their rights as guaranteed by Te Tiriti in the governance and management of faith-based institutions that care for children and vulnerable adults? How should such change be led and implemented?

- 70 Modern understandings of tino rangatiratanga have for the most part been defined within a political paradigm, within the parameters of Te Tiriti grievances and settlements, and framed against the background of colonisation and Māori efforts to survive as a people and a culture. Within Te Hāhi Mihinare, conversations around tino rangatiratanga have included other understandings and potentials. The Ngata Dictionary defines tino rangatiratanga as self-determination. This aligns well with an understanding long held by Te Hāhi Mihinare, informed in part by missional strategy of the Church Missionary Society (CMS) for the development of indigenous churches. This strategy held to the three-fold principles of self-governance (self-determination), self-support (economic independence), and self-propagation (indigenous priorities and leadership), and helped among other things provide the frame for the

development of Te Tiriti o Waitangi through the involvement of CMS missionaries like The Rev'd Henry Williams. Tino rangatiratanga has also been explored and understood against the frame of Te Paipera Tapu, including understandings of Te Rangatiratanga o Te Rangi and rangatiratanga as servanthood. This has been the wananga of our whakapono for the last two centuries, and while as with all Māori societal development it has been directly undermined and oppressed by the forces of colonisation, the foundations for this wananga continuing and our agency as Māori within it still remains. So we feel that Māori can and have been able to exercise their own tino rangatiranga, despite the challenges. A lot of the extant issues that Māori have faced in the past can be attributed to colonial 'dominance', and our failures as a church in this area have been largely a product of inequity and a failure to live up to our own values. As Māori, we feel much more confident in the exercise of our own mātauranga, and the wider church is now attempting to grapple and engage with that and all of the positive implications that our mātauranga holds. Our General Synod is putting aside significant time and resources to engage in wananga around mātauranga Māori and mātauranga Mihinare as a pathway forward for a shared future.

- 71 We see mātauranga as a resource that Māori, Pākehā, and all who live in Aotearoa New Zealand, can share and use to enable each other to flourish. The report of Te Rōpū Whakamana i Te Tiriti o Waitangi entitled "Ko Aotearoa Tēnei" (WAI262) is a road map for the post-settlement future of Te Tiriti and helps to show the fundamental contribution that mātauranga could provide across all aspects of Aotearoa New Zealand society. The same is outlined in a more specific context (that of common law in Aotearoa New Zealand) in *Lex Aotearoa*, authored by Justice Sir Joseph Williams, showing mātauranga as being foundational now to our legal system. Our own Constitution, which structures our church according to three cultural streams, each with their own tino rangatiratanga, is also a prototype and prefiguring of where we believe mātauranga could take us when paired with our whakapono. This sharing – or blending and merging – of mātauranga forms part of what we believe is fundamental for the healing and flourishing of survivors as well. A redress system that takes mātauranga seriously, and incorporates all the taonga that a

person is entitled to, including whakapono and wairuatanga, is necessary if that redress is to be holistic and effective. Survivors have told us that they don't want to merely survive. They want to be healed, and to know what it is to live and flourish.

Redress developments since March 2021

- 72 Since the Royal Commission hearings in March 2021 the Church's work on redress has had three distinct aspects.
- 73 Firstly we have taken steps either personally or through Bishops around New Zealand to engage with and provide redress to survivors who gave evidence to this Commission concerning abuse in the Anglican Church. This also included engaging in a redress process with a survivor of spiritual abuse who approached counsel at the March 2021 hearings. We have regularly utilised the services of Mark Wells who has met with survivors and made recommendations regarding redress.
- 74 Archbishop Philip has personally met with Ms C (survivor of sexual abuse by a Vicar), Robert Oakly (survivor of sexual abuse of Archdeacon Jameson) and the survivor of spiritual abuse [WITN0265169 | WITN0266007]. The Church has engaged in the following redress processes and settlements:
- Robert Oakly – settlement agreed followed by personal meeting with Archbishop Philip at Mr Oakly's home [WITN0265170 | WITN0266008].
 - Ms C – personal meeting with Archbishop Philip and offer of settlement made [WITN0265171 | WITN0266009].
 - Ms M (WITN0056001) and the estate of her sister – settlement reached [WITN0265172 | WITN0266010].
 - GRO-B-2 GRO-B – apology and settlement reached [WITN0265173 | WITN0266011].
 - GRO-B-3 GRO-B – meeting with and personal apology from Bishop

- GRO-B-4 – agreed settlement and signed apology from Bishop Justin. Apology published in Diocesan Publication. Further voluntary payment of \$6,500 was given in addition to settlement sums [**WITN0265174 | WITN0266012**].

75 Secondly the Archbishops have endeavoured to support survivors deal with other institutions within the Church. Archbishop Philip has also provided support to a survivor brought to his attention through the Network for Survivors of Abuse in faith-based institutions and a small Anglican school to assist them in engaging Mark Wells to facilitate a redress process to address abuse suffered by the survivor as a child at that school. He has also acted as a support and advocate for a survivor of abuse as a child, Roger Allison, whose case does not fall neatly within the category of abuse in state or faith-based care. The injustices of his case show the need for a universal consistent approach to children and vulnerable people who suffer abuse wherever in society it occurs.

76 Finally work has occurred on the identification and development of an appropriate holistic and universal redress scheme for use within the Anglican Church. In July 2021 the Church invited Kooyoora Ltd to present to representatives from the Church, schools and care organisations about their work and processes for two Anglican Dioceses in Victoria and schools and care organisations. That led to more focused discussions on the most appropriate approach in New Zealand taking into account our special cultural setting. Ms Hera Clarke was then engaged to work on the development of a holistic approach for the Anglican Church.

The Ministry Standards Commission

77 An independent website is now up and running for the Ministry Standards Commission:

<https://ministrystandards.org/ministry-standards-commission>

78 When the Ministry Standards Tribunal finds that a case amounts to misconduct, the Ministry Standards Commission will publish its decision on the website (with some exceptions to protect a person involved in the case or connected to the people in the case from extreme hardship). The findings dated May 2022 and

decision dated June 2022 of the Tribunal regarding Ross Browne appear on the website.

79 As of August 2021 the Registrar was handling six complaints which fall within the scope of the Royal Commission. One of those related to Ross Browne.

Statement of Truth

This statement is true to the best of my knowledge and belief and was made by me knowing that it may be used as evidence by the Royal Commission of Inquiry into Abuse in Care.

Signed

The Most Rev'd Philip Richardson

Dated: 5 October 2022

GRO-C

Signed

The Most Rev'd Donald Steven Tamihere

Dated: 5 October 2022

GRO-C