Comments from Suzanne Pitama, University of Otago Christchurch on the Maori Ethics Report, received 12 November 2013

Overall I found the document interesting and reflective.

I would also like to raise the following points for discussion amongst the authors:

1. It would be good if the key purpose of the document was made clear in the first section. It talks about the review but I found myself trying to be clear about the actual agenda of the paper. It wasn't til half way through that I realised the PRM is only in a 'thinking about' phase.
2. I think the sections at the end (other considerations) need to go into the background to clearly articulate the context in which Maori are placed in Aotearoa, I think this would lead to a paper that allows the reader to rest assured the whole context (not just the MSD agenda) has been thought through.
3. I like the use of Te Ara Tika, I thought it was an interesting way to use this document/framework. I think that placing Te Ara Tika as a review tool is great for this purpose. Would the document have been strengthened by just introducing it, then using it in relation to the PRM – as it stands it seems a little repetitive to state what it is and it's questions, then break it down again with it's questions in relation to the kaupapa of the paper.
4. Would the document be enhanced by a table under each Te Ara Tika component highlighting what should be done, how it might enable addressing Maori disparities and then limitations/deficits of the PRM and/or what would need to be included to ensure it's safe. But perhaps this is beyond the scope of the purpose of the document? I just felt that it was saying well you are going to use the PRM think about these things – where I think the risks raised, really seemed to highlight the risk the PRM will be to the Maori community, without necessarily reducing risk of children who are at greatest risk of maltreatment. How might the tool encompass the impacts of colonisation? What might services do/or be designed to do to address colonisation? Or poverty? I think these issues are raised but perhaps lose their place of importance because the purpose of the document needs to be made clearer. I also think that it would be good to flag these 'risks' raised in the report as clear issues for the next consultation phase, and how they might impact the pilot.