

EDITORIAL

Māori Data Sovereignty: A Decade of Research, Practice and Policy

Lara M. Greaves (Ngāpuhi, Pākehā, Taranā)^{1,2}  | Logan Hamley (Ngāti Rangi, Whanganui)³  | Nicole Edwards (Kāi Tahu, Ngāti Kahungunu)⁴ 

¹School of History, Philosophy, Political Science & International Relations, Victoria University of Wellington, Wellington, New Zealand | ²Department of Statistics, University of Auckland, Auckland, New Zealand | ³Whakauae Research Services Limited, Whanganui, New Zealand | ⁴School of Biological Sciences, University of Auckland, Auckland, New Zealand

Correspondence: Lara M. Greaves (lara.greaves@vuw.ac.nz)

Received: 7 April 2026 | **Revised:** 22 July 2026 | **Accepted:** 24 July 2026

Keywords: data | indigenous data sovereignty | Māori data sovereignty | policy | research

ABSTRACT

The Māori Data Sovereignty (MDSov) movement advocates for Māori rights and interests in data and works to ensure that Māori data supports Māori aspirations. The language of MDSov has now been used for a decade, as conceptualised in Aotearoa by Te Mana Raraunga, the Māori data sovereignty network and globally through the Global Indigenous Data Alliance. To mark this decade, this special issue takes stock of developments within MDSov and how researchers have implemented these principles in diverse disciplines and science. In this review, we take stock of the movement, reflecting on its constitutional and historical underpinnings, and how Te Mana Raraunga came to exist. We then describe the major themes of the special issue: that the concept of MDSov is now well established and is increasingly being applied in frameworks across new issues and subject areas to benefit equity; that hapū and iwi are implementing these frameworks in useful ways and that technical solutions are an exciting space for further innovation. Finally, we look ahead to the next decade and the challenges (and opportunities) of extending the movement across groups and where it might become appropriation; to artificial intelligence and to evolution in the data ecosystem, such as changes to the census. Taken together, this review shows that MDSov is widely used, with a wide range of researchers implementing its principles, and that it provides methods and ideas to move data and research in Aotearoa New Zealand forward into the future.

1 | Introduction

Māori Data Sovereignty (MDSov) aims to ensure that Māori rights and interests in data are not only protected, but also that data is collected and governed to support Māori sovereignty and the realisation of our collective aspirations (Royal Society Te Apārangi 2023). Although the foundations, values and practice of MDSov have a long history, the language of MDSov has been in use for more than a decade. MDSov has supported an array of research, policy and practice transformations across public and private sectors in Aotearoa. To mark this decade and the formation of Te Mana Raraunga (TMR; the MDSov network) in 2015, we brought together this special issue to take stock of its history, including the last decade, and developments in

MDSov in science, policy, hapori Māori,¹ universities, enterprise and all data contexts.

This editorial review first describes the historical, legal and constitutional underpinnings of the movement. Although TMR formed in 2015, it continued a long legacy of Māori data practices and leadership. We describe some of this whakapapa (genealogy) and the legal and constitutional underpinnings of MDSov to set the scene. Next, we describe how TMR was created, alongside key research, policy and practice impacts, the relationship with Te Kāhui Raraunga (TKR) and how work in Aotearoa connects with the global Indigenous data sovereignty (IDSov) movement and the Global Indigenous Data Alliance (GIDA). We then summarise some of the thematic contributions of the special issue,

including: how the field has developed and become embedded in data practices, albeit unevenly; how MDSov challenges the status quo for many disciplinary paradigms, including the balance between individual and collective data rights; implementation case studies within research, hapū and Iwi research centre contexts and where technical and relational solutions can uphold MDSov. We end with a discussion of the crucial issues for the next decade, alongside the need to operationalise MDSov to meet a number of challenges and opportunities.

2 | Historical, Legal and Constitutional Underpinnings

MDSov can be defined as the inherent rights and interests that Māori have in relation to the collection, ownership and application of Māori data (Te Mana Raraunga 2018). The MDSov movement is grounded in national and international instruments that have varying amounts of constitutional force to support the implementation of MDSov in Aotearoa. He Whakaputanga o te Rangatiratanga o Nu Tirenī (the Declaration of Independence of the United Tribes of New Zealand, henceforth 'He Whakaputanga') signed in 1835 and Te Tiriti o Waitangi (the Treaty of Waitangi, henceforth 'Te Tiriti') signed in 1840 each assert Māori sovereignty and determine a partnership between Māori and the Crown (Mutu 2020). These are complemented by the Mātaatua Declaration on Cultural and Intellectual Property Rights of Indigenous Peoples (1993) and the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (UNDRIP) (2007), which both state that Indigenous peoples must have control over their knowledge systems, data and resources. Together, these instruments provide the legal and ethical rationale for MDSov and have shaped its development within Aotearoa.

Sovereignty was first recognised in official constitutional documents through He Whakaputanga, first signed in 1835 by northern rangatira. He Whakaputanga was the first international agreement recognising the mana (sovereignty) of hapū in Aotearoa. It asserted that hapū had sovereignty over their land and affairs and was formally recognised by the British Crown (Mutu 2020). Extending this formal agreement, Te Tiriti o Waitangi, first signed on 6 February 1840, further asserted hapū sovereignty. Te Tiriti is widely recognised as Aotearoa's foundational constitutional document, and establishes and guides Māori and Crown relations, often formally enacted through treaty principles (Mutu 2020). MDSov experts focus primarily on the interpretation of the three Articles of Te Tiriti, but particularly Article 2, as the foundation for MDSov and Māori Data Governance (West 2022). Specifically, Article 2 states that rangatira, hapū and Māori will maintain tino rangatiratanga of lands, villages and all taonga (treasures). While taonga is a broad category, the Waitangi Tribunal has defined taonga as including both tangible and intangible items, leaving space for data in its varied forms to be considered taonga (Hudson et al. 2017; Adams et al. 2026; Waitangi Tribunal 2014). Further arguments have supported the logic of data as taonga, since data are significant, important and valued by Iwi, hapū, whānau and hāpori Māori, particularly in the age of technology (Hudson et al. 2017).

Building on the argument for Māori rights over taonga, the WAI 262 claim (Waitangi Tribunal 2011), lodged in 1991 on behalf of six kaumātua, asserted tino rangatiratanga over the natural and cultural resources in Aotearoa (Houghton 2021). The claim explicitly draws on the framework of intellectual and cultural property to claim that the New Zealand government had consistently failed to uphold its treaty responsibilities and obligations for Māori, particularly when deferring to international intellectual property rights agreements (Geismar 2013). Specific concerns such as the commodification of kūmara and other Indigenous flora, such as harakeke, motivated the claimants to ensure that these taonga and the mātauranga associated with them, were appropriately protected (Adams et al. 2026). This claim has been central to reasserting Māori relationships to data, particularly as they relate to biological resources (Hudson et al. 2017).

The First International Conference on the Cultural and Intellectual Property Rights of Indigenous Peoples, convened by the nine Iwi of Mātaatua in 1993 (Adams et al. 2026), also placed Indigenous Cultural and Intellectual Property Rights on the agenda for nation-states. The Mātaatua Declaration, as an assertion of Indigenous Cultural and Intellectual Property Rights, sought to enshrine Indigenous control over Indigenous knowledge and data, prevent exploitation by governments, researchers and corporations and provide ethical guidelines for how to collaborate effectively with Indigenous peoples (Mead 2005). Specifically, the Declaration states that *Indigenous Peoples of the world have the right to self-determination and in exercising that right must be recognised as the exclusive owners of their cultural and intellectual property* (Mātaatua Declaration on Cultural and Intellectual Property Rights of Indigenous Peoples 1993). This language would carry to another key international Indigenous declaration, the UNDRIP, shaping intellectual rights and data rights internationally.

The UNDRIP is a legally non-binding global human rights instrument that articulates the rights and interests of Indigenous peoples, extending to data rights (Lightfoot 2016). While momentum for the UNDRIP began in the 1970s and 1980s, the Mātaatua Declaration was influential for the thinking of the working group that drafted the UNDRIP in the 1990s and 2000s (Davis 2012). Passed in 2007 and endorsed by Aotearoa in 2010, the UNDRIP declares the rights of Indigenous peoples within nation-states. In particular, Article 3, the right to self-determination; Article 18, the right to participate in decision-making; Article 19, the right to free, prior and informed consent; and Articles 31 and 32, outlining the rights to cultural heritage, knowledge and cultural expressions and to determine and develop priorities and strategies for the development of such resources. These articles provide a clear foundation for IDSov and Indigenous Data Governance (IDGov) internationally (Kukutai and Taylor 2016; Lovett et al. 2019).

Alongside the constitutional and legal basis for MDSov, there has also been a long history of Māori leaders using data to reflect Māori community needs and influence policy and research. This legacy extends back more than a hundred years, arguably representing the community foundations of MDSov. Although only a snapshot of the wide-ranging work of Māori in

communities, research, science and policy, many of these works directly supported the modern-day MDSov movement and, while informally discussed, have not often been captured in the broader whakapapa of MDSov. While these studies did not frame themselves using the language of MDSov, they nevertheless used many of the key principles the movement is based on, and the authors were often influential figures in the lives of those who established TMR.

In response to a lack of data on Māori communities and clear, present need, in 1916 Te Rangi Hiroa conducted an epidemiological study into the spread of smallpox within Māori communities in Te Tai Tokerau (Aotearoa's Northern region). [Hiroa \(1916\)](#) study illustrated that overcrowding, care practices around not isolating the sick and a lack of access to healthcare and vaccinations were causing the illness in Māori communities, which countered perceptions of smallpox as an illness Māori were susceptible to due to 'race'. Writing in the 1980s, historian MPK [Sorenson \(1982\)](#) expressed how Māori anthropologists and later politicians Te Rangi Hiroa and Apirana Ngata transformed a range of policy areas through a combination of their service to the community and an ability to bridge Western science and knowledge systems with te ao Māori.

On multiple occasions, the Māori Women's Welfare League also created and led data collection on important policy topics for Māori. In 1951, Whina Cooper moved from rural Hokianga to Grey Lynn (an Auckland suburb) and saw household overcrowding and poor quality accommodation, while hearing that housing allocations were inequitable for Māori. Alongside the Waitemātā (Auckland) chapter of the League, she created a study of housing that was influential in Crown policymaking by documenting the scope of the problem ([Gassin and Nichol 2023](#)). Again, in 1982, the League, led by study director Erihapeti Murchie, surveyed 1,172 wāhine Māori through *Rapuora*. *Rapuora* was an effort by Māori to collect their own data, shaped by their own community needs, while training up 164 wāhine as interviewers and researchers along the way ([Murchie 1984](#)). This led to the creation of Te Whare Tapa Whā by Mason Durie and Te Hoe Nuku Roa, a study of Māori households that began in the 1990s ([Durie 1995, 1998](#)) representing an indelible impact on Māori health through the League's work.

Working within the Crown system, Whetūmārama Wereta, Darrin Bishop and others within Statistics New Zealand created the Māori Statistics forum, which initiated the Māori Statistics Framework. This framework provided initial development of what a data system centred on Māori aspirations could look like ([Wereta and Bishop 2006](#)). Similarly, Whatarangi Winiata's works in Māori business and economic development on quantifying hapū and iwi resources built a basis for modern-day research on the Māori Economy ([Winiata 1987](#)).

By the 1990s, the values and principles underpinning MDSov were starting to be operationalised in research and in healthcare, but with limited Crown recognition. The impacts of data on real Māori health outcomes have since been recognised in the Hauora report from the Waitangi Tribunal inquiry into health inequity ([Waitangi Tribunal 2019](#)). In the 1990s, wāhine Māori were more than twice as likely to die from cervical cancer as other women

([Public Health Group 1996](#)). Part of this inequity was attributed to a lack of cultural competence by healthcare providers and less access to reliable screening ([Smith et al. 2017](#)). Given these experiences and the sensitivity of the topic and screening data, trust in data was recognised in law with the establishment of a data kaitiaki group over cervical cancer register data in the Health Cervical Screening (Kaitiaki) Regulations 1995 ([Te Whatu Ora 2025](#)). This was an early move representing Crown recognition of the need for Māori Data Governance (MDGov) and sovereignty in improving outcomes.

Similarly, Maybelle McLeod, working for health provider Kimi Hauora Health, had observed that a genetically linked illness was responsible for whānau passing away young from stomach cancer. This observation led to a longstanding scientific collaboration: in 2023, Maybelle and others were awarded a Prime Minister's Science Prize. Their work has influenced diffuse gastric stomach cancer standards and care around the world, saving many hundreds of lives beyond Aotearoa. This work was only possible due to contracts and agreements protecting whakapapa information and intellectual property ([Ngā Pae o te Māramatanga 2024](#)). Further pivotal Māori-led interventions in health research, ethics and genomics include Te Ara Tika ([Hudson et al. 2010](#)), Te Mata Ira ([Hudson et al. 2016a](#)) and He Tangata Kei Tua ([Hudson et al. 2016b](#)), which established some of the earliest Indigenous-led ethical and governance frameworks for research, genomic inquiry and biobanking in Aotearoa, translating principles of rangatiratanga, tikanga and collective responsibility into practical guidance for researchers and institutions. All of these initiatives have created a long legacy in epidemiology, hauora Māori, and all of these studies and initiatives could well be named MDSov if initiated today.

3 | The Development of the Māori and IDSov Movement

In July 2015, a group of Māori researchers and practitioners participated in a workshop on Data Sovereignty for Indigenous Peoples hosted by the Academy of Social Sciences in Australia. The workshop considered the implications of the UNDRIP for the collection, ownership and application of data pertaining to Indigenous peoples. Building from this gathering, TMR had its inaugural gathering in Hopuhopu later in 2015. From this gathering, TMR created a Charter which was confirmed by the wider network in 2016, outlining the purpose of the network and its approach to work ([Te Mana Raraunga 2016](#)). TMR advocates for the realisation of Māori rights and interests in data; for data to be used in safe and ethical ways to enhance the well-being of Māori people, language and culture; and for Māori governance over Māori data ([Te Mana Raraunga 2016](#)). The establishment of the MDSov Principles ([Te Mana Raraunga 2018](#)) represented a successful tool for socialising a new approach to embedding MDSov into non-Māori organisations across central government and policy, local government, non-governmental and private sectors ([Lilley et al. 2024](#)).

Members have been formative in driving research and impact through MDSov and the emerging MDGov since 2015.

MDGov, defined as *the processes, practices, standards and policies that enable Māori, as collectives and as individuals, to have control over Māori data* (Kukutai et al. 2023, 5), supports MDSov through providing a clear framework to support MDSov. For example, the Tikanga in Technology project explored how mātauranga Māori and tikanga guide artificial intelligence (AI), data sovereignty and governance to ensure equity, ethics and protection of Indigenous knowledge, producing an array of outputs related to the New Zealand Privacy Act (Kukutai et al. 2023), benefit sharing (Coltman et al. 2025) and decolonising algorithms and algorithmic sovereignty (Brown et al. 2024; Keegan 2025). Importantly, this work is also being increasingly localised, driven and controlled by hapū collectives asserting mana over their taonga (Clark et al. 2025; Kukutai et al. 2020, 2022).

Alongside research, members of TMR have been influential in transforming how the Integrated Data Infrastructure (IDI) was used. First prototyped in 2011 and expanded in 2013, the IDI was increasingly being used for policy, analysis and research purposes to inform decision-making in government and business (Greaves et al. 2024). However, there were limited mechanisms to ensure IDI work benefited Māori or to ensure Māori control and authority when and as appropriate (Sporle et al. 2021). Ngā Tikanga Paihere, established in 2018, represented a significant move towards addressing ethical issues and guiding good behaviour and practice when engaging with Māori data (Stats NZ 2020).

Similarly, TMR members provided consultation and submissions to The Data and Statistics Act 2022, which has set out clear obligations for the Crown to recognise and support Māori interests in data that extend beyond the previous Act (Kukutai et al. 2023; Oliver et al. 2022). The 2022 Act requires the Government Statistician to acknowledge Māori interests in data collection, statistics production and access to and use of data for research to support the economic, social, cultural and environmental well-being of Māori, including Iwi and hapū. The Act also requires the Statistician to grow Māori capability to collect and use data, ensure Māori can engage with and access data under the Act and maintain Stats NZ's capability to understand Te Tiriti and work effectively with Māori.

While TMR has been formative in enabling change at a national level, this work has been alongside the Data Iwi Leaders Group (Data ILG) and TKR. The Data ILG of the National Iwi Chairs Forum was established in 2016 to enable Iwi to better harness the potential of data to support development and to work with the Crown to support Māori data aspirations. The Mana Ōrite agreement (Stats NZ 2021) is a partnership document between Stats NZ and the Data ILG (Sporle et al. 2021). The agreement was the first of its kind globally and functioned to solidify the authority of Iwi over their own data. TKR was subsequently established in 2019 to enact the vision of Data ILG and operationalise Mana Ōrite. TKR aims to strengthen MDSov through an Iwi-specific approach, increase Māori statistical capability, increase Iwi data accessibility and to support Māori innovation through empowered data usage (Kukutai et al. 2023). This has included releasing *Te Whata* (Te KR 2020) a data platform made for Iwi, by Iwi, using Census 2023 data; the *Māori Data Governance Model* (Kukutai, Moses et al. 2023); the *Māori AI Governance Framework* (TKR 2025a) and creating bespoke

apprenticeships and scholarships to grow Iwi data capacity and capability (Te KR 2019). TMR formally acknowledges the relationship through its Mana-Mahi framework (Sporle et al. 2021), wherein Iwi (by extension the Data ILG and TKR) have the mana to formally work in partnership with the Crown, while TMR is able to advocate, challenge, and support where needed.

Internationally, many of the founders of TMR have also been influential in the wider IDSov movement through the GIDA network. Today, the GIDA network consists of Maïam nayri Wingara Collective (Australia); TMR; the Pacific Data Sovereignty Network (Aotearoa); the United States IDSov Network; the First Nations Information Governance Centre in Canada; GIDA-Inuit, First Nations and Métis (Canada) and GIDA-Sápmi (Norway, Sweden and Finland). There are also emerging movements in Asia and Africa and the newly established Red Latinoamericana para la Soberanía de Datos Indígenas (RELASDI) in Latin America. The GIDA network initially came together to produce the trailblazing *Indigenous Data Sovereignty: Toward an Agenda*, published in 2016 (Kukutai and Taylor 2016). That edited volume, and its 2020 follow-up, *Indigenous Data Sovereignty and Policy* (Walter et al. 2020), present a comprehensive view of both the successes and challenges of asserting IDSov within colonial contexts.

Additionally, the GIDA network produced the CARE Principles (Collective benefit, Authority to control, Responsibility and Ethics) for IDGov (Carroll et al. 2023), extending on the FAIR (Findable, Accessible, Interoperable, Reusable) data principles, ensuring that Indigenous data are able to advance Indigenous innovation and self-determination (Carroll et al. 2021). The CARE principles have been widely socialised internationally, and the CARE data maturity model (Jennings et al. 2023) supports their implementation alongside local data sovereignty and governance principles and frameworks. Further, a GIDA collaboration has created the first Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers (IEEE) standard regarding the “appropriate disclosure of Indigenous peoples’ relationships and/or links to all data” (IEEE 2025). This standard provides clear opportunities to ensure FAIR and CARE principles are embedded within international technology standards to support IDSov and IDGov (GIDA 2023). As such, TMR and the broader GIDA network have consistently sought to transform data practices to support the enactment and implementation of IDSov and IDGov across local, national and international contexts.

4 | The Special Issue: MDSov in Research, Practice and Policy

Over the past decade, the normative foundations of MDSov have become increasingly visible across research, policy and institutional discourse, although the practical question of how those foundations are realised within sectors and enacted in everyday settings remains unevenly addressed. This special issue examines this gap by illustrating how MDSov has been translated into methods, infrastructures, organisational arrangements, decision tools and sector-specific practices. This focus is closely aligned with the priorities articulated in the TMR 2025 strategy hui (TMR 2025). Members reaffirmed the importance of TMR

as an advocacy body and a voice for policy engagement and Crown accountability, but also as a network that connects people, initiatives and expertise across the MDSov ecosystem. Members raised the ongoing need for capacity and capability building, for practical exemplars and success stories that others can learn from, and for attention to emerging issues. In alignment with those priorities, the articles within the special issue can also be understood as a response to these calls from members. Collectively, these contributions show that the field has moved decisively beyond principles and has assembled a body of practical models, exemplars and lessons for wider use. Note that the following summary is based on this special issue; however, there are many examples of MDSov and MDGov in action in wider literature, many of which can be found in [King et al. \(2026\)](#) in this special issue.

One of the core strengths of this collection is that it reflects a field that has moved beyond the need to justify MDSov as a concept. Instead, the field is engaged in tracing its implications, testing its application in practice and extending its reach across diverse institutional and social settings. The scoping review by [King et al. \(2026\)](#) makes this especially clear. By tracing the concepts, values, principles and practices through which MDSov and MDGov have been operationalised in the literature, the review demonstrates both the breadth and the growing impact of the field. Concepts such as kaitiakitanga, rangatiratanga, whakapapa, whanaungatanga and manaakitanga are no longer only invoked aspirationally; they are being used to shape models, tools and applied practices. The review reminds readers that this work remains uneven and important gaps persist, including limited attention to the aspirations and priorities of specific Māori subgroups such as tamariki and rangatahi, tangata whaikaha (Māori living with disabilities) and takatāpui (Māori of diverse genders, sexualities and sex characteristics). The review provides an important frame for the issue as a whole, where the challenge is not whether MDSov should shape data practice, but how, where and for whom it is being made tangible. Addressing some of this need, [Short et al. \(2026\)](#) use of gamification as a means of building MDSov literacy provides a strategy for building MDSov knowledge. Their MDSov escape room game, tested with high school and undergraduate students and university staff, highlights a novel way of communicating MDSov that resonates with a range of audiences, particularly rangatahi, with opportunities to test its applicability with different audiences.

The collection also highlights that some of the most compelling examples of implementation emerge where MDSov informs discussions of individual versus collective rights. The papers by [Pēpi Tarapa-Dewes and Kukutai \(2026\)](#) on whakapapa data and [Renfrew et al. \(2026\)](#) on visual research are particularly important here. They reinforce that data—including whakapapa data—is significant to Māori not simply because they identify individuals, but because of wider relationships across generations, places, communities and spiritual domains. Similarly, images of wharehau, urupā and wāhi tapu disrupt the dominant ethics of individual consent in research when these places have deep relationships with Māori collectives. Thinking relationally, amongst kin, between people and whenua and between people and te ao wairua, reorients governance away from narrow and individualised privacy models and towards a relational understanding of data sensitivity, meaning and obligation.

This highlights the limitations of decontextualised consent models and conventional data protection frameworks when applied to Māori realities. In doing so, the collection contributes to a broader rethinking of what responsible data governance requires.

Similarly, [Boulton et al. \(2026\)](#) describe Te Pā Raraunga, which provides a Ngāti Hauiti-grounded account of implementing MDSov and MDGov within a Māori health research centre. Here, MDSov is translated into practical arrangements around repositories, access, oversight, stewardship, security and layered governance. In contrast, the work of [Klemm and colleagues \(2026\)](#) mapping where Ngāti Kuri taonga and data are held worldwide highlights the tensions and challenges of enacting data sovereignty and data governance within contemporary museology systems, especially when control and ownership do not reside with Indigenous peoples. Despite these challenges, the article by [Klemm et al. \(2026\)](#) highlights the ongoing drive for Ngāti Kuri to maintain relationships with their taonga.

A recurring theme across several contributions is the recognition that operationalisation is itself a design challenge. Frameworks, methods and processes must be carefully developed through iterative, relational work in ways that are meaningful to the communities they are intended to serve. [West and Renfrew \(2026\)](#) analysis of MDSov and MDGov in universities highlights many of these issues, showcasing how systemic failures prevent MDSov and MDGov from being enacted in universities, despite the popularity of MDSov and MDGov language in policy documents. This is primarily attributed to resourcing and institutional inertia that also impedes broader decolonisation and Indigenisation efforts within universities. [Lambert et al. \(Early View\)](#) present co-designed framing of Māori data as taonga, which seeks to address this inertia through viewing implementation as a situated and ongoing process of co-design where principles are made actionable through community-led governance, practical templates and creating processes grounded in tikanga, trust and accountability. Both works highlight the progress made and the unevenness that remains in institutional uptake. It is through this work of understanding what MDSov principles require in particular relationships, settings and communities, that the field resists implementation being reduced to a checklist of top-down procedural compliance.

Alongside these relational foundations, implementation also depends on the development of technical and procedural innovations capable of putting MDSov principles into practice. [Elliott and Sporle's \(2026\)](#) contribution on sovereignty-permitting web applications demonstrates that questions of access, privacy, control and collective benefit are not external to the technical design but must be built into the architecture itself. [Houghton \(Early View\)](#) discusses the Tapu-Noa Matrix, and points to a related dynamic in the legal-regulatory sphere, where tikanga concepts are translated into a structured tool for decision-making within trade mark assessment. Both papers converge on a key point from different domains: whether in the form of digital architectures, practical frameworks or evaluative matrices, operationalising MDSov depends on the development of the practical machinery to support its implementation.

This is especially visible in institutional settings, most notably health. One valuable domain-specific contribution in this collection shifts the focus towards health data governance. [Murphy et al. \(2026\)](#) provide an evaluation of the Māori health data governance planning and protocol checklist within Te Whatu Ora. Improving Māori health data practice requires governance arrangements that shape who decides, how decisions are made, what protocols apply and how data are used in ways that are accountable to Māori aspirations and well-being.

5 | Te Pae Tawhiti: The New Horizons of MDSov

Collectively, these articles show that operationalising MDSov is no longer only a future aspiration. This leads us to several concluding points about what the future of the movement could hold. The special issue and editorial have taken stock of the past decade of MDSov, but this also leaves questions: what might the next decade look like? And what are the coming challenges and opportunities for the movement?

While this special issue has focused on the implementation of MDSov specifically, the broader data sovereignty movement has been taken up by other communities in Aotearoa. The Pacific Data Sovereignty Network (PDSN), founded in 2021, seeks to address gaps in how Pacific communities are represented in national data in Aotearoa ([Pacific Data Sovereignty Trust 2021](#)). Now a member of the broader GIDA network, the PDSN has produced work focusing on building community awareness, engaging with Statistics NZ around Census data ([Pacific Data Sovereignty Network 2022](#)) and responding to the impacts of AI on Pacific Data Sovereignty ([Pacific Data Sovereignty 2025](#)).

Similarly, Ethnic Data Sovereignty is an emerging area of research and practice in Aotearoa that seeks to establish data sovereignty principles and support data rights for ethnic communities ([Health Research Council of New Zealand 2024](#)). Beyond the national context, the CARE principles and the broader language of community data sovereignty are travelling into other contexts, such as refugee and internally displaced people ([Suchikova and Nazarovets 2025](#)), to support the data rights of marginalised people. While the boundaries of IDSov and IDGov framing are yet to be determined by Indigenous groups, the broader uptake of IDSov language speaks to both the impact of the movement internationally and the power of positioning the movement through a sovereignty and rights-based framework.

However, we also note the possibilities for the language of sovereignty to be co-opted by Big Tech companies and stripped of its emancipatory power. [Grohmann and Costa Barbosa \(2026\)](#) discuss “sovereignty-as-a-service” (p. 417) whereby Big Tech corporations are selling the language of sovereignty to nation-states, creating a digital landscape where sovereignty is granted by platforms like Microsoft, Google and Amazon, instead of sovereignty being exercised over them. IDSov is not immune to this appropriation. Alongside these developments, emerging digital technologies, particularly AI, are creating new conditions that require the principles and practice of IDSov to be exercised in new ways.

This was highlighted at the 2026 GIDA meeting on IDSov and Artificial Intelligence in Texcoco, Mexico ([GIDA 2026](#)). Convened by TMR in partnership with the PDSN and local hosts from the Latin American IDSov movement, the meeting reflected growing recognition that Indigenous rights, authority and collective interests must be upheld across the full lifecycle of AI systems, including their design, training, deployment and governance. Its focus ranged across governance and equity, capability and capacity, cultural and intellectual property, digital trade, sustainability and synthetic data, signalling a concerted effort to address the opportunities and risks of emerging technologies on Indigenous terms. Synthetic data, for example, is often presented as a technical response to problems of privacy, scarcity and access, particularly where communities may lack the infrastructure or scale of data needed to develop digital tools on their own terms. Yet synthetic data, whether generated through statistical methods or AI systems, can intensify questions of provenance, consent, accountability and collective harm by making these issues harder to trace, attribute and govern ([World Economic Forum 2025](#)).

At the same time, the meeting also pointed to the potential of AI when developed within IDGov frameworks. Under such conditions, AI may support community-defined priorities, strengthen digital capability, widen innovation in resource-constrained settings and generate tools that are more responsive to Indigenous languages, knowledge systems and social realities. Initiatives such as those led by Te Hiku Media point to this potential, showing how Indigenous-led AI development can support language revitalisation, cultural continuity and technological capability while keeping governance, benefit and accountability close to the community ([Jones et al. 2023](#)). The question ahead is not simply whether AI will be used, but whether and how it can be developed in ways that uphold Indigenous data rights and ensure that innovation serves collective wellbeing rather than becoming another mode of extraction.

Issues also remain in Crown data collections and statistics. While we were editing this special issue, the Crown moved away from a door-to-door (enumerated) census to one based on administrative data with some smaller surveys ([Reti 2025](#)). Administrative data includes information collected about individuals in the day-to-day running of the state, through agencies such as education, social welfare, health and corrections. Multiple Māori experts, alongside TMR and TKR, have expressed concerns over the quality and breadth of the administrative data and survey approach that will be used to replace the traditional census model ([Kukutai 2025a](#); [Greaves et al. 2025](#)). In particular, there are concerns over obtaining reliable Māori descent data to reliably estimate the Māori electorates, te reo fluency data and Iwi affiliation, as well as concerns around surveillance, trust and the ability of data to meet Māori community, Iwi and hapū needs. TKR is continuing to lead this response and working to design alternative models, but this census decision will have wide-ranging impacts on the robustness of Aotearoa’s data ecosystem and MDSov ([TKR 2025b](#)).

To conclude, we have canvassed just three emerging points of conversation in the movement. These sit alongside unresolved discussions around the findability of Indigenous data and metadata practice within science and academic institutions;

MDSov issues associated with increasing use of biometric data such as fingerprints, iris scans and facial recognition technology; and concerns over collective privacy and broader problems relating to AI, energy use, infrastructure and the environment (Kukutai 2025b; Office of the Privacy Commissioner 2025). Indigenous movements are largely based on the values of pro-environmentalism and our relationships to the environment and often alongside resistance to capitalism and the further embedding of colonisation and extractive practices (Cormack and Kukutai 2022). The need for Indigenous resistance and advocacy in these spaces will undoubtedly continue. While the past decade has been focused on theorising, frameworks, organising and initial implementation, this next decade will likely build on the long legacy of Māori data advocacy to meet coming challenges and opportunities to continue working together to forward Māori rights and interests in data.

Acknowledgments

The editors wish to acknowledge Whetūmārama Wereta (nee Rolleston), a Māori data leader, who passed away in 2023. Moe mai rā e te rangatira. The editors also wish to acknowledge the current and past members of Te Pokapū of Te Mana Raraunga, as well as those who have carried the kaupapa forward within Te Kāhui Raraunga and Data ILG, who have been formative in shaping the landscape of Māori data sovereignty. We thank Ripeka Skipper for her research assistant work in preparing this article.

Funding

Lara Greaves was supported by a Rutherford Discovery Fellowship from the Royal Society of New Zealand (RDF-VUW2301).

Conflicts of Interest

The authors declare no conflicts of interest.

Data Availability Statement

Data sharing is not applicable to this article as no datasets were generated or analysed during the current study.

Endnotes

¹ Note that we include a Māori language glossary with the paper for unfamiliar readers.

References

- Adams, C. I., M. R. Roberts, and P. L. Wilcox. 2026. "An Indigenously-Designed Ecosystem for Environmental DNA Research and Application in Aotearoa New Zealand." Authorea Preprints. https://d197for5662m48.cloudfront.net/documents/publicationstatus/306784/preprint_pdf/2bbbae4b4b6e37609eb8d45993f2c2ee.pdf.
- Boulton, A., L. Hamley, and D. Karaka. 2026. "Te Pā Raraunga: The Development of a Data Governance Model for Ngāti Hauiti." *Journal of the Royal Society of New Zealand* 56, no. 3: e70052.
- Brown, P. T., D. Wilson, K. West, et al. 2024. "Māori Algorithmic Sovereignty: Idea, Principles, and Use." *Data Science Journal* 23, no. 15: 1–16. <https://doi.org/10.5334/dsj-2024-015>.
- Carroll, S. R., E. Herczog, M. Hudson, K. Russell, and S. Stall. 2021. "Operationalizing the CARE and FAIR Principles for Indigenous Data Futures." *Scientific Data* 8, no. 1: 108. <https://www.nature.com/articles/s41597-021-00892-0>.
- Carroll, S. R., I. Garba, O. L. Figueroa-Rodríguez, et al. 2023. "The CARE Principles for Indigenous Data Governance." Open Scholarship Press Curated Volumes: Policy. <https://openscholarshippress.pubpub.org/pub/xx3kj9rv/release/1>.
- Clark, V., T. Kukutai, V. Teague, H. Kani, and E. Pēpi Tarapa-Dewes. 2025. "The Māori Data Privacy Framework: How Useful Is It for Hapū?" <https://researchcommons.waikato.ac.nz/items/47b08efe-76b9-4a44-bde6-7e11f3e32fdb>.
- Coltman, T., M. Hudson, J. Mika, et al. 2025. "Benefit Sharing on Genetic Resources: Modelling Data Access, Control and Willingness-to-Pay for Digital Sequence Information." *Ecological Solutions and Evidence* 6: e70063. <https://doi.org/10.1002/2688-8319.70063>.
- Cormack, D., and T. Kukutai. 2022. "Indigenous Peoples, Data, and the Coloniality of Surveillance." In *New Perspectives in Critical Data Studies*, edited by A. Hepp, J. Jarke and L. Kramp, 121–141. Palgrave Macmillan. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-96180-0_6.
- Davis, M. 2012. "To Bind or Not to Bind: The United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples 5 Years on." *Australian International Law Journal* 19: 17–48. <https://search.informit.org/doi/abs/10.3316/informit.329563918658659>.
- Durie, M. H. 1995. "Te Hoe Nuku Roa Framework: A Māori Identity Measure." *The Journal of the Polynesian Society* 104, no. 4: 461–470. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/20706636>.
- Durie, M. H. 1998. *Te Mana, Te Kāwanatanga: The Politics of Self-Determination*. Oxford University Press. <https://1drv.ms/w/c/afac87a0765d9aa5/IQABluATx-nZR4LRXlwxQJjAAYLVH6HY5sp8Ni6T90QQ-LE?e=plJQpz>.
- Elliott, T., and A. Sporle. 2026. "Open-Source Tools for Building Data-Driven, Sovereignty-Permitting Web Apps." *Journal of the Royal Society of New Zealand* 56, no. 2: e70047.
- Klemm, M. F. d. A., C. Milne, I. Brown, S. Ringham, and W. A. Nelson. 2026. "Tracing Taonga Trajectories: A Methodological Framework for Indigenous Heritage Mapping." *Journal of the Royal Society of New Zealand* 56, no. 1: e70012. <https://rsnz.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/full/10.1002/snz.270012>.
- Gassin, T., and M. Nichol. 2023. *Māori Housing and Government Policy 1935–1990 (Wai 2750)*. Waitangi Tribunal.
- Geismar, H. 2013. "Resisting Settler-Colonial Property Relations? the WAI. 262 Claim and Report in Aotearoa New Zealand." *Settler Colonial Studies* 3, no. 2: 230–243. <https://doi.org/10.1080/2201473X.2013.781923>.
- GIDA. 2023. "IEEE Provenance of Indigenous Peoples' Data." <https://www.gida-global.org/ieee-provenance>.
- GIDA. 2026. *GIDA IDSov and AI Workshop*. Colegio de Postgraduados (COLPOS).
- Greaves L. M., C. Lindsay Latimer, E. Muriwai, et al. 2024. "Māori and the Integrated Data Infrastructure: An Assessment of the Data System and Suggestions to Realise Māori Data Aspirations." *Journal of the Royal Society of New Zealand* 54, no. 2: 190–206. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03036758.2022.2154368>.
- Greaves, L., E. Tarapa Dewes, K. West, and L. Renfrew. 2025. "Scrapping the National Census Raises Data Sovereignty and Surveillance Fears for Māori." *The Conversation* <https://theconversation.com/scrapping-the-national-census-raises-data-sovereignty-and-surveillance-fears-for-maori-25927>.
- Grohmann, R., and A. Costa Barbosa. 2026. "Sovereignty-as-a-Service: How Big Tech Companies Co-Opt and Redefine Digital Sovereignty. Media." *Culture & Society* 48, no. 2: 416–424.
- Health Research Council of New Zealand. 2024. "Data Ethics and Sovereignty: An Asian and Ethnic Minority Perspective." <https://www.hrc.govt.nz/resources/research-repository/data-ethics-and-sovereignty-asian-and-ethnic-minority-perspective>.

- Hiroa, T. R. 1916. "The smallpox epidemic among the Maoris in the northern district." In *Proceedings of the Australasian Medical Congress*, 212–224. John Mackay.
- Houghton, J. 2021. "The New Zealand Government's Response to the Wai 262 Report: The First Ten Years." *The International Journal of Human Rights* 25, no. 5: 870–893. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13642987.2020.1859480>.
- Houghton, J. Early View. "The Tapu-Noa Matrix for Determining whether Use or Registration of a Trade Mark Is Likely to Offend Māori." *Journal of the Royal Society of New Zealand*.
- Hudson, M., A. Beaton, M. Milne, et al. 2016a. *Te Mata Ira: Guidelines for Genomic Research With Māori*. Māori and Indigenous Governance Centre. University of Waikato. <https://researcharchive.wintec.ac.nz/id/eprint/5640/>.
- Hudson, M., A. Beaton, M. Milne, et al. 2016b. *He Tangata Kei Tua: Guidelines for Biobanking With Māori*. Māori and Indigenous Governance Centre. University of Waikato. <https://researchcommons.waikato.ac.nz/entities/publication/df1ee079-8d6c-4b2e-9606-5ec35bf0e7c8>.
- Hudson, M., M. Milne, P. Reynolds, K. Russell, and B. Smith. 2010. *Te Ara Tika: Guidelines for Māori Research Ethics: A Framework for Researchers and Ethics Committee Members*. 1–29. Health Research Council of New Zealand. https://www.otago.ac.nz/research/forms/7_Matauranga%20Maori%20Guidelines%20for%20Research/Te%20Ara%20Tika%20Guidelines%20for%20Maori%20Research%20Ethics_0.pdf.
- Hudson, M., T. Anderson, T. K. Dewes, P. Temara, H. Whaanga, and T. Roa. 2017. "He Matapihi Ki Te Mana Raraunga" - Conceptualising Big Data Through a Māori Lens." In *He Whare Hangarau Māori: Language, Culture & Technology*, edited by H. Whaanga, T. A. G. Keegan, and M. Apperley, 64–73. Te Pua Wānanga ki te Ao/Faculty of Māori and Indigenous Studies, University of Waikato. <https://researchcommons.waikato.ac.nz/server/api/core/bitstreams/a2fe2ad9-7138-4b03-9f17-153adcaa8db8/content>.
- Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers. 2025. "IEEE Recommended Practice for Provenance of Indigenous Peoples' Data (IEEE Std 2890-2025)." <https://doi.org/10.1109/IEEESTD.2025.11302960>.
- Jennings, L., T. Anderson, A. Martinez, et al. 2023. "Applying the CARE Principles for Indigenous Data Governance to Ecology and Biodiversity Research." *Nature Ecology & Evolution* 7: 1547–1551. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41559-023-02161-2>.
- Jones, P. L., K. Mahelona, S. Duncan, and G. Leoni. 2023. "Kia Tangata Whenua: Artificial Intelligence that Grows From the Land and People." *Ethical Space: The International Journal of Communication Ethics* 2023, no. 2/3. <https://doi.org/10.21428/0af3f4c0.9092b177>.
- Keegan, T. T. 2025. *Māori Data Sovereignty in AI Development: Seeking Māori Appropriate Pathways*. University of Waikato. <https://www.waikato.ac.nz/assets/Uploads/Research/Research-institutes-centres-and-groups/Entities/Te-Mata-Punenga-o-Te-Kotahi-Te-Kotahi-Research-Institute-TKRI/Maori-LLM-report-final-TeTaka.pdf>.
- King, P. T., N. Paki Paki, D. Cormack, et al. 2026. "Poipoia Te Kākano Kia Puāwai: The Operationalisation of Māori Data Sovereignty in Aotearoa—a Scoping Literature Review." *Journal of the Royal Society of New Zealand* 56, no. 2: e70029.
- Kukutai, T. 2025a. "Census in Crisis—further Erasure of Indigenous Peoples?." *Science* 389, no. 6760: eaea0932. <https://www.science.org/doi/full/10.1126/science.aea0932>.
- Kukutai, T. 2025b. "Protecting Pieces of Us: The Need for Indigenous Perspectives in the Fuzzy World of Biometric Data Regulation." *Science* 388, no. 6743: eadw9973. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.adw9973>.
- Kukutai, T., and J. Taylor, eds. 2016. *Indigenous Data Sovereignty: Toward an Agenda*. ANU Press. Vol. 38. <https://books.google.co.nz/books?hl=en&lr=&id=wolFDgAAQBAJ&oi=fnd&pg=PR7&dq=Kukutai,+T.,+%26+Taylor>.
- Kukutai, T., C. Moses, K. Campbell-Kamariera, et al. 2023b. "Māori Data Governance Model." Te Kāhui Raraunga. <https://researchcommons.waikato.ac.nz/items/c076bc80-973b-4389-ac04-3902de003d48>.
- Kukutai, T., J. Whitehead, and H. Kani. 2022. "Tracing Opuatia: Repatriating and Repurposing Colonial Land Data." *New Zealand Geographer* 78, no. 2: 134–146. <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/full/10.1111/nzg.12344>.
- Kukutai, T., N. Mahuika, H. Kani, D. Ewe, and K. H. Kukutai. 2020. "Survivance as Narrative Identity: Voices From a Ngāti Tiipa Oral History Project." <https://researchcommons.waikato.ac.nz/items/4bcca266-6efd-4b08-87d8-1ed99063b1d5>.
- Kukutai, T., S. Cassim, V. Clark, et al. 2023. "Māori Data Sovereignty and Privacy." Tikanga in Technology Discussion Paper. Te Ngira Institute for Population Research. <https://researchcommons.waikato.ac.nz/items/8b16bd0e-bf41-4630-a721-3f343912b69d>.
- Lambert, S., H. Hakopa, and M. Heimlick. Early View. "Reframing Data as a Taonga: A Māori Data Sovereignty Framework." *Journal of the Royal Society of New Zealand*.
- Lightfoot, S. 2016. *Global Indigenous Politics: A Subtle Revolution*. Routledge. <https://api.taylorfrancis.com/content/books/mono/download?identifierName=doi&identifierValue=10.4324/9781315670669&type=googlepdf>.
- Lilley, S., G. Oliver, J. Craneffeld, and M. Lewellen. 2024. "Māori Data Sovereignty: Contributions to Data Cultures in the Government Sector in New Zealand. Information." *Communication & Society* 27, no. 16: 2801–2816. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1369118X.2024.2302987>.
- Lovett, R., V. Lee, T. Kukutai, D. Cormack, S. C. Rainie, and J. Walker. 2019. "Good Data Practices for Indigenous Data Sovereignty and Governance." *Good Data* 1: 26–36. [https://books.google.co.nz/books?hl=en&lr=&id=Y0vUDwAAQBAJ&oi=fnd&pg=PA26&dq=Lovett,+R.,+Lee,+V.,+Kukutai,+T.,+Cormack,+D.,+Rainie,+S.+C.,+%26+Walker,+J.+\(2019\)](https://books.google.co.nz/books?hl=en&lr=&id=Y0vUDwAAQBAJ&oi=fnd&pg=PA26&dq=Lovett,+R.,+Lee,+V.,+Kukutai,+T.,+Cormack,+D.,+Rainie,+S.+C.,+%26+Walker,+J.+(2019)).
- Mataatua Declaration on Cultural and Intellectual Property Rights of Indigenous Peoples. 1993. https://www.wipo.int/tk/en/databases/creative_heritage/indigenous/link0002.htm.
- Mead, A. T. P. 2005. Public policy, ethics & Mātauranga Māori." In *Tikanga Rangahau Mātauranga Tuku Iho: Traditional Knowledge and Research Ethics Conference Proceedings 2004*, 115. <https://www.maramatanga.ac.nz/sites/default/files/TKC-2004.pdf#page=121>.
- Murchie, R. E. 1984. *Rapuora: Health and Maori Women*. Māori Women's Welfare League.
- Murphy, T., L. Kremer, S. Crengle, K. Bartholomew, and R. Tipene. 2026. "Use of the Māori Health Data Model Planning and Protocol Checklist in the Abdominal Aortic Aneurysm and Atrial Fibrillation Screening Research Programme in Aotearoa." *Journal of the Royal Society of New Zealand* 56, no. 3: e70059.
- Mutu, M. 2020. "Mana Māori Motuhake: Māori Concepts and Practices of Sovereignty." In *Routledge Handbook of Critical Indigenous Studies*, edited by B. Hokowhitu, A. Moreton-Robinson, L. Tuhiwai-Smith, C. Andersen, and S. Larkin, 269–282. Routledge Handbook of Critical Indigenous Studies. <https://www.taylorfrancis.com/chapters/edit/10.4324/9780429440229-24/mana-m%C4%81ori-motuhake-margaret-mutu>.
- Ngā Pae o te Māramatanga. 2024. "International Indigenous Research Conference." Ngā Pae o te Māramatanga. <https://www.maramatanga.ac.nz/node/2161>.

- Office of the Privacy Commissioner. 2025. "Inquiry Into Foodstuffs North Island's Trial Use of Facial Recognition Technology." <https://www.privacy.org.nz/assets/DOCUMENTS/20250603-FRT-Inquiry-Report-A1082856.pdf>.
- Oliver, G., S. Lilley, J. CraneField, and M. Lewellen. 2022. "Implementing Indigenous Data Sovereignty: Insights From Legislative Reform in Aotearoa New Zealand." *Proceedings of the Association for Information Science and Technology* 59, no. 1: 474–478.
- Pacific Data Sovereignty Network. 2022. "Pacific Data Sovereignty Network Tripartite Signing With Statistics New Zealand & Ministry for Pacific Peoples." <https://pacificdatasovereignty.com/pacific-data-sovereignty-network-tripartite-signing-with-statistics-new-zealand-ministry-for-pacific-peoples/>.
- Pacific Data Sovereignty Trust. 2021. About Us. <https://pacificdatasovereignty.com/about-us-2/>.
- Pacific Data Sovereignty. 2025. "Pacific Data Sovereignty & AI Report." <https://pacificdatasovereignty.com/wp-content/uploads/2025/10/PACIFIC-DATA-SOVEREIGNTY-AI-REPORT.pdf>.
- Pēpi Tarapa-Dewes, E., and T. Kukutai. 2026. "If It Don't Talk, It's Not Whakapapa Data": Conceptualising Whakapapa Data in a Digital Age." *Journal of the Royal Society of New Zealand* 56, no. 1: e70016.
- Public Health Group. 1996. *Rangatahi Sexual Wellbeing and Reproductive Health: A Discussion Document*. Ministry of Health.
- Renfrew, L., L. Hamley, J. Le Grice, et al. 2026. "Tikanga and Ethical Considerations for Visual Research With Rangatahi Māori." *Journal of the Royal Society of New Zealand* 56, no. 1: e70026.
- Reti, S. 2025. *Sharpened Focus on Quality Economic, Population Stats*. New Zealand Government. <https://www.beehive.govt.nz/release/sharpened-focus-quality-economic-population-stats>.
- Royal Society Te Apārangi. 2023. "Mana Raraunga Data Sovereignty." <https://www.royalsociety.org.nz/assets/Mana-Raraunga-Data-Sovereignty-web-V1.pdf>.
- Short, S., K. Ruckstuhl, and B. Sommerville. 2026. "Tā Te Tamariki Mahi, he wāwāhi Tahā: Gamifying Māori Data Sovereignty." *Journal of the Royal Society of New Zealand* 56: e70037. <https://doi.org/10.1002/snz.70037>.
- Smith, M. A., S. Edwards, and K. Canfell. 2017. "Impact of the National Cervical Screening Programme in New Zealand by Age: Analysis of Cervical Cancer Trends 1985–2013 in All Women and in Māori Women." *Cancer Causes & Control* 28: 1393–1404.
- Sorrenson, M. P. K. 1982. "Polynesian Corpuscles and Pacific Anthropology: The Home-Made Anthropology of Sir Apirana Ngata and Sir Peter Buck." *The Journal of the Polynesian Society* 91, no. 1: 7–27.
- Sporle, A., M. Hudson, and K. West. 2021. "Indigenous Data and Policy in Aotearoa New Zealand." In *Indigenous Data Sovereignty and Policy*, edited by M. Walter, T. Kukutai, S. R. Carroll, and D. Rodriguez-Lonebear, Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780429273957>.
- Stats NZ. 2020. "Ngā Tikanga Paihere (Data Ethics)." <https://www.data.govt.nz/toolkit/data-ethics/nga-tikanga-paihere>.
- Stats NZ. 2021. "Mana Ōrite Relationship Agreement." <https://stats.govt.nz/about-us/what-we-do/mana-orite-relationship-agreement/>.
- Suchikova, Y., and S. Nazarovets. 2025. "Extending the CARE Principles: Managing Data for Vulnerable Communities in Wartime and Humanitarian Crises." *Scientific Data* 12, no. 1: 420.
- Te KR. 2019. "Te Kāhui Raraunga." <https://www.kahuiraraunga.io/>.
- Te KR. 2020. "Te Whata." <https://tewhata.io/>.
- Te Mana Raraunga. 2016. "Our Charter." <https://www.temanararaunga.maori.nz/tutohinga>.
- Te Mana Raraunga. 2018. "Principles of Māori Data Sovereignty: Brief #1." <https://static1.squarespace.com/static/58e9b10f9de4bb8d1fb5ebbc/t/5bda208b4ae237cd89ee16e9/1541021836126/TMR+Ma%CC%84ori+Data+Sovereignty+Principles+Oct+2018.pdf>.
- Te Whatu Ora. 2025. "National Kaitiaki Group." <https://www.healthnz.govt.nz/about-us/who-we-are/expert-groups-and-networks/expert-groups/national-screening-expert-groups/national-kaitiaki-group>.
- TKR. 2025a. "Communiqué From Hui Raraunga 2025: Protecting and Caring for Māori Data as a Taonga in a Changing Census Environment [Communiqué]." https://www.kahuiraraunga.io/_files/ugd/b8e45c_5dc3b5ffcd044621b9e90b185b572a92.pdf.
- TKR. 2025b. *Māori Artificial Intelligence Governance Framework: Contextualised Advice for AI Use, Extending the Māori data Governance Model*. Te Kāhui Raraunga.
- TMR. 2025. "Summary of the TMR. 2025 Strategy Hui." <https://static1.squarespace.com/static/58e9b10f9de4bb8d1fb5ebbc/t/68f0425ce4bbe70af7959362/1760576092621/Summary+of+the+TMR+2025+Strategy+Hui.pdf>.
- United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (UNDRIP). 2007. "OHCHR and Indigenous Peoples." In *At the 33rd session of the HRC*. <https://www.ohchr.org/en/indigenous-peoples/un-declaration-rights-indigenous-peoples>.
- Waitangi Tribunal. 2011. "Ko Aotearoa tēnei: A Report Into Claims Concerning New Zealand Law and Policy Affecting Māori Culture and Identity (WAI 262, Vol. 1)." https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=2402050.
- Waitangi Tribunal. 2014. "He Whakaputanga Me Te Tiriti: The Declaration and the Treaty: The Report on stage 1 of the Te Aparahi o Te Raki Inquiry (WAI 1040)." https://forms.justice.govt.nz/search/Documents/WT/wt_DOC_85648980/Te%20RakiW_1.pdf.
- Waitangi Tribunal. 2019. "HAUORA: Report on Stage One of the Health Services and Outcomes Kaupapa Inquiry (WAI2575)." https://forms.justice.govt.nz/search/Documents/WT/wt_DOC_150429818/Hauora%20Pre-PubW.pdf.
- Walter, M., T. Kukutai, S. R. Carroll, and D. Rodriguez-Lonebear, eds. 2020. *Indigenous Data Sovereignty and Policy*. Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780429273957>.
- Wereta, W., and D. Bishop. 2006. "Towards a Maori Statistics Framework." In *Aboriginal Policy Research: Moving Forward, Making a Difference*, edited by J. White, S. Wingert, D. Beavon, and P. Maxim, Thompson Educational Publishing. Vol. 3.
- West, K. T. 2022. "Data, From a Given, to the Taken: Theorising Māori Data Sovereignty in Aotearoa." Doctoral diss., University of Auckland.
- West, K., and L. Renfrew. 2026. "Māori Research Data Governance in New Zealand Universities." *Journal of the Royal Society of New Zealand* 56, no. 3: e70048.
- Winiata, W. 1987. *Hapū and Iwi Resources and Their Quantification*. Decision Research Centre, Victoria University of Wellington.
- World Economic Forum. 2025. "Synthetic Data: The New Data Frontier." https://reports.weforum.org/docs/WEF_Synthetic_Data_2025.pdf.

Appendix

Glossary

Aotearoa	New Zealand
hapori	Communities
hapū	Extended kinship group; clan; descended from a common ancestor

harakeke	Flax
hauora	Health and wellbeing
hui	Meeting
Iwi	Extended kinship group; tribe; or nation; descended from a common ancestor
kaitiaki	Guardian
kaitiakitanga	Guardianship
kaumātua	Older people; older people of status
kaupapa	Topic, policy, matter for discussion
kūmara	Sweet potato
mana	Authority, prestige, esteem, power
manaakitanga	Hospitality, support; showing respect and care for others
mātauranga	Knowledge
Pākehā	New Zealanders of European descent
rangatahi	Youth; young people
rangatira	Leader; chief
rangatiratanga	Chieftainship, leadership
takatāpui	Māori of diverse genders, sexualities, and sex characteristics
tamariki	Children
tangata whaikaha	Māori living with disabilities
taonga	Treasures
te ao Māori	The Māori world; often used to refer to Māori culture, values and practices
te ao wairua	The spiritual world or dimension
te reo Māori	Māori language
tikanga	Customs, values and cultural practices
tino rangatiratanga	Absolute sovereignty
urupā	Burial ground
wāhi tapu	Sacred or restricted place
wāhine Māori	Māori women
whakapapa	Genealogy, genealogical connection
whanaungatanga	Relationships, kinship; a sense of family-like connection
whānau	Family, wider family-like group
wharehau	Meeting house, main building of a marae