



**FOUNDATION
NORTH**
*Te Kaitiaki Pūtea o
Tāmaki o Tai Tokerau*

Understanding the Landscape of Auckland & Northland:

An Evidence Review

July 2018

Written by the Centre for Social Impact

Executive summary

This report summarises the key findings of an evidence review completed by the Centre for Social Impact to inform the implementation of Foundation North’s 2018 Strategic Plan. These key findings have been used to inform the development of funding priorities for the Foundation alongside the development of a broader range of positive outcomes that best contribute to the Foundation’s overall vision.

Snapshot of key findings

Population profile	<p>One-third of Māori living in New Zealand reside in Auckland and Northland. Auckland’s communities are relatively young, and very ethnically diverse. Northland’s population has an older than average age profile with potentially negative economic impacts.</p>	Population change	<p>Auckland’s population is growing quickly. Asian and Pacific populations are increasing the fastest across the region. The age profile of Māori and Pacific populations is getting younger, whilst that of NZ Europeans is getting older. The population is rapidly ageing, particularly in Northland.</p>
Income inequality and deprivation	<p>Addressing inequalities improves outcomes for everyone. Income inequality, rather than average personal income, drives a range of wellbeing outcomes. There are significant wealth gaps in New Zealand, with Māori and Pacific most affected by inequalities in net worth and socio-economic deprivation.</p>	Economic wellbeing	<p>Northland’s economy is fragile and GDP per capita is low. This impacting median incomes, unemployment, and youth who are not in education, employment or training. Auckland’s economy is stronger. Whilst median incomes are higher, there is still a large number of people with low incomes.</p>
Social cohesion	<p>Addressing inequalities and providing opportunities for communities to connect and participate can strengthen social cohesion. Belonging and having access to social support networks is a key issue in Auckland. Life satisfaction is an issue in Northland.</p>	Education	<p>Education is a determinant of future socio-economic wellbeing. NCEA achievement rates, student transience and early childhood education participation are key issues in Northland and South Auckland. Māori and Pacific educational outcomes have improved, but the gap hasn’t closed.</p>
Children and young people	<p>Children with two or more risk factors have worse outcomes.</p> <p>Northland and South Auckland are areas with greater numbers of children and young people considered to be at risk.</p>	Housing	<p>Homelessness and housing affordability are significant issues in Auckland and Northland. Income inequality is an underlying cause. Māori, Pacific, under 25s and new migrants are disproportionately affected by severe housing deprivation. Home ownership and sustainable tenancies can support social cohesion.</p>
Environmental wellbeing	<p>Declining environmental wellbeing impacts everyone. These impacts can worsen existing social inequalities.</p> <p>Key regional issues include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Biodiversity loss - Water quality - Impacts of climate change on communities. 	Community sector	<p>Key trends/issues are challenging the sector’s ability to deliver impact:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Funding pressures from changes in government contracting - Financial sustainability - Increasing community need - Responding to diversity.

Key findings

1. Population profile

(i) Why is population data an important indicator?

- Analysing population data – including population size, age structure and ethnicity – can help to identify current and future trends and the presence of inequalities that are affecting the wellbeing of communities.
- Understanding the diversity profile of a region can also support organisations to consider and develop appropriate cultural competencies and engagement strategies.

(ii) What are the regional trends and issues?

- Northland has a population of 171,400 (3.6% of New Zealand's population). Auckland has a population of 1,614,400 (34% of New Zealand's population).
Source: Statistics New Zealand, 2017a.


- Māori make up a quarter of Northland's population (26% or 44,928 people). This equates to 7.5% of New Zealand's total Māori population. Māori make up 11% (169,800) of the Auckland region's population. Auckland's Māori population accounts for 25% of New Zealand's total Māori population. Auckland and Northland's largest iwi have yet to complete Treaty settlements.
Sources: Statistics New Zealand, 2016a; Office of Treaty Settlements, 2017.

- The age profile of Auckland is younger than the New Zealand average. The largest concentration of young people in Auckland is in Waitakere, Manukau and Manurewa-Papakura.
Source: Statistics New Zealand, 2016a.

- Auckland has one of the most diverse populations in the world. Nearly 40% were born overseas, compared to 25% nationally. Two-thirds of New Zealand's total Asian and Pacific populations, and more than half of New Zealand's Middle Eastern, Latin American and African populations, live in Auckland. Ethnic profiles vary significantly between local board areas.
Sources: Statistics New Zealand, 2013; Ministry of Business, Innovation & Enterprise (MBIE), 2015a.

- Northland has an age profile that is older than the national average - with 18.3% of people aged 65 years and over, compared with 14.3% nationally. This trend is set to increase (see section 2), meaning that the current gap in the number of working-age people could grow.
Source: Statistics NZ, 2013.


Figure 1: Completed Treaty settlements and current negotiations



Age group	New Zealand	Auckland
Median	38 years	35 years
Over 65s	14.3%	11.5%
Under 15s	20.4%	20%

Auckland's diversity

- 40% of population born overseas
- 39% of overseas born are Asian
- 30% speak more than one language
- 220 recorded ethnic groups
- Ōtara-Papatoetoe, Māngere-Ōtāhuhu and Manurewa are the most diverse local board areas



2. Population profile

(i) Why is population change an important indicator?


- 1) Analysing population change trends can help to identify issues that communities in the future may face.
- 2) As the characteristics of populations change, this can have direct impacts on a wide range of community issues. Net migration, changing diversity and shifting age structures may impact social cohesion. Population growth may impact on housing availability and increase environmental pressures through urbanisation. An ageing population may necessitate structural changes to the provision of aged care; and a declining working-age population may cause issues related to economic wellbeing. (OECD, 2017a).
- 3) There can be positive impacts from population change that can help to make communities stronger and more vibrant. For example, migration can enhance a community's cultural vibrancy, and an ageing population can contribute to society through an increase in volunteering and a strengthening of community networks. (Statistics New Zealand, 2009).

(i) What are the regional trends and issues?


1) Auckland's population has grown at a faster rate than the New Zealand average - by 18% compared to 12% nationally (2006-2016). This growth is set to continue, with a 40% increase over the next 20 years (600,000 more people by 2038). This data is highly conservative, assuming immigration rates drop to one-third of current levels by 2028. *Source: Statistics New Zealand, 2017b.*

Area	Growth by 2038
Western Auckland	38%
Central Auckland	30%
Northern Auckland	24%
Southern Auckland	23%


2) Auckland's population growth will mean almost 200,000 additional households in the region. This will have a significant impact on housing infrastructure. *Source: Statistics New Zealand, 2017b.*



3) 70% of the growth in Auckland's population between 2018 and 2038 will comprise Asian (50%) and Pacific (20%) populations. *Source: Statistics New Zealand, 2017b.*



4) Northland's ethnicity will be 40% Māori by 2038, an increase of 10%. As with Auckland, the Asian population (58% increase) and Pasifika population (105% increase) will experience the largest overall growth, and form 11% of Northland's population by 2038. *Source: Statistics New Zealand, 2017b.*



<p>5) By 2038, Auckland's and Northland's Māori and Pacific populations will have a much younger age profile than that of NZ Europeans. Source: Statistics New Zealand, 2017b.</p>	Ethnic group	Auckland median age		Northland median age	
		2018	2038	2018	2038
	NZ European	39.4	43.1	46.5	50.1
	Māori	24.7	28.8	25.4	29.2
	Pacific	23.9	27.9	17.9	20.1
Asian	31.7	37.4	31.4	36.6	
<p>6) The number of people over 65 in Auckland will more than double in the next 25 years (2018-2043). The ageing population will have implications for aged care provision. Source: Statistics New Zealand, 2017b.</p>	Year	Population 15-39 years		Population over 65 years	
	1996	255,600		112,300	
	2018	323,700		208,000	
	2033	378,800		353,600	
	2043	371,200		432,800	
<p>7) Northland's population will grow 10% in the next 20 years (2018-2038), and 100% of this growth is projected to be people over 65 years (this equates to a 65% increase from current levels). This will also have implications for aged care provision. Source: Statistics New Zealand, 2017b.</p>	Year	Population 15-39 years		Population over 65 years	
	1996	39,000		16,900	
	2018	46,400		34,900	
	2033	47,800		53,800	
	2043	47,700		59,400	

3. Income inequality and deprivation

(i) Why are income inequality and deprivation important indicators?

- 1) The latest research shows that the greatest predictor of health and social problems is inequality of income, not personal income. International evidence shows that there is no correlation between average income and health and social wellbeing. Therefore, increasing average income, without addressing income inequality, will have no effect on wellbeing outcomes.
(Wilkinson, R. G., & Pickett, K., 2010).
- 2) The presence of income inequalities can impact on community cohesion, health outcomes, infant mortality, social capital and mobility, national economic stability, educational attainment and life satisfaction.
(Wilkinson, R. G., & Pickett, K., 2010; Ministry of Social Development (MSD), 2017a; The Equality Trust, 2017).
- 3) Inequalities are a driver behind a range of important life outcomes, so threaten future wellbeing and prosperity. Inequalities in education can lead to income inequality. This then perpetuates existing cycles of poverty and causes intergenerational disadvantage.
(Chartered Accountants of Australia and New Zealand, 2017).
- 4) Addressing inequalities is a priority globally, and for national and local government.
(United Nations, n.d.; Local Government New Zealand, 2016).
- 5) It is also likely that future trends in population change will increase inequalities, for example, between age groups and ethnic groups. Changes in technology are also likely to increase inequalities, through increased automation and employment skills premiums and gaps.
(International Monetary Fund, 2015).

(ii) What are the regional trends and issues?

- 1) There are significant wealth and opportunity inequalities in New Zealand, with 10% of New Zealanders accounting for 60% of the country's wealth. Inequalities disproportionately affect Māori and Pacific; whose median net worth is 10-20% of the median net worth of NZ Europeans.
Source: Statistics New Zealand, 2016b.

Ethnic group	Median net worth (2015)
NZ European	\$114,000
Asian	\$33,000
Māori	\$23,000
Pacific	\$12,000

- 2) Income inequalities can impact on the wellbeing of children. New Zealand ranks 21 out of 42 OECD countries for child poverty. Children from the groups listed in the table (adjacent) are proportionally more likely to live in low-income families. This in turn affects their chances of positive outcomes as adults.
Source: MSD, 2017a; OECD, 2017b.

Children are more likely to be from low-income families if they:
Are Māori or Pacific
Are from sole-parent households
Have parents with no or low qualifications
Live in rental accommodation
Live in households where the main source of income is benefits

- 3) Socio-economic deprivation is highest in the Far North and South Auckland. Half of the Far North's population live in the highest areas of deprivation (deciles 9-10 of the NZDep 2013 Index of Deprivation).¹
Source: University of Otago, n.d.

Region	% living in decile 9-10 communities	# living in decile 9-10 communities
Far North	50%	28,026
Papakura	41%	20,286
Manukau	40%	140,241
Whangārei	30%	23,172
Kaipara	26%	4,872

¹ The NZDep2013 Index of Deprivation is an area-based measure of socio-economic deprivation in New Zealand. It is calculated using data from nine 2013 census variables, including access to communications; household income; benefit income; employment; qualifications; home ownership; single-parent households; overcrowding; and access to a car. For more information see a University of Otago report on the NZDep2013 Index.

<p>4) In total, 673,000 people in Auckland and Northland experience multiple deprivation.² <i>Source: Statistics New Zealand, 2016b. The University of Auckland, n.d.</i></p>	Decile NZ Index of Multiple Deprivation²	Population Auckland & Northland																																																																																
	10 (worst)	213,714																																																																																
	9	176,493																																																																																
	8	152,541																																																																																
	7	130,245																																																																																
<p>5) Māori and Pacific are disproportionately affected by socio-economic deprivation in Auckland. Nearly 60% of Auckland's Pasifika population and 40% of Auckland's Māori population live in the most deprived communities (deciles 9-10). <i>Source: Auckland Regional Public Health Service, 2014.</i></p>	Ethnic group	% living in decile 9-10 communities																																																																																
	Total Auckland	20%																																																																																
	Pacific	60%																																																																																
	Māori	40%																																																																																
<p>6) New Zealand's economic growth is negatively affected by inequalities. The graph (adjacent) shows the impact of inequalities (1985-2005) on subsequent cumulative economic growth (1990-2010). This negative impact was higher for New Zealand than for other OECD countries. <i>Source: OECD, 2014.</i></p>	<p>Figure 2: Estimated consequences of changes in inequality (1985-2005) on subsequent cumulative growth (1990-2010). <i>Growth rate, in percentages</i></p> <table border="1"> <caption>Estimated data for Figure 2: Growth rate, in percentages</caption> <thead> <tr> <th>Country</th> <th>Without impact of inequality (Orange)</th> <th>Impact of inequality (Blue)</th> <th>Actual (Black Diamond)</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr><td>Ireland</td><td>2</td><td>60</td><td>62</td></tr> <tr><td>United Kingdom</td><td>2</td><td>48</td><td>50</td></tr> <tr><td>Netherlands</td><td>-2</td><td>40</td><td>38</td></tr> <tr><td>Sweden</td><td>-2</td><td>40</td><td>38</td></tr> <tr><td>Finland</td><td>-2</td><td>40</td><td>38</td></tr> <tr><td>Norway</td><td>-2</td><td>40</td><td>38</td></tr> <tr><td>Austria</td><td>-2</td><td>30</td><td>28</td></tr> <tr><td>Turkey</td><td>-2</td><td>30</td><td>28</td></tr> <tr><td>Belgium</td><td>-2</td><td>30</td><td>28</td></tr> <tr><td>New Zealand</td><td>-15</td><td>15</td><td>0</td></tr> <tr><td>United States</td><td>-2</td><td>30</td><td>28</td></tr> <tr><td>Germany</td><td>-2</td><td>30</td><td>28</td></tr> <tr><td>Denmark</td><td>-2</td><td>25</td><td>23</td></tr> <tr><td>Canada</td><td>-2</td><td>25</td><td>23</td></tr> <tr><td>France</td><td>-2</td><td>15</td><td>13</td></tr> <tr><td>Japan</td><td>-2</td><td>15</td><td>13</td></tr> <tr><td>Spain</td><td>-2</td><td>10</td><td>8</td></tr> <tr><td>Italy</td><td>-2</td><td>10</td><td>8</td></tr> <tr><td>Mexico</td><td>-10</td><td>10</td><td>0</td></tr> </tbody> </table>		Country	Without impact of inequality (Orange)	Impact of inequality (Blue)	Actual (Black Diamond)	Ireland	2	60	62	United Kingdom	2	48	50	Netherlands	-2	40	38	Sweden	-2	40	38	Finland	-2	40	38	Norway	-2	40	38	Austria	-2	30	28	Turkey	-2	30	28	Belgium	-2	30	28	New Zealand	-15	15	0	United States	-2	30	28	Germany	-2	30	28	Denmark	-2	25	23	Canada	-2	25	23	France	-2	15	13	Japan	-2	15	13	Spain	-2	10	8	Italy	-2	10	8	Mexico	-10	10	0
Country	Without impact of inequality (Orange)	Impact of inequality (Blue)	Actual (Black Diamond)																																																																															
Ireland	2	60	62																																																																															
United Kingdom	2	48	50																																																																															
Netherlands	-2	40	38																																																																															
Sweden	-2	40	38																																																																															
Finland	-2	40	38																																																																															
Norway	-2	40	38																																																																															
Austria	-2	30	28																																																																															
Turkey	-2	30	28																																																																															
Belgium	-2	30	28																																																																															
New Zealand	-15	15	0																																																																															
United States	-2	30	28																																																																															
Germany	-2	30	28																																																																															
Denmark	-2	25	23																																																																															
Canada	-2	25	23																																																																															
France	-2	15	13																																																																															
Japan	-2	15	13																																																																															
Spain	-2	10	8																																																																															
Italy	-2	10	8																																																																															
Mexico	-10	10	0																																																																															

² The New Zealand Index of Multiple Deprivation has identified areas of deprivation by using routinely collected data from government departments and the census. It comprises 28 indicators grouped into seven domains of deprivation: Employment, Income, Crime, Housing, Health, Education and Access to Services. The highest weighting is given to Employment and Income (28% weighting each); followed by Health and Education (14% weighting each). For more information see The University of Auckland website. www.fmhs.auckland.ac.nz/en/soph/about/our-departments/epidemiology-and-biostatistics/research/hgd/research-themes/imd.html

4. Economic wellbeing


(i) Why is economic wellbeing an important indicator?

- 1) Economic wellbeing has a direct impact on labour force participation, hours of work, unemployment, joblessness and salary rises. Addressing economic wellbeing can therefore reduce income inequalities associated with low labour force participation, unemployment, joblessness and low salaries, and as a result can positively impact social and community wellbeing.
(Statistics New Zealand, n.d./b).
- 2) The Ministry of Business, Innovation and Employment prioritises the relationship between economic development and household income, job opportunities and housing affordability (income to cost ratio).
(MBIE, 2017a).
- 3) Regional economic wellbeing and development is of particular importance to Māori, “because of the relatively large proportion of Māori living outside the main centres.”
(MBIE, 2017a, p7).

(ii) What are the regional trends and issues?

- 1) Economic growth in New Zealand has been faster than in most OECD countries. Despite this, low productivity growth has contributed to income levels that are 20% below the OECD average.
Sources: MBIE, 2015b; New Zealand Productivity Commission, 2014 (graph).

Figure 3: Actual gap in GDP per capita versus predicted gap - OECD countries and OECD average



- 2) Job availability in Northland is low. Low labour intensity industries account for 30% of GDP (agriculture and manufacturing), and the region has the lowest GDP per capita in New Zealand.
Source: Statistics New Zealand, 2013.

Region	GDP per capita
Northland	\$36,500
National	\$54,178

- 3) Auckland’s economy is strong, driven primarily by professional, financial and ICT services.
Source: Statistics New Zealand, 2013.

Region	GDP per capita
Auckland	\$58,717
National	\$54,178

- 3) Northland’s poor economic wellbeing as a region impacts negatively on employment opportunities, unemployment and income inequalities. These impacts disproportionately affect Māori.
Source: Statistics New Zealand, 2013.

Income/Work indicators	Northland	NZ average
Unemployment	10%	7%
Unemployment – Māori	20%	16%
Median income	\$23,400	\$28,500
Median income – Māori	\$19,100	\$22,500

<p>5) These issues have contributed to Northland having the highest rate of young people not in education, employment or training (Y-NEET) in New Zealand. Source: <i>Statistics New Zealand, 2013.</i></p>	Northland's Y-NEET youth		
	16.8% of young people		
	5,000 young people		
<p>6) Auckland's economic wellbeing offers employment growth and means that the median income is higher than the national average. However, there are still over half a million people in the region earning below \$20,000 per annum. Source: <i>Statistics New Zealand, 2013.</i></p>	Income/Work indicators	Auckland	NZ average
	Median income	\$29,600	\$28,500
	Earning <\$20,000	39%	38%
<p>7) Auckland's rate of young people not in education, employment or training (Y-NEET) is lower than the New Zealand average; however, this still equates to 27,000 young people. Source: <i>Statistics New Zealand, 2013.</i></p>	Northland's Y-NEET youth		
	16.8% of young people		
	5,000 young people		
<p>8) Globally, place-based community economic development (CED) initiatives have been developed in response to the correlation between income inequality and social deprivation. CED, including social enterprise, can provide opportunities to "build a new economy" and contribute to regional community sustainability. Sources: <i>Jennings, D., 2014; MBIE, 2015b; Ākina Foundation, n.d.</i></p>	Community economic development opportunities		
	Community housing		
	Social enterprise		
	Community-owned buildings and assets		
	Iwi enterprise and the Māori economy		
Pacific social enterprise			


5. Social cohesion

(i) Why is social cohesion an important indicator?

- 1) Social cohesion is an indicator of how strong, inclusive and equitable in opportunity a society is.
(Auckland Council, 2015).
- 2) Social cohesion can be measured through indicators such as income inequality, civic participation, trust in communities, government and other institutions, life satisfaction, feelings of belonging, inclusion and connectedness and social mobility i.e. opportunities to move out of disadvantage.
(OECD, n.d.).
- 3) The Treasury highlights the importance of social capital for living standards - “when there are high levels of participation, interconnection and cohesion, there are correspondingly high levels of social capability; that is, a high level of the ability of various interests in society to co-operate towards common goals.”
(Treasury, 2001, p24).
- 4) Life satisfaction is a key component of social cohesion. Many of the indicators of life satisfaction for Māori are the same as those for non-Māori (e.g. health status, income adequacy, trust); however, whanaungatanga (relationships) plays a greater role in life satisfaction for Māori than it does for other population groups.
(Statistics New Zealand, 2015c).

(ii) What are the regional trends and issues?

1) New Zealand ranks ninth out of 30 OECD countries in terms of trust indicators. Over two-thirds (69%) of New Zealanders express trust in other people, which is above the OECD average of 59%. <i>Source: OECD, 2016a.</i>	OECD country	% Popⁿ expressing trust	Rank in OECD
	Denmark	89%	1/30
	New Zealand	69%	9/30
	Australia	64%	12/30
	OECD total	59%	
2) Low levels of life satisfaction and sense of purpose are issues in Northland compared to the rest of New Zealand. Northlanders rank well in terms of their sense of belonging, have lower levels of loneliness and feel that they have good access to support during a crisis. <i>Source: Statistics New Zealand, 2015b.</i>	Indicator	% Popⁿ	Rank in New Zealand
	Life satisfaction (7/10 or above)	80.2%	15/16
	Sense of purpose (7/10 or above)	84.8%	14/16
	Sense of belonging	95.9%	5/16
	Loneliness (never felt lonely in past 4 weeks)	71.4%	4/16
	Social support (access to support in crisis)	97.1%	7/16
3) There are issues with social cohesion in Auckland. Aucklanders have a below average sense of purpose and sense of belonging. They also have the second lowest level of social support (i.e. access to support in times of crisis) in the country. <i>Source: Statistics New Zealand, 2015b.</i>	Indicator	% Popⁿ	Rank in New Zealand
	Life satisfaction (7/10 or above)	82.7%	7/16
	Sense of purpose (7/10 or above)	82.9%	12/16
	Sense of belonging	93.7%	12/16
	Loneliness (never felt lonely in past 4 weeks)	70%	6/16
	Social support (access to support in crisis)	94.9%	15/16

<p>4) Where communities have opportunities to connect, engage in community planning and decision-making and participate in community-based activities (sports, recreation, arts, cultural events and other community activities), social cohesion can be strengthened. <i>Source: Centre for Social Impact, 2017.</i></p>	<p>Key enablers of social cohesion</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reducing inequalities Supporting participation Community and social networks that support belonging and inclusion Community-led development Equity of access to key community opportunities (housing, education, employment, health services, community activities) 										
<p>5) Levels of life satisfaction for Māori, Pacific, and to a lesser extent, Asian populations, are lower than those for NZ European populations. This challenges social cohesion in New Zealand’s communities. <i>Source: Statistics New Zealand, 2015b.</i></p>	<p>Life satisfaction above or below total population by ethnicity</p>  <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Ethnicity</th> <th>Life Satisfaction (Above or Below Total Population)</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Asian</td> <td>-1.1</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Pacific</td> <td>-4.5</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Māori</td> <td>-4.7</td> </tr> <tr> <td>NZ European</td> <td>1.5</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Ethnicity	Life Satisfaction (Above or Below Total Population)	Asian	-1.1	Pacific	-4.5	Māori	-4.7	NZ European	1.5
Ethnicity	Life Satisfaction (Above or Below Total Population)										
Asian	-1.1										
Pacific	-4.5										
Māori	-4.7										
NZ European	1.5										
<p>6) Evidence shows that key issues for older people include loneliness, social isolation, elder abuse and neglect and quality of care. For older Aucklanders, data indicates that key issues include feeling valued, feeling safe, feeling that there is a sense of community, income inequality and perceptions of housing affordability. <i>Source: Age Concern, 2016; Auckland Council, 2017a.</i></p>	<p>Older Aucklanders – key issues</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1 in 5 think housing costs are unaffordable 60% feel a sense of community in their local area 60% feel safe 41% feel that older people are valued in Auckland Median personal income for over 65s is \$20,900, compared to \$29,600 for over 15s 										

6. Education

(i) Why is education an important indicator?

- 1) Education is a key determinant of a person's future social and economic wellbeing. Educational outcomes can determine social development, future employment opportunities, income and economic wellbeing, and overall personal wellbeing including health and social capital. (Education Counts, 2013).
- 2) New Zealanders with no qualifications have an unemployment rate 48% higher than those whose highest qualification is a school qualification. Average earnings are 24% higher for those with a tertiary qualification. (Education Counts, 2013).
- 3) Educational attainment can be influenced by a range of factors including early learning, school transience, stand-downs and suspensions and wider factors including family income. (Education Counts 2017a, 2017b).

(ii) What are the regional trends and issues?

1) Student transience is higher in Northland than any other region in New Zealand. There are also pockets of high transience in South Auckland. <i>Source: Education Counts, 2017b.</i>	Region	Transience rate per 1,000 students	
	National	5.0	
	Northland	19.4	
	Auckland	5.5	
	- Papakura	23.4	
	- Manurewa	21.8	
2) NCEA Level 1 achievement rates are low in Northland, South Auckland and Tāmaki, compared to the national average. <i>Source: Education Counts, n.d./a</i>	Region	NCEA Level 1 % achieved	
	National	88.4%	
	Northland	85.1%	
	- Far North	83.7%	
	Auckland	90.4%	
	- Papakura	76.8%	
	- Manurewa	77.2%	
	- Maungakiekie-Tāmaki	81.1%	
3) NCEA level 1 achievement rates are lower for Māori and Pacific students across New Zealand – and relatively lower for Māori in Auckland and for Pacific in Northland. Rates are improving, but the gap between Māori and Pacific students, and non-Māori and non-Pacific students, is not reducing. <i>Source: Education Counts, n.d./a</i>	Region	Māori NCEA L1	Pacific NCEA L1
	National	76.4%	85.2%
	Northland	76.2%	79.7%
	Auckland	74.5%	85.8%
4) Northland's rates of stand-down, suspension, exclusion and expulsion are 1.5 to 3 times the national average. Stand-down rates are most elevated for Māori boys. <i>Sources: Education Counts, 2017a; Salvation Army, 2015.</i>	Region / student type	Stand-down rates per 1,000 students	
	National / All	5.0	
	Northland / All	19.4	
	National / Māori	30.5	
	Northland / Māori	48.8	
	National / Boys	30.5	
	Northland / Boys	44.8	

<p>5) Internationally, New Zealand rates well for early childhood education (11th out of 34 OECD countries). However, rates of participation in early childhood education are a concern in the Far North, South Auckland and Tāmaki. Participation rates are also lower for Māori and Pacific children across the region.</p> <p>Sources: <i>Education Counts, 2017c; OECD, 2016c.</i></p>	Region		Prior participation in early childhood education			
	National		96.8%			
	Māngere-Ōtāhuhu		89.2%			
	Far North		92.6%			
	Manurewa		92.9%			
	Maungakiekie-Tāmaki		93.2%			
Ōtara-Papatoetoe		93.2%				
<p>6) There are 455 students enrolled in alternative education in Northland and Auckland, which represents 0.5% of the total student population (2016). From 2012-2015 the number of enrolled students decreased annually. In 2016, however, enrolment numbers were the highest since 2012. Alternative education students are more likely to be male.</p> <p>Source: <i>Education Counts, n.d./a</i></p>	Region/Gender	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016
	Northland/M	65	60	57	58	60
	Northland/F	25	28	24	18	32
	Auckland/M	298	216	164	164	219
	Auckland/F	163	139	111	111	144
	Total	551	443	356	351	455

7. Children and young people

(i) Why is child and youth wellbeing an important indicator?

- 1) The wellbeing of children and young people can significantly influence their potential for success as adults. Children who have their needs met from the womb to school are more likely to become healthy, resilient and contributing adults. (Heckman, J., University of Chicago, 2008).
- 2) The first five years of life are critical to future wellbeing. Evidence shows that removing barriers and providing effective early interventions give the greatest social return on investment. This is best achieved through supporting parents and children aged 0-3 years. (Heckman, J., University of Chicago, 2008).
- 3) The wellbeing of children depends largely on the capabilities, wellbeing and situations of the adults around them and the extent to which their lives are affected by issues such as poverty, a lack of support, social isolation, stress and disadvantage. (Center on the Developing Child, Harvard University, n.d.).

(ii) What are the regional trends and issues?

1) The Treasury has identified four key risk factors ³ that are predictive of longer-term life outcomes and challenges for children 0-5 and 6-14 years. Children with two or more of these risk factors are significantly more likely to experience poor outcomes as adults. Source: Treasury, 2015.	Potential poor outcomes as adults	Increased likelihood (with 2+ risk factors)	
	Contact with youth justice by 18 years	X 7	
	Leave school with no qualification	X 3	
	Receive benefits for 2+ years by age 21	X 6	
	Spend time in jail by age 21	X 10	
	Receive benefits for 5+ years when 25-34	X 4	
2) The average projected Oranga Tamariki, Department of Corrections and benefits costs (by age 35 years) associated with poor outcomes for children with two or more risk factors are significant. As children experiencing risk age, the projected costs increase. Source: Treasury, 2015.	Child/Risk	Projected costs (average)	
	0-5 with <2 risk factors	\$45,637	
	0-5 with 2+ risk factors	\$184,456	
	6-14 with <2 risk factors	\$46,544	
	6-14 with 2+ risk factors	\$205,014	
3) One in four children in Northland has two or more risk factors. In the Far North, this increases to almost one in three. Whilst Auckland's children are generally at lower risk than average, there are areas in South Auckland where higher numbers of children are at greater risk. Source: Education Counts, n.d./a	Region	% 0-5 yrs (2+ risk factors)	% 6-14 yrs (2+ risk factors)
	New Zealand	13%	14%
	Northland	25%	26%
	- Far North	30%	30%
	Auckland	11%	12%
	- Manurewa-Papakura	23%	26%
	- Manukau	17%	21%
4) Treasury has identified five target risk populations for young people aged 15-19 years, and five for young people aged 20-24 years ⁴ . These target populations are those at highest risk of poor transitions and outcomes as adults. Source: Treasury, 2015.	Increased likelihood of poor outcomes, including:		
	Not achieving Level 2 qualification		
	Being on a benefit long term		
	Receiving a prison or community sentence		
	Needing to access mental health services		
5) The average projected Oranga Tamariki, Department of Corrections, and benefits costs (by age 35 years) associated with poor outcomes for young people in one or more of the target risk populations are significant. The projected costs for older young people (20-24 years) in one or more of the target risk populations are significantly higher. Source: Treasury, 2015.	Age/Risk	Average projected costs	
	15-19 with no risk factors	\$48,725	
	15-19 with 1+ risk factors	\$236,754	
	20-24 with no risk factors	\$45,524	
	20-24 with 1+ risk factors	\$304,705	


³ The risk factors for children identified by Treasury are: having a Child Youth & Family (CYF) finding of abuse or neglect; being mostly supported by benefits since birth; having a parent with a prison or community sentence; having a mother with no formal qualifications

⁴ The five target risk populations for young people aged 15-19 are: teenage boys with Youth Justice or Corrections histories; teenagers with health, disability issues or special needs; teenage girls supported by benefits; mental health service users with stand-down or CYF histories; and young people who have experienced significant childhood disadvantage. The five target risk populations for young people aged 20-24 are: young offenders with a custodial sentence; young offenders with a community sentence and CYF history; jobseekers in poor health with CYF histories; sole parents not in full-time employment with CYF histories; and long-term disability beneficiaries.

6) One in four young people aged 15-19 years in Northland is in a target risk population. In the Far North, one in five young people aged 20-24 is in a target risk population – more than twice the national average. Whilst Auckland’s children are generally at lower risk than average, there are areas in South Auckland where high proportions of young people are at risk.
 Source: Treasury, 2015.

Region	% 15-19 yrs at risk	% 20-24 yrs at risk
New Zealand	14%	8%
Northland	23%	16%
- Far North	26%	19%
Auckland	11%	6%
- Manurewa-Papakura	22%	12%
- Maungakiekie-Tāmaki	17%	8%

7) Youth transitions in Northland and South Auckland are a concern. Northland has a higher percentage of long-term Y-NEET youth (those not in education, employment or training) than any other region, across both age groups. One-quarter (26%) of 20-24 year olds are long-term Y-NEET. One-third (32%) of 20-24 year olds in the Far North are long-term Y-NEET. Manurewa-Papakura has the highest proportions of long-term Y-NEET youth aged 20-24 years in the Auckland region (23%).
 Source: Treasury, 2015.



8. Housing

(i) Why is housing an important indicator?

- 1) Across New Zealand, many communities are currently experiencing housing issues, including affordability to buy and rent, availability (supply), and suitability (quality). Without accessible, affordable and suitable housing, people are more likely to experience poor health and socio-economic outcomes, and/or are less likely to address existing issues such as addictions, joblessness or mental health conditions. *(Housing First Auckland, 2017).*
- 2) Issues with housing affordability, supply and quality are key structural or wider system issues that can cause significant housing deprivation i.e. homelessness. Income inequality is another key structural factor that can affect housing affordability and homelessness. *(Auckland Council, 2017b).*
- 3) Homelessness is officially defined as having no options to acquire safe and secure housing. Those at highest risk of homelessness include people with no or low incomes, addictions, mental health issues or emotional trauma (e.g. family violence or state care experience) and those without support networks. *(Auckland Council, 2017b).*
- 4) Research suggests that home owners – and renters with sustainable tenancies - have more social capital, as they are able to put down social roots and invest time in their communities. As housing affordability decreases, it “threatens to erode New Zealand’s strong social capital (a measure of how strong society is).” *(Chartered Accountants of Australia and New Zealand, 2017).*

(ii) What are the regional trends and issues?

1) New Zealand has the highest level of homelessness per capita in the OECD. There are 40,000 people living on the streets, in emergency housing, or in shelter that is considered sub-standard. This equates to almost 1% of the country’s population. <i>Sources: Yale University, 2017; OECD, 2017c.</i>	OECD country and rank	Homeless as % of pop^a
	1. New Zealand	0.94%
	2. Czech Republic	0.65%
	3. Australia	0.47%
	4. Canada	0.44%
	5. Germany	0.42%
2) The 2013 census showed that there were 20,296 people homeless in Auckland. This number is estimated to have increased to 23,409 in 2017. Both of these figures do not include those living in uninhabitable housing, such as sheds and garages, which is difficult to measure accurately. The number of homeless people is increasing by approximately 1,000 per year (since 2013, and projected to 2020). <i>Source: Treasury, 2015.</i>	Homeless category	2013 (pop^a)
	Sleeping rough (street, car)	771
	Emergency accommodation (refuge, marae, hotels etc.)	3,175
	Temporary accommodation private (couch surfers)	16,350
	Uninhabitable housing (garages, sheds)	Unknown
3) The cost of emergency housing grants and accommodation-related hardship grants is rising. Government is currently spending \$140,000 per day on emergency housing provision. <i>Source: MSD, 2017b.</i>	Government spending (NZ total)	Cost at June 2017
	Accommodation supplement	\$20 million/week
	Emergency housing grants	\$12.6 million/quarter
	Hardship grants related to accommodation costs	\$16 million/quarter
4) Housing affordability for first home buyers is a significant issue in Northland and Auckland, with more than 70% of households having below average incomes after housing costs. <i>Source: MBIE, 2017b.</i>	Region	% with < average income after housing costs
	National	77%
	Northland	83%
	Auckland	82%
5) Housing affordability for renters is a significant issue in Northland, and in parts of Auckland – particularly South Auckland. <i>Source: MBIE, 2017b.</i>	Region	% with < average income after housing costs
	National	60%
	Northland	74%
	Auckland	56%
	- Manukau	71%
	- Manurewa-Papakura	66%

<p>6) Homelessness is a significant issue in Northland too. It has the third highest rate of ‘severe housing deprivation’ (homelessness) in New Zealand, and the Far North District has the second highest rate of any territorial authority in New Zealand. Source: <i>University of Otago, 2013.</i></p>	Region	Severe housing deprivation per 1,000 popⁿ (2013)
	Auckland	14 per 1,000
	Gisbourne	14 per 1,000
	Northland	13 per 1,000
	- <i>Far North</i>	18 per 1,000
<p>7) Young people under 25 years, Māori and Pacific and new migrants are over-represented in ‘severely housing deprived’ (homeless) populations across New Zealand Source: <i>University of Otago, 2013.</i></p>	Population group	Prevalence in severely housing deprived popⁿ
	Under 25s	51%
	New migrants	<1 year in NZ = 6% >5 years in NZ = 0.8%
	Pacific	10 x that of NZ Europeans
	Māori	5 x that of NZ Europeans

9. Environmental wellbeing

(i) Why is the environment an important indicator?

- 1) A healthy natural environment can support community wellbeing. Addressing environmental pressures, unsustainable land use and biodiversity loss can help to give communities access to quality green spaces and waterways and create opportunities for community enterprise.
(Local Government New Zealand, 2016).
- 2) The environment impacts on everyone. The health of the environment influences land use, agriculture and industry, recreation, tourism, cultural practices and other social indicators of wellbeing.
(Local Government New Zealand, 2016).
- 3) Key shifts and changes to the environment will have significant potential to cause unequal impacts on communities, localities and generations, depending on how we respond to them. This can exacerbate existing inequalities and associated outcomes relating to health, income, housing, education and social cohesion.
(Local Government New Zealand, 2016).
- 4) For Māori the concept of kaitiakitanga (stewardship, protection and guardianship) is of cultural significance. The Conservation Act 1987 gives effect to the principles of the Treaty of Waitangi and recognises the importance of partnership with tangata whenua to enhance the conservation of resources and heritage.
(Department of Conservation, 2007).

(ii) What are the regional trends and issues?

1) National biodiversity trends are concerning. A third of native species has been lost, the threat status is getting worse for 40 species and native land cover is decreasing. Source: Statistics NZ, n.d./c.	Biodiversity indicator	Data	
	Loss of native species to date	32%	
	Threat status change 2002-2005	Worse for 40 species	
	Native land cover 1997-2002	Loss of 16,500ha	
2) Communities' ability to steward and future-proof our natural environment will be impacted by climate change. Climate change-related events (droughts, floods, fires and cyclones) will impact community wellbeing and resilience. Climate change will also impact on key industries such as agriculture and will therefore affect economic wellbeing. Source: Local Government NZ, 2016.	Key impacts of climate change		
	Flooding in urban areas		
	Potential for 'climate change refugees' from the Pacific region		
	Increase in fires, floods, droughts and cyclones affecting communities		
3) Major environmental challenges in Auckland include the declining health of marine and freshwater ecosystems, including urban streams, biodiversity pressure from urban expansion, soil pollution and air quality pressure from population increases. Source: Auckland Council, 2017c.	Council priorities		
	Native species protection		
	Waste reduction		
	Other priorities include reducing: air pollution emissions, marine sediments, water consumption, vulnerable ecosystems		
4) Major environmental challenges in Northland include maintaining and enhancing water quality for swimming and shellfish food collection, flood protection in urban Kaitiāia and Whangārei, and sustainable land management. Source: Northland Regional Council, 2015	Council priorities		
	Flood protection		
	26 river catchments at unacceptable risk of flooding		
	Other priorities include: farm water quality, air quality, improving regionally significant spaces, pest control		
5) Community satisfaction with the state of coasts, rivers and lakes is declining in Auckland and Northland, and is particularly low in Northland. Source: Statistics NZ, n.d./d.	Region	Satisfaction with coasts, rivers, lakes	
		2008	2012
	National	72.4%	72.7%
	Auckland	80.3%	73.5%
	Northland	74.2%	69.3%
6) Community satisfaction with the state of green spaces including forests, bush reserves and other green spaces is increasing, but is still below the national average in Northland. Perceived ease of access to green spaces is also lower in Auckland. Source: Statistics NZ, n.d./d.	Region	Satisfaction with green spaces	
		2008	2012
	National	82.7%	84.2%
	Auckland	81.6%	86.6%
	Northland	78.1%	80.5%

10. Community sector

(i) Why is the health of the community sector an important indicator?

- 1) A strong and sustainable community sector can be an important support mechanism for a region's communities, providing long-term activities, events and services that enhance community vibrancy and wellbeing and address social inequalities. (Treasury, 2017).
- 2) The community and social sector landscape in New Zealand is in a period of change driven by new social investment approaches. If the sector is not positioned to overcome key barriers in responding to these changes, there is a greater likelihood of community needs and aspirations being unmet. (Treasury, 2017; Deloitte 2016).

(ii) What are the regional trends and issues?

<p>1) The government is pursuing a social investment approach, which involves a stronger focus on results and measuring impact. Service providers will need to overcome challenges to meet this approach effectively, including their capacity to define measurable outcomes and collect good evaluation data.</p> <p>Sources: Treasury, 2017; Deloitte, 2016.</p>	Social investment principles
	Targeted funding to high-risk populations
	Early intervention approach
	Increased focused on evidence
	Service-user centred design
<p>2) The community sector is facing significant challenges that relate to financial viability, including funding shortfalls, government contracting shifts, over-reliance on grants and increased compliance costs. Foundation North grantees (2015-16) identified funding and resources as their top two community challenges.</p> <p>Sources: ComVoices, 2016; Foundation North, 2016, 2017.</p>	Issues raised by interviewees:
	- Outcomes diluted if funding is too broad
	Top challenges identified by grantees:
<p>3) Wider community trends are also affecting the sector's capacity and capability to deliver impact – especially increased community inequalities that are driving an increased demand for services, and changing community diversity requiring new approaches and competencies across the sector.</p> <p>Sources: Foundation North, 2016, 2017.</p>	Issues raised by interviewees:
	- Increasing inequity in communities
	- Increasing diversity brings complexity
<p>4) Foundation North stakeholders identified capacity and capability development as critical to supporting better outcomes. Locally-led initiatives were also seen as important – along with building local capability to increase impact.</p> <p>Source: Foundation North, 2017.</p>	Top challenges identified by grantees:
	- Unable to meet needs
	- Poverty was the most identified challenge for grantees in the Far North and Manukau.
<p>5) Foundation North grantees identified their ability to engage communities, and the services/support that they provide as being their key strengths.</p> <p>Source: Foundation North, 2016</p>	Issues raised by interviewees:
	- Lack of capacity and capability
	- The need to support stronger capability for Pacific organisations
<p>6) Key stakeholders interviewed by Foundation North highlighted the importance of addressing sector fragmentation through convening and collaboration.</p> <p>Source: Foundation North, 2017.</p>	Top strengths identified by grantees:
	- Lack of training opportunities
	- Lack of support for volunteers
<p>7) Key stakeholders interviewed by Foundation North highlighted the importance of funding with a focus on need, and investing over the longer term to achieve transformational change.</p> <p>Source: Foundation North, 2017.</p>	Measuring impact is still a key challenge for most groups
	Interview quotes
	“Foundation North have a role in bringing groups together.” “Support collaboration across sectors”
	Interview quotes
	“Funders need to be in for the long term – ongoing support and engagement is important.” “[Prioritise] longer term initiatives, focused on transformational change.”

References

Population profile

1. Auckland Council (2014). Measuring Auckland's population density. Retrieved from: <http://knowledgeauckland.org.nz/assets/publications/Measuring-Aucklands-Population-Density-26052014-Complete.pdf>
2. Ministry of Business, Innovation and Employment (2015a). Migration and labour force trends Auckland overview 2015. Retrieved from: <http://www.mbie.govt.nz/info-services/immigration/migration-research-and-evaluation/migration-and-labour-force-trends/2015>
3. Office of Treaty Settlements (2017). 12 Month Progress Report 1 July 2016 – 30 June 2017. Retrieved from: <https://www.govt.nz/assets/Documents/OTS/12-month-progress-report-to-June-2017.pdf>
4. Statistics New Zealand (2013). Census 2013. Data retrieved from: <http://m.stats.govt.nz/Census/2013-census.aspx>
5. Statistics New Zealand (2016a). National population estimates as at 30 June 2016. Data retrieved from: http://www.stats.govt.nz/browse_for_stats/population/estimates_and_projections/NationalPopulationEstimates_HOTPA30Jun16.aspx
6. Statistics New Zealand (2017a). Population estimates and projections. Data retrieved from: http://www.stats.govt.nz/browse_for_stats/population/estimates_and_projections.aspx
7. Te Ara (2017). Māori New Zealanders – Iwi. Retrieved from: <https://teara.govt.nz/en/iwi>

Population change

8. Ministry of Social Development (2016). The Social Report 2016. Retrieved from: <http://socialreport.msd.govt.nz/health/health-expectancy.html>
9. OECD (2017a). OECD population data. Retrieved from: <https://data.oecd.org/pop/population.htm>
10. Statistics New Zealand (2009). The impact of structural population change (structural change and the 65+ population articles). Wellington: Statistics New Zealand. Retrieved from: http://archive.stats.govt.nz/browse_for_stats/people_and_communities/older_people/structural-change-and-the-65-population.aspx
11. Statistics New Zealand (2016a). National population estimates as at 30 June 2016. Data retrieved from: http://www.stats.govt.nz/browse_for_stats/population/estimates_and_projections/NationalPopulationEstimates_HOTPA30Jun16.aspx
12. Statistics New Zealand (2017b). Population estimates and projections. Data retrieved from: http://www.stats.govt.nz/browse_for_stats/population/estimates_and_projections.aspx

Income inequality and deprivation

13. Auckland Regional Public Health Service (2014). Demographic Profile Report 1: Census 2013 Auckland Usual Residents Snapshot. Retrieved from: <http://www.arphs.govt.nz/Portals/o/Documents/Census%202013%20Report%20-%20Demographic%20Profile.pdf>
14. Chartered Accountants of Australia and New Zealand (August 2017). The quest for prosperity: how can New Zealand keep living standards rising for all? Retrieved from: <https://www.charteredaccountantsanz.com/news-and-analysis/insights/future-inc/the-quest-for-prosperity>

15. International Monetary Fund (2015). Causes and consequences of income inequality: a global perspective. Retrieved from: <https://www.imf.org/external/pubs/ft/sdn/2015/sdn1513.pdf>
16. Inequality: A New Zealand Conversation (2017). Understand inequality. Retrieved from: <http://www.inequality.org.nz>
17. Local Government New Zealand (2016). The 2050 Challenge: Future proofing our communities: A discussion paper. Retrieved from: <http://www.lgnz.co.nz/assets/42597-LGNZ-2050-Challenge-Final-WEB-small.pdf>
18. Ministry of Social Development. (2017a). The material wellbeing of NZ households: Overview and key findings. Retrieved from: <https://www.msd.govt.nz/documents/about-msd-and-our-work/publications-resources/monitoring/household-income-report/2017/incomes-report-overview.pdf>
19. OECD (2014). Focus on Inequality and Growth. Retrieved from: <http://www.oecd.org/els/soc/Focus-Inequality-and-Growth-2014.pdf>
20. OECD (2017b). Child poverty. Retrieved from: http://www.oecd.org/els/soc/CO_2_2_Child_Poverty.pdf
21. Statistics New Zealand (n.d./a). Income inequality. Retrieved from: http://www.stats.govt.nz/browse_for_stats/snapshots-of-nz/nz-social-indicators/Home/Standard%20of%20living/income-inequality.aspx
22. Statistics New Zealand (2015a). Median net worth by ethnicity. Retrieved from: http://www.interest.co.nz/sites/default/files/embedded_images/StatsNZ.pdf
23. Statistics New Zealand (2016b). Top ten percent of households have half of total net worth. Retrieved from: http://www.stats.govt.nz/browse_for_stats/people_and_communities/Households/HouseholdNetWorthStatistics_MRYeJun15.aspx
24. The Equality Trust (2017). About inequality: Impacts. Retrieved from: <https://www.equalitytrust.org.uk/about-inequality/impacts>.
25. The University of Auckland (n.d.). Index of Multiple Deprivation developed by Exeter et al 2017 and licensed by The University of Auckland for re-use. Retrieved from: http://nihiviewprdo1.its.auckland.ac.nz/NZIMD_Single/atlas.html
26. The University of Otago (n.d.). Socioeconomic deprivation indexes: NZDep and NZiDep, Department of Public Health. Retrieved from: <http://www.otago.ac.nz/wellington/departments/publichealth/research/hirp/otago020194.html>
27. United Nations (n.d.). Goal 10 – reduce inequalities within and between nations. Retrieved from: <https://www.otago.ac.nz/wellington/departments/publichealth/research/hirp/otago020194.html>
28. Wilkinson, R. G., & Pickett, K. (2010). The spirit level: Why greater equality makes societies stronger. New York: Bloomsbury Press. Retrieved from: <https://www.un.org/sustainabledevelopment/inequality/>

Economic wellbeing

29. Akina Foundation (n.d.). Our story.
Retrieved from: <http://akina.org.nz/about/our-story/>
30. Jennings, D. (2014). Community economic development: understanding the New Zealand context.
Retrieved from: <http://www.communityresearch.org.nz/research/community-economic-development-understanding-the-new-zealand-context/>
31. OECD (2017b). Child poverty.
Retrieved from: http://www.oecd.org/els/soc/CO_2_2_Child_Poverty.pdf
32. Ministry of Business, Innovation and Employment (2015b). MBI's Pasifika economic strategy 2015-21.
Retrieved from: <http://www.mbie.govt.nz/info-services/infrastructure-growth/pacific-economic-development/documents-image-library/mbie-pacific-economic-strategy.pdf>
33. Ministry of Business, Innovation and Employment (2016). What we know (and don't know) about economic growth in New Zealand.
Retrieved from: <http://www.mbie.govt.nz/publications-research/publications/economic-development/what-we-know-and-dont-know-about-economic-growth-summary.pdf>
34. Ministry of Business, Innovation and Employment (2017a). Growing New Zealand for all – MBI's economic narrative.
Retrieved from: <http://www.mbie.govt.nz/publications-research/publications/mbie-corporate/mbie-economic-narrative.pdf>
35. New Zealand Productivity Commission (2014). An international perspective on the New Zealand productivity paradox.
Retrieved from: <http://www.productivity.govt.nz/sites/default/files/international-perspective-working-paper.pdf>
36. Statistics New Zealand (n.d./b). The New Zealand labour market during recession.
Retrieved from: http://www.stats.govt.nz/browse_for_stats/income-and-work/employment_and_unemployment/nz-labour-market-during-recession.aspx
37. Statistics New Zealand (2013). Census 2013.
Data retrieved from: <http://m.stats.govt.nz/Census/2013-census.aspx>
38. Statistics New Zealand (2017c). Gross domestic product per capita by region year ended March 2016.
Retrieved from: http://www.stats.govt.nz/browse_for_stats/economic_indicators/NationalAccounts/RegionalGDP_HOTPYeMar16.aspx

Social cohesion

39. Age Concern New Zealand (2016). Valuing Age: The economic contribution of older New Zealanders.
Retrieved from: <https://www.ageconcern.org.nz/files/valuingage.pdf>
40. Auckland Council (2015). Research strategy and priority research areas 2013 – 2016: Research plans.
Retrieved from: <http://knowledgeauckland.org.nz/assets/publications/Auckland-Council-research-plans-March-2015.pdf>
41. Auckland Council (2017a). Older Aucklanders: A quality of life status report.
Retrieved from: <http://knowledgeauckland.org.nz/assets/publications/TR2017-014-Older-Aucklanders-quality-of-life-status-report.pdf>
42. Centre for Social Impact (2017). Evidence review – effective philanthropy to strengthen communities. Developed for Eastern and Central Community Trust.
43. OECD (n.d.). Social cohesion.
Retrieved from: <http://www.oecd.org/dev/inclusivesocietiesanddevelopment/social-cohesion.htm>
44. OECD (2016a). OECD Social indicators.
Retrieved from: http://www.oecd-ilibrary.org/social-issues-migration-health/society-at-a-glance_19991290

45. Statistics New Zealand (2015b). New Zealand General Social Survey 2014. Retrieved from: http://archive.stats.govt.nz/browse_for_stats/people_and_communities/Well-being.aspx
46. Statistics New Zealand (2015c). *Ngā tohu o te ora: The determinants of life satisfaction for Māori 2013*. Retrieved from: http://www.stats.govt.nz/browse_for_stats/people_and_communities/Māori/te-kupenga/determinants-life-satisfaction-Māori.aspx
47. The Treasury (2001). Towards an inclusive economy. Retrieved from: <https://treasury.govt.nz/publications/wp/towards-inclusive-economy-wp-01-15>

Education

48. Education Counts (n.d./a). Data tables – school leavers with NCEA Level 1 or above or above. Retrieved from: <http://www.educationcounts.govt.nz/statistics/indicators/data/education-and-learning-outcomes/28812#4>
49. Education Counts (n.d./b). Data tables – school rolls. Retrieved from: <https://www.educationcounts.govt.nz/statistics/schooling/student-numbers/6028>
50. Education Counts (2013). Impact of education on income. Retrieved from: <http://www.educationcounts.govt.nz/statistics/indicators/main/education-and-learning-outcomes/1919>
51. Education Counts (2017a). Stand-downs, suspensions, exclusions and expulsions from school. Retrieved from: <http://www.educationcounts.govt.nz/statistics/indicators/main/student-engagement-participation/Stand-downs-suspensions-exclusions-expulsions>
52. Education Counts (2017b). Transient students. Retrieved from: <http://www.educationcounts.govt.nz/statistics/indicators/main/student-engagement-participation/transient-students>
53. Education Counts (2017c). Data tables – prior participation in ECE. Retrieved from: <https://www.educationcounts.govt.nz/statistics/early-childhood-education/participation>
54. OECD (2016b). Education at a glance. Retrieved from: <http://www.oecd.org/education/education-at-a-glance-19991487.htm>
55. Salvation Army (2015). Mixed Fortunes: The geography of advantage and disadvantage in New Zealand. Retrieved from: http://www.salvationarmy.org.nz/sites/default/files/uploads/20150511SAMixedFortunesReport_o.pdf

Children and young people

56. Center on the Developing Child – Harvard University (n.d.). Building adult capabilities. Retrieved from: <https://developingchild.harvard.edu/innovation-application/key-concepts/adult-capabilities/>
57. Heckman, J.J. (2008). Return on Investment: Cost vs. benefits. University of Chicago. Retrieved from: <https://childandfamilypolicy.duke.edu/pdfs/10yranniversary/Heckmanhandout.pdf>
58. The Treasury (2015). Children and youth at risk. Retrieved from: <https://insights.apps.treasury.govt.nz/#>
59. Salvation Army (2015, p10). Mixed Fortunes: The geography of advantage and disadvantage in New Zealand. Retrieved from: http://www.salvationarmy.org.nz/sites/default/files/uploads/20150511SAMixedFortunesReport_o.pdf

Housing

60. Auckland Council (2017b). Homelessness policy project.
Retrieved from: http://infocouncil.aucklandcouncil.govt.nz/Open/2017/07/CEN_20170719_AGN_7015_AT_files/CEN_20170719_AGN_7015_AT_Attachment_54512_1.PDF
61. Chartered Accountants of Australia and New Zealand (August 2017).
The quest for prosperity: how can New Zealand keep living standards rising for all?
Retrieved from: <https://www.charteredaccountantsanz.com/news-and-analysis/insights/future-inc/the-quest-for-prosperity>
62. Housing First Auckland (2017). It's about ending homelessness – not managing it.
Retrieved from: <https://www.housingfirst.co.nz/housing-first>
63. Ministry of Business, Innovation and Employment (2017b).
Housing Affordability in New Zealand: Results.
Retrieved from: <http://www.mbie.govt.nz/info-services/housing-property/sector-information-and-statistics/housing-affordability-measure/latest-results>
64. Ministry of Social Development (June 2017). Social housing quarterly report.
Retrieved from: <https://www.msd.govt.nz/documents/about-msd-and-our-work/work-programmes/social-housing/social-housing-quarterly-report-june-2017.pdf>
65. OECD (2017c). Homeless population.
Retrieved from: <http://www.oecd.org/els/family/H3-1-Homeless-population.pdf>
66. The University of Otago (2013). Severe housing deprivation in Aotearoa/New Zealand 2001-2013. Retrieved from: <http://www.healthyhousing.org.nz/wp-content/uploads/2016/08/Severe-housing-deprivation-in-Aotearoa-2001-2013-1.pdf>
67. Yale University (2017). As cities grow worldwide, so do the numbers of homeless.
Retrieved from: <http://yaleglobal.yale.edu/content/cities-grow-worldwide-so-do-numbers-homeless>

Environmental wellbeing

68. Auckland Council (2017c). The Auckland Plan.
Retrieved from: <http://theplan.theaucklandplan.govt.nz>
69. Department of Conservation (2007). Conservation general policy.
Retrieved from: <http://www.doc.govt.nz/Documents/about-doc/role/policies-and-plans/conservation-general-policy.pdf>
70. Department of Conservation (2017a). Investing in conservation education for a sustainable and prosperous future – national education strategy 2010-2030.
Retrieved from: <http://www.doc.govt.nz/Documents/getting-involved/students-and-teachers/national-education-strategy-2010-2030.pdf>
71. Department of Conservation (2017b). Four-year plan: Budget 2017.
Retrieved from: <http://www.doc.govt.nz/Documents/about-doc/four-year-plan/doc-four-year-plan-2017.pdf>
72. Local Government New Zealand (2016). The 2050 Challenge: Future proofing our communities: A discussion paper.
Retrieved from: <http://www.lgnz.co.nz/assets/42597-LGNZ-2050-Challenge-Final-WEB-small.pdf>
73. Northland Regional Council (2015). Long-term plan 2015-2025.
Retrieved from: http://nrc.objective.com/portal/final_ltp/final_ltp_2015-2025
74. Statistics New Zealand (n.d./c). Measuring New Zealand's Progress Using a Sustainable Development Approach: 2008. Topic 2: Biodiversity.
Retrieved from: http://www.stats.govt.nz/browse_for_stats/snapshots-of-nz/Measuring-NZ-progress-sustainable-dev-%20approach/sustainable-development/biodiversity.aspx
75. Statistics New Zealand (n.d./d). Physical environment across regions.
Retrieved from: http://www.stats.govt.nz/browse_for_stats/people_and_communities/Well-being/across-regions/phys-environ.aspx

Community sector

76. Deloitte (2016). State of the state, New Zealand 2016: Social investment for our future. Retrieved from: <http://datafutures.co.nz/assets/Uploads/state-of-the-state-nz-final-v-1.pdf>
77. The Treasury (2017). Social investment. Retrieved from: <http://www.treasury.govt.nz/statesector/socialinvestment>
78. ComVoices (2016). 2016 State of the community sector survey: Snapshot. Retrieved from: <https://comvoicesdotwordpressdotcom.files.wordpress.com/2016/10/comvoices-2016-state-of-the-sector-survey-snapshot-final-25-oct.pdf>
79. Foundation North (2016). Impact report data collected in 2015 and 2016. Impact Reports asked funding recipients to identify the major strengths and challenges for their organisations and/or wider communities. Foundation North staff were able to assess the data provided by grantees (in open text format) and code it to create a list of the most commonly identified strengths (16 categories) and challenges (20 categories).
80. Foundation North (2017). Stakeholder interviews August-September 2017. Key findings from stakeholder interviews completed by Foundation North staff.