**Visual**

**A black bordered panel group assembled in a grid to discuss responses to questions asked during the ‘Men who use violence’ webinar held in collaboration with the New Zealand Family Violence Clearinghouse. All the speakers are middle-aged. At the top left is Nicola Woodward, who has her blond hair pulled back into a bun, sitting in her lounge with a wooden duchess in the background. Nicole is wearing a red and grey flowered crew-neck top. In the top middle is Pauline Gulliver, sitting at a desk with a white background. She has light brown, shoulder length hair and is wearing a lavender hoodie. Top right is Jane Koziol-McLain, again sitting at a desk, in a study. Jane has grey hair, pulled back and is wearing a black v-neck top. A bookshelf is in the background of Jane’s video. Bottom centre-left is Michael Roguski, a bald man sitting in front of a white background. Michael wears a black t-shirt. Bottom centre-right is Tim Marshall, with short cropped hair, sitting in front of a white background. Tim also wears a black t-shirt, although his collared shirt has narrow white trim.**

**Audio**

Pauline: Kia ora. So this is a chance for us, as a panel, to answer some of the questions that were posted from the webinar – from the Family Violence Death Review Committee's webinar – that was held in collaboration with the New Zealand Family Violence Clearinghouse. And we have three of our original panellists that have returned for this: Nicola, Jane and Tim. And we're also joined by one of our committee members, Michael Roguski from Kaitiaki Research and evaluation.

I'm Pauline Gulliver, senior specialist at the Health Quality & Safety Commission. So I'm going to pose the questions and our wonderful panellists are going to respond to them. In association with this recording we'll also post some written responses to some of the questions that were answered as we're not going to have time to get through them all. But we are immensely grateful for all the questions that were posed during the webinar and apologies it has taken us a wee while to get to this point.

So, Tim just to start with you. One of our first questions was 'How do we most effectively challenge ideas of manhood at a national level? What are the most effective messages for us to get out there to create ideas of manhood that men and boys want to ascribe to but are not always about being in control?'

Tim: Yeah kia ora team. Well one of the things I was thinking about with this question actually is around what the terminology around masculinity has defaulted to in recent times. And we often talk about toxic masculinity.
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Tim: And I think that the danger of that is that, for a lot of men, they see it as a kind of like a blame culture to men. And like you know, so that it actually excludes them in the conversation. So they kind of get that negative reaction. So I think talking more about encouraging men to embrace you know the full range of masculinity and actually masculinity includes a whole range of things some of which are healthy and some of which are unhealthy. And we need to, I suppose, understand the full context of that and the unhealthy parts. Understanding, you know, where they come from and how strong is that model for us and our [sic] and then how does it impact on the context of our current behaviour. And so taking that kind of more inclusive approach I suppose that connects them as men in a kind of, I suppose, a little bit like the work that we do with men trying to say take that non-judgmental approach but trying to encourage men on the learning journey for themselves to sort of think about what is it about being a man for me you know. How do I make sense of that and then and then how does that impact on how I behave in myself and how that influences my connection with others.

Pauline: Thanks Tim. Nicola or Michael, did either of you want to comment on that?

Nicola: Yeah I suppose my contribution would be to encourage us to think about that question within the context of a sort of masculine and feminine dynamic and inter-relationship because I don't think that we could really fully support a reflection on you know perceptions of manhood without looking at that within the context of perceptions of womanhood, and the roles that we are all socialised, continue to be deeply socialised, within. And how that socialisation as a girl and a woman plays in a very reinforcing dynamic with those who are grown up as boys and become men. So obviously the question of you know the masculine and feminine is recognised now as being far less binary and the conversation is more deeply around gender but I think that it's one that has to involve us at all.

Pauline: Michael?

Michael: The only thing I've got to add is that there is space here within governmental strategy to actually look at how these messages could roll out at a local community level. But also provincial and national. Like, I think there is a role to play for government in supporting a move away from these messages and we also know that there is a link between alcohol and our sporting culture. And I think there's real need to de-link those sort of activities. Not that sport in itself is bad but there are some aspects of sport that have been held up which can distort masculinity. And I think we really need to have a conversation as a nation about those and de-link anything that supports those sort of things. Sport should just stand on its own.

Pauline: Excellent thank you team. So Nicola, the short-term interventions is the favoured option as it's cheaper and we all know that longer-term interventions are more effective and long lasting. So what can we do to make funders and agencies more aware of this as well as changing this at a governmental level so that they can see the benefit for Aotearoa and make the necessary funds available, to be able to do this much-needed work?

Nicola: I think, first of all, there's so many responses to this question but one is that if we do all know that longer term intervention is more effective then we need to be much more proactive in bringing that evidence to the forefront of our discussions about what models of practice we should be developing and the competences required to develop those practices. I don't think, for me, it's necessarily as simple as it needs to be longer rather than short. Central to the question of 'how long is effectiveness' and the need for models of practice and service options that are personalised, that are adaptive and responsive, that are able to recognise and be flexible to needs and risks and issues and strengths and opportunities as they arise. Not only for the individual but also within the context of within the whānau. That's why I think it's really important we talked about language during the seminar. I think it's really important that we shift away from using terms like 'programme'. Because they are all not what I've just talked about: adapted, responsive, personalised, flexible. I think there's a quite an embedded mindset around programmes and content and delivery and compliance that is connected deeply with the social services relationship with the judicial system. And there's perhaps a little bit more to say about that as well.

I think there's a conundrum for NGOs because obviously there's a real, you know, need to you know sustain income sources and those income sources are commonly attached to short-term contracts. But that binds us also in the same limitation that individuals and whānau are [sic] in. It undermines organisational development and resilience just as it undermines personal development and whānau development and resilience. But at the end of the day I think that if we want to encourage a shift towards more holistic and futuristic models of practice, NGOs need to stand up and perhaps take a more forthright role in setting out the limitations of the short-term funding model as it is connected directly to the effectiveness of practice for families.

Pauline: Thanks Nicola. Michael did you have anything to add?

Michael: You're right Nicola. There are so many layers to this question. For me, when we look at the chronology of events, leading the man who has experience with violence into a programme, for instance, is generally through the courts. So it's not just about a question of short-term versus long-term. People have enormous problems accessing support to move away from violence. It's wrong. I think it's really a terrible indictment on our country that the majority of people access non-violence programmes because of a court order. So we need to sort of have a cast of, I don't know if it's the right metaphor, cast the net wider or start thinking differently about providing support early. But also without having to go through a court system. I was in Auckland and to do a self-referral to one programme was costing someone fifteen hundred dollars. So they had identified that they had a need. They hadn't engaged in physical violence but they engaged in emotional and psychological violence, but they wanted to nip it in the bud as soon as possible. So they needed to pay fifteen hundred dollars. A lot of people can't do that.

The other thing I just want to say too is that as a language we as a country are focusing on programmes. It's almost like put someone in a programme that's quite – they're dealt with. And I think there we need to have multiple responses, of which a programme is one. But we really need to start thinking about how we can do things differently to support non-violence at a local community level. So we can actually start providing supports and interventions at that stage as well. It's not just about sending on someone to a programme.

Pauline: Tim can I invite you into the conversation?

Tim: I agree with what Nicola and Michael said and I think that whole programme response, you know, is the traditional model. And here at – we run the men's centre here – and the longest standing group we have is not government funded. And it's the group that people can stay in, in and out, of as long as they want or need to. And as long as it takes, you know, to be able to embed the change. And we get men who come intensively for a while and then and then we don't see them and they get on a good track but then they come back when they need to check in and update and when they've had a learning or they've come up with another challenge. But we're still there you know. I think that's the main thing. And like Mike said, you know, it's not necessarily a programme but often a programme of action.

So you know there's a number of pieces of the puzzle and they often will be different. So what we tend to do traditionally is you go to a non-violence programme mainly the same content for a group of different – different group of people who come from a different journey to that point. Which kind of assumes you're just going to get this package you know whereas, and it might hopefully fit with a few of you, but it probably won't fit with all of you. And you'll have to wait until the part that does fit with you to come around on the programme menu, versus actually being able to respond to the individual needs in a much more flexible way. That's my thoughts there.

Pauline: Jane did you want to add anything to that?
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Pauline: No? Okay. So my next question is to Michael. There are, are these models of power and control working for our Māori men? Are there holistic Māori models? Where does cultural connectedness, understanding and competency fit within the need for changing behaviours? It's a large question.

Michael: It's a hard question. So first of all, no they're not working for Māori men. But models that are based on a power and control model such as the Duluth Model, are generally not working for any men. So, what we do know, there is growing evidence to suggest that rather than a singular programme for on non-violence for the male perpetrator for instance, at a programmatic level what works seems to be working very, very well is when the NGO looks at the whole of whānau. So under a model of keeping everyone safe, that there are parallel programmes available for instance. Where the man who has identified a problem with violence either self-identified or through the courts for instance, goes on his journey, a supportive journey, through either a facilitator but also sometimes with one-on-one follow-up counselling. But his, let's say it's a female partner, they're also going to need support often to understand his journey of transformation and change. Because understandably, many people don't trust it when their partners start to change because they've heard that sort of thing before.

But also the models that have been working well include our babies, our tamaiti. And understanding that there's been trauma there and that they need – and so I've seen some programmes that for instance it'll be a holiday programme. So Te Whakaruruhau o Meri in Auckland, they have a school holiday programme which is all about healing and empowering the young children. But Te Whakaruruhau Māori Women's Refuge in Hamilton they're doing this extremely well. Kokiri Marae, they are also doing it really, really well as well. But what's also common about all these programmes is that they look at basic needs as well. They will also – it's not just about the male who is a perpetrator going through a programme – they'll make sure that there's food on the table, that there is a 24-hour case management, sort of. I mean these are my words, case management. But if there is the threat of an eruption of violence there's someone to call. And so either for the man who's about to engage in violence to go to someone's house or that case manager will come to their house and try and ease the tensions. Someone 24 hours, that's been working really, really well and we can see this with Safe Man Safe Family as well. So, I could go on for ages, but I think what's also important is I think people within Aotearoa are sick of international models being placed in New Zealand where there are many growing number of initiatives which are doing very well. We need to evidence this, we need to gather their stories because I feel when I'm with the community, people are wanting examples of excellence that they can look at and adjust to their own locations. They don't want a one size fits all. Did I answer the question there Pauline?

Pauline: I think you did. Yes, I think you did. Tim, do you might have anything to add?

Tim: Yeah well I think like Mike says I think there's a lot of richness and what's around and available to us locally. And probably locally in our own spaces so I think of our experience with using – I don't know if it's the right word – but metaphorical ways of representing stuff. So we, Tangi Hepi was our counsellor, way back. He had a model of the Pateke model which is a flounder in Tamuri and the difference between where they live. One lives in the sort of dirt and that sort of thing and the other one was in the clear water. And that was about the journey of change and that was really connected with our with a lot of our men because of the connection to that whakaaro around those images but also I suppose connection to maybe activities and things that they might be involved in there's diving and things like that and fishing. And some of the pūrākau I suppose you can draw on as well from those stories. But I think one of the important things and it's another tangi tip for us here is always about meeting people where they are. Because often the danger is that we make an assumption about somebody's cultural connection and that, sometimes that can have the flip side in terms of distancing in terms of saying 'well hey I don't really know about that I don't really know that stuff'. When we make that assumption that we need to do this because this this person's Māori or Pacific or whatever but we need to do it in a way that connects with where they are so that we bring them along I suppose in a way that that supports your understanding and connects to the kaupapa. But I think there's definitely potential and there's probably a lot of – sorry some music going on in the background here – potential to tap into our local stories.
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Pauline: Excellent, thank you Tim. Nicola just drawing you into this conversation.

Nicola: I think with, you know, at risk of stating the obvious most families that are experiencing violence are not likely in the first instance to reach out to a specialist family violence agency. So we've recognised increasingly the importance of specialist family violence agencies providing a holistic response. Which means that they need somehow to bring a broader range of capabilities and service options to provide that holistic response. But how do we connect with the vast majority of families that are not just about to reach out, or engage with this topic with the specialist violence agency? And that's why I do, you know, still advocate for the model of a co-located practice that has been developed at The Loft in Christchurch, that you know provides access to an enormously broad range of health, social and community services through just one front door. So that may mean that the primary need is clothing or it may be that, you know, power's just about to be cut off or it may be that, you know, they need some assistance with food or traveling or whatever. If we can engage with people on their most fundamentally important matter, right here right now, without necessarily doing so as a family violence agency but as a holistic one-stop shop, we increase our possibilities of connecting with people and safely initiating conversations about safety much more so than we otherwise could expect to do if we were just expecting or waiting for people to come to specialist family violence agencies.

Pauline: Thanks Nicola. Jane did you want to add anything here?
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Pauline: No? I'm going to drag you in Jane because the next question has been posed to you. So we've been hearing a lot about of talk about violence and intervention programmes. What about early intervention when families are vulnerable? And I suppose this moves directly on from what Nicola was just talking about. How we know about the stresses of from vulnerability to the impact of violence.

Jane: I think one of the things I just want to start with is the idea, I remember once I was in a panel and they were talking about building strength and resilience. And so when I'm always asked about vulnerability, I think, you know, what we need to do is get rid of the vulnerability. I mean that is early intervention. Early intervention is is looking at our structures and saying you know right now, we have child poverty. So we if we want to reduce family violence we have to address some of these deep-seated issues that we have as a society like child poverty. So I think that's on a – on a societal level when we're talking about prevention of violence. So what we want to do is not, we want to prevent vulnerability not just prevent violence. I think that's one point.

I think the second point was, Michael mentioned the children, and I think any time when there's violence and vulnerabilities and we bring communities in to support the children we are doing early intervention. And we are looking to what the next generation is going to have. So I think certainly that focus on strengthening families around children is very useful going forward. So when there is violence among partners, adults in a home, asking the questions about the children, looking at the entanglement of the children and putting strengths in the family to reduce the violence and looking to the children I think is is a promising early intervention.

Pauline: Thanks Jane. Given Michael, given Jane just referenced you, would you like to pick up the conversation?

Michael: I actually think Jane did it. I mean combining what Jane and Nicola just said, I love the idea and I've seen this work really well, where it's about having an opportunity to start the conversation. I've seen this when I visited Tim's work as well. Rather than just having a programme where someone's referred to. If we could have initiatives that could increase dialogue and in a safe way, so people can come and raise issues and ask for help in a gentle, supportive way, that would be great. The barriers to this though is the family, the whānau I work with are extremely terrified of the role of Oranga Tamariki. So we need another discussion around when someone asks for help how can that happen without an immediate referral to Oranga Tamariki, for instance. And I think we, as a nation, or professional body

we need to understand those fears more.

Pauline: Thanks Michael. Tim, did you want to add to that at all?

Tim: Yeah, just I was just thinking one of my other questions here was around the inclusion of the children's voice actually you know. And I just think one of the things is one of the risks, I think, and those of us who work with the adults is that we lose sight of that in the work and how as it's been covered before in our conversation, earlier around making sure that all the parts of the puzzle connect, and all members of the family are being supported in a way that, you know, brings a you know truly holistic whānau approach, I suppose. And often for us that work mainly with men and, I suppose, mainly with perpetrators it's the first connection is trying to make sure something's happening with their partner or the person who's a victim or survivor in that space. But then the next step around that is what's happening with the children and that's often not necessarily overlooked, but it's not necessarily connected as well. And like Mike said, you know, the risk that people have and the fear that family had was that, once we start talking about that, you know, that Oranga Tamariki and those ones get involved so 'I might not actually tell you really what's happening because I'm worried about what you might do with that information', you know. And just to touch on Jane's point around, one of my other hats is working on the whānau resilience project actually and that's looking at what builds that outside systems and services. And, you know, a lot of whānau tap into things within their own kind of circles I suppose that actually are building that, and building that in a way that prevents you know, them falling over when things do get tough. So I think we need to enhance more of that space as well.

Pauline: Thanks Tim. Nicola i just want to invite you in if you've got anything to add.

Nicola: Yeah I was just reminded of an initiative that just acknowledging, you know, historical conflict of interest that Aviva was developing that was based on the principles of peer support, and developing community capability and community resilience. There's an initiative that some of you may be familiar with. Many of the listeners will call it mental health first aid, which is about building capability within neighbourhoods to be able to recognise and provide an appropriate supportive response to people who are experiencing distress, under health distress, and Aviva has developed a similar initiative that looks at supporting whānau – anybody who identifies as important in a relationship with children – could be early childhood educators, uncles, aunts to understand what child safety is, what it looks like, what it doesn't look like, and how they might initiate conversations with people within their neighbourhoods, within their whanau about child wellbeing. So it's a model of earlier intervention and it is about recognising that the vast majority of concerning conversations, potential conversations about child wellbeing, actually sit within the community. And as a model of earlier intervention if we could develop the capability, the confidence, skills of communities, to hold that then we intervene earlier and de-escalate the need for statutory involvement. So those principles of, you know, mental health first aid, there is a very strong evidence base and support within that sector and I think that that kind of kaupapa is something that we can look to as well in our space.

Pauline: Thanks Nicola. There's another question here that we originally had posed to Jeremy but who unfortunately couldn't join us, that I might just seek all of your responses on because it kind of draws from the discussions we were just having. And the question is: 'I can hear from the presenters that the responses need to be timely and appropriate. Do you think this is happening right now or what steps do you need – do you think need to be taken – so that this can occur? The issue of timing raises concerns if you're waiting for the time to be 'right' for the perpetrator to come forward for support and issues around whether or not that compromises the safety of the family in the meantime? How do we reconcile those two pressures?' Tim, can I pose that to you first?

Tim: Yeah thanks. I suppose one of the learnings for us from timing is that one of the things that we notice is that it takes – there's quite a number of barriers of course for men asking for help. You know, the first question you asked me around masculinity was one of the areas around that you know it's uh, the whole stigma around coming to a place like ours even though we've done our best efforts not to be a reinvention of some things. But you know it's talking to some of the men, you know they've taken a couple of weeks to walk past our door for a couple of weeks before summoning up the courage to come upstairs. And when they do that, we realise that we've got to capture that moment because if we don't you know, good chance that they'll think 'oh no it's not for me'. And we've had that before where, some reason, there wasn't somebody available to talk to them and to hear them at that moment and they might have filled out a form and given the details, and then they often don't connect. So I think it is being able to respond at the time when they are asking for help and if that's – the idea of the awareness campaigns is that people, you know, one of the – I think that one of the goals is that you see them and think actually yeah no 'I need to do something about this, now where do I go?' And now we talked about on the webinar, these places need to be obvious and they need to be accessible and available.

And then the other side of it when you talked about balancing safety. I think that really, when safety is compromised then we need – there's some just definite steps that we all have to take – you know, to make sure people are safe, you know. So it's not necessarily saying 'we won't worry about safety while we wait for this guy to turn the light bulb on'. But when those men are turning those light bulb – well I'm talking for the men because that's the most of the people that we work in the space – when those light bulbs are turned on and where they do want to reach out, we need to make those places obvious and accessible and so we can capture that moment, I think, and get started. Yeah if that answers the question? Sorry.

Pauline: Perfectly. Thank you Tim. Nicola do you want to add anything to that?

Nicola: I think the thing that sort of came to mind and listening to Tim and in thinking about my own experiences is, you know, the question of motivation, which is often raised. And, you know, motivation is questioned if people, for example, begin a program because, you know, they've been referred through the judicial system. I think it's fundamentally the responsibility of professionals to motivate. You know, it's for us to instil hope, it's for us to instil a sense of possibility and alternative. This idea that we have to wait for somebody to reach bottom is unprofessional from my perspective but also unsafe. We have to be reaching out with an irresistible proposition. You know, a sense that is articulated through our own word, that there is really potential and hope and an opportunity. And I sort of found it a little bit difficult to sort of articulate that myself because I'm because I'm sort of feeling it. But this idea that, you know, we have to you know, hold people accountable and wait for them to accept responsibility and then engage with us it's fundamentally lacking in what we say is important which is manaakitanga, aroha, and earlier intervention. And that's why I think that one of our biggest challenges as a sector individually, and I think many of us are experiencing this as we journey through the Black Lives Matter opportunity is the need for us to go through a process, a journey of you know, emotional intelligence and self-evaluation ourselves. You know, there is so much implied and enacted power within our services and our structure and the relationships that we offer to people. Some of it is explicit, as I say, it's implied but I think that's a real fundamental challenge, a real fundamental challenge for us. I could go on for this – go on about this for ages – and be, you know, become even less articulate than I'm being now But I think that it is fundamental to the mindset and the belief system that has the potential to really drive change across the sector.

Pauline: Thanks Nicola. Michael, did you want to add anything?

Michael: Yeah, I guess if we could imagine cutting an onion in half and there are many layers to the onion. There's the programmatic level maybe somewhere near the middle. As we go out though I've seen huge success through programmes such as 'It's Not Okay' campaign at a local level where people like Vic Tamati, Phil Paikea come in and they, I guess in a way they're doing consciousness raising, where they come and talk about their journeys of transformation. So that's another – I'm just saying, there are many strings to the bow. And community-based action is really, I've seen so much success from it and maybe it's because it gives people a common language where they can talk about pain, talk about violence, non-violence. No one really understands why it works but it does work for different parts of our communities. And I think this is a real opportunity for more funding and for the Government to actually do this at a community level. I've got to say too there's a real risk that, you know earlier, that talked about Māori models? And this is not a question that was posed, but our white middle-class men with problems with violence can so easily go hidden. So while we're talking about early intervention and we're talking about making sure there's food on the table through food banks, and electricity and stuff, we also need to include the conversation about the white middle-class person who has a problem with violence who doesn't come across those, necessarily come across those, sorts of avenues. Because at the moment they are under-represented in our statistics. But we know, very much, of course they're there and this is again, another part of the conversation that we really, really need to have. How we can access these parts of our communities that go – are currently under the radar? Sorry for going off point there Pauline.

Nicola: I think that's a really important point, if I could just add something to that. The partners, or former partners, of those white middle-class men who use violence, may be more likely to engage with services. And, you know, we talked in the seminar briefly about a massive service gap which is for young people. And I think that, you know, in response to that point, the need to develop appropriate supports for young white men, amongst others, to try and break that inter-generational cycle, is something that needs to be attended to.

Pauline: Jane, did you want to add anything to that conversation?
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Pauline: I have to admit, I strongly agree with you. I think it's an area that we need to explore some more and do some more work around. I'm conscious that we're coming to the end of our allocated time for this and I think, though we might not have touched on everybody's question, I'm looking at the questions on my screen and I think that the conversation has sort of traversed the breadth of questions that we got posed. There was one final one that I guess it would be nice to wrap up on and I think Michael you've already touched on this, and actually probably all of our panellists have already touched on this but it might be useful just as something to finish on. And the question goes 'I'd love to hear of anywhere that services are meeting the needs of the community.' And it's talking about models of engagement. 'Are there any places you can offer as great models of engagement for whānau, within which violence is used and/or for men using violence and what programmes do you think are impactful for our tāne, and what makes them so?' And I guess that that sort of has that broader question that tends to be the million dollar question for a lot of the people who are watching the webinar, which was 'What does success look like and do we have a picture of that at present?' So final remarks on that would be awesome. Jane, you've been really quiet can I bring you in on this?

Jane: I think I'm quiet because I think our webinar we really wanted to hear from community, and it is – we're community – so I'm gonna defer to them again because that's what – that's where it's happening and we have to listen. So yeah, I'll pass my time over.

Pauline: Okay Nicola, I'll bring you in then.

Nicola: I would imagine that, you know, the vast majority of services and organisations are contributing a degree of success to the community. The question is what models of practice can really optimise that success. If you look at the challenges the families face, difficulties in accessing services, the complexity of challenges, the co-existing range of challenges that families need. I am still gonna say that, from my perspective, a model that does need – does warrant further exploration and development – is The Loft. As an early model of co-located, integrated practice in Christchurch. It has undergone an evaluation so there is some research evidence there. It worked closely, we work closely, with the New Zealand Institute of Economic Research. I might have got that name slightly wrong. But to develop a research evaluation framework so you know it's a model that is very much grounded in research evidence. It is generating evidence and it has a robust evaluative framework there to support it. Very much aligned with government policy rhetoric, child poverty, one stop shops, et cetera. I would say that, wouldn't I.

Pauline: Great, thank you very much Nicola. Michael?

Michael: So I'm very much a systems person. I completely agree with Nicola. And yeah, I've visited The Loft, it's amazing. I think when I'm work working with communities, they want a model that they can take and change it and alter it according to their own location. You know, not a one-size-fits-all. Yeah absolutely. And I think, again I'm not answering your question, there is a real opportunity to develop a case study approach of some models, a selection of models that are working in Aotearoa. And so that could be like a toolbox, a tool kit for communities to look at, and see how they may be able to do it for themselves. That said, when I have worked with communities, the things that are working, as Nicola has said, is a systems approach that is multi-levelled, which works with the whānau, always keeping in mind our babies, our children. That is not short-term, that is there for the duration for as long as the whānau require it, but also provides – makes sure that people's basic needs are met, from. And one thing we didn't talk about is alcohol and other drug addiction, gambling addiction, and making sure that people have a roof over their heads. So when I talk about a systems approach it includes all of that as a holistic package. Kia ora.

Pauline: Tim, it means you get the final word.

Tim: Yeah, cool. Yeah I suppose all of us at work, like Nicola said, there is heaps of people who don't do this work to not make a difference. And I think there's pockets of excellence across Aotearoa and in a lot of communities. And a lot of them are actually under the radar. You know it was interested to see there was a great story about Ghandi Nivas the other week, and the police minister said we should have one of these in every community. And I'd encourage the police minister to look outside his front door actually. Because there's examples of that in all communities. Not the same as Ghandi Nivas, and not the same as Tauawhi, and not the same as Aviva. But there are examples of excellence, and I would hope that those in government would actually, you know, step outside and have a look and actually talk. Like Michael said, you know, there's a there's an opportunity to go around. I mean, I've been invited to a number of places at times to say what we do at Tauawhi here and, while this model works for our community and works in a way for a number of our men, it won't necessarily fit every community, you know, because we do have demographic differences, you know, and other differences that means that whatever happens needs to be responsive to the needs of the people that are there. And I think, like, touching on what Mike said as well, in terms of stepping away from a programme approach to a programme of action. And I just wanted to put a plug in here, we've mentioned Safe Man Safe Family here, I suppose. And it's come out of Vic Tamati's own journey. And it's really a community framework in response to support for men which includes a whole range of things which a programme peer support model, respite accommodation, long-term time out facilities a safe space and all of those things. And it's an example of a, yeah, a more holistic approach where like Mike and Nicola sort of said, it is covering all the bases. And looking at, rather than just the one person that presents through your door for that one kaupapa, what's behind their context of that behaviour and that journey but also the connections across their family. And, you know, like Vic says you know, how do you know the man is safe? The family will tell you. But how often do we check in with the family around that safety? You know. So it's looking at the whole picture. But it needs to fit yeah, with the localised land community approaches really and I think, you know, over the years we've all met probably people from around the country who are doing really awesome work with whatever they've got, you know, but it's often not necessarily connected to other people in the country and there's not a strong community of practice, I think, in the family, kind of the family violence sector across capturing everybody who works in, connected to the system and outside the system as well I think.

Pauline: Kia ora. Thank you very much, Tim. So I'm gonna wrap up now. I want to thank every one of you. I also want to thank our other panellists who were with us on the day. So Denis Grennell, Fiona Cram, and Jeremy Eparaima. I acknowledge all the hard work that all of you do, and I'm immensely grateful for your contributions. Yeah, so thank you very much. Thanks.

**Visual**

**Video ends**