

The Whare Framework

Eric Tey

Created: 1 Septembert 2026

Last Revised: 16 September 2026

An ex-ante appraisal framework combining existing strategic frameworks applied through New Zealand's unique cultural perspective.

1. Introduction

The Whare Framework is an ex-ante (before implementation) appraisal framework for heritage-digitisation partnerships in Aotearoa NZ. The framework is a derivative of [Moore's Strategic Triangle](#), Sir Mason Durie's [Te Whare Tapa Wha](#), and Māori data-sovereignty principles alongside miscellaneous sector-specific resources to provide a unique perspective on information handling and digitisation of records in the unique community landscape of Aotearoa.

The term ex-ante means before the fact. This is an intentional design decision which limits the framework's scope. Only terms and procedures such as, but not limited to, draft agreements, due diligences, engagement records, and technical specifications, are within the scope of testing.

2. The Problem

A public archive contemplating a digitisation partnership must answer a specific question:

“Will this agreement leave the collection, and our authority over it, better or worse off in the future?”

Established public-private partnership (PPP) frameworks and literature are designed around addressing factors regarding cost comparisons, risk management, and financing strategies. It fails to address specific heritage requirements as a key focal point – a vital yet often assumed factor in the sector of heritage archive digitisation. Three key gaps are identified when reviewing existing frameworks, and act as the foundation for the development of The Whare Framework.

Value for money: Existing appraisals tend to focus on value for money. They work by comparing a partnership against a costed public-sector alternative, and fails to price cultural integrity, mana (spiritual power) and taonga (authority) of treasured Maori artefacts, and the confidence a community has that its records are held properly.

What defines “Success”: PPP success literature state themselves that success criteria vary by state, jurisdiction and stakeholders, and that “success” is an abstract concept instead of a fixed standard.

Compliance does not mean success: In the case of USA's National Archives, partnership principles require non-exclusivity, free public access and rights reversion after an embargo, and the programme nonetheless led to a situation where most digitised records sit behind a single commercial subscription, with the archive largely not publishing them freely even after the embargoes lapsed. On paper, every principle was satisfied but the public outcome still failed. A scoring framework that rewards the presence of good clauses without considering what happens when a partner does only the minimum scores that arrangement as a success.

Inversion

Frameworks in the conventional literature assumes the public partner contributes money or risk and receives capability. In the heritage digitisation sector, the flow tends to run the other way around.

The Crown holds and funds the asset. The partner's considerations is substantially non-monetary: credentialing, market access, brand association, and privileged access to a national collection. What the public institution transfers is its institutional legitimacy. One could even say the archive is paying in mana.

No established framework currently has a field for this.

Moore's strategic triangle can hold it, because legitimacy is one of his three vertices. Te Whare Tapa Wha can name it as taha wairua. This framework works to combine the two and generate an appraisal question that can

be measurable – “*What happens to the institution’s mana if the partner is acquired, breached or discredited?*”

What The Whare Framework does

The framework combines two frameworks that already exist.

1. **Moore’s Strategic Triangle:** Supplies three questions any public-value proposition must answer.
2. **Te Whare Tapa Wha:** Supplies five domains those questions get asked about and a structural rule – one wall fails, the house fails – hence making the framework non-compensatory.

3. Structure

The framework is proposed as a matrix containing three questions asked about five domains – giving fifteen cells.

The Three Questions – Moore’s Vertices

Mark Moore’s strategic triangle holds that a public-value proposition must be simultaneously worthwhile, authorised and deliverable. All three factors must align. The Whare Framework models them to suit a whare (house) and an institution.

Moore’s Vertex	Reframed by The Whare Framework	What is being asked?
Public Value	Te Kaupapa – What the Whare is for	Is the value proposition real, and whose value is it?
Legitimacy and Support	Te mana – whose authority it stands under, and who may speak in it	Who authorises this and is that authorisation sufficient?
Operational Capacity	Te kaha – Whether it can be built and kept standing	Can the institution deliver and sustain this across the full term?

Moore’s insistence on the alignment of all three vertices is carried forward. Misalignment can be diagnostic rather than just a “low score”. The framework reads this pattern explicitly.

The Five Domains – Te Whare Tapa Whā

Te Whare Tapa Wha models wellbeing as a wharenui (community house): Four walls on a foundation, where damage to any one dimension leaves the whole unbalanced. The framework was designed to address Māori healthcare services and has been mapped onto modelling partnership risk.

Pole	What it carries in a partnership appraisal
Taha Tinana – The Physical	The collection itself and the digitisation operation: What is in scope, technical standards, handling, logistics, infrastructure.
Taha Hinengaro – The “Mind” of the Institution	Knowledge, expertise and descriptive authority: Whether the institution retains capability or reduces it over time.

Taha Whanau – Relationships	The partnership relationship itself and the communities the records serve.
Taha Wairua – The Spirit/Intangible	Cultural integrity, public trust, mana, and the value people derive from knowing authority and governance exist and are cared for
The Land/Foundation	
Whenua – The Foundation	Sovereignty and stewardship. Who holds the data, on what terms, under whose jurisdiction and what passes to the next generation.

Each of the four poles **score**, and the whenua **passes or fails**.

In Durie's model, the poles are equal and the foundation is beneath them. A house with a compromised foundation does not average out to be adequate. This property is reserved and carried forward to The Whare framework.

A failure on whenua stops the deal regardless of performance elsewhere. This means strong commercial terms, fast turnarounds and generous access provisions cannot offset a sovereignty breach, because the thing that is being traded away is not recoverable later.

This makes the framework **non-compensatory**. Conventional scorecards may let dimensions trade off against each other which is appropriate when every dimension is a commensurable benefit. It is inappropriate when one dimension is a Te Tiriti obligation.

4. How to use the framework

The Whare framework outlines eight steps.

Step	Name	What it includes
1	Scope the Appraisal	In one paragraph each, record: • The deal: Who the proposed partner is, what they do and what form the arrangement takes place. • The material: Which collections or series are in scope, their volume, condition and whether any of it is taonga Māori or otherwise carries cultural obligations • The term: Contract length, embargo or preferential-use period, renewal and termination provisions • The consideration: What each side gives and receives.
2	Assemble the evidence	Every cell in the instrument names the evidence it needs. Gather it before scoring and note explicitly where evidence is absent.
3	Run the Whenua/foundation gate	If sovereignty and stewardship fail – the whole model fails. A deal that cannot clear this foundation will not proceed to full appraisal. Record: Pass, Pass with Clause, or Fail
4	Score the four poles across the three vertices	Record: • The finding: what the evidence shows • Assessment: Interpretation and reading of what it means for the deal • Consequence: The contract clause required if the finding is weak Keeping finding and assessment in separate fields lets a second reader disagree with judgement without losing evidence. Use the four-point scale in Decision Rules
5	Run the worst-compliant-outcome test	Assume the partner performs precisely the minimum the draft contract requires and nothing more. No such thing as goodwill or discretionary generosity. Record: The resulting situation in five years and at contract end . If that state is unacceptable, the contract is a problem, and the required clauses should be recorded.
6	Read the misalignment pattern	Total each vertex across the four poles and compare. Record: The pattern between vertices. Archetypes are set out in Decision Rules .
7	Write the determination	Record one of three: • Proceed • Proceed subject to clauses • Decline State the determination in one paragraph, then attach the clause register and completed instrument as evidence.
8	Register the clauses as the monitoring baseline	Every clause the appraisal produces should be recorded and handed over for evaluation.

5. Decision Rules

The Scoring Scale:

Score	Name	Meaning
3	Strong	The evidence exists, is documented and the obligation is contractual.
2	Adequate	The evidence exists, through the obligation rests on policy or practice rather than contract. A 2 is not a pass as anything that rests on practice rather than contract has to be converted before signature or explicitly accepted as a known exposure.
1	Weak	The intention is stated, with no evidence that it is documented or enforceable. Requires a named clause
0	Absent	The question cannot be answered from the evidence pack. Requires a named clause

Non-Compensatory Rules

The framework refuses averaging in three places:

- 1) **Whenua.** Any fail on the Whenua tests ends the appraisal at decline.
- 2) **Any 1 or 0 requires a named clause.** A weak cell cannot be offset by a strong one. It either produces a drafted contract consequence or an explicit, recorded acceptance of the exposure by someone with authority to sign-off.
- 3) **No vertex may be weak overall.** If any of the three vertices average below 2, the determination is at best *proceed subject to clauses*, regardless of the other two.

Misalignment Archetypes

Pattern	Name	Example
Value High Legitimacy Low	Compliant Failure	The deal delivers measurable benefit through a process nobody with standing authorised. Satisfies its own principles and produces a public reckoning later.
Value High Capacity Low	Personnel Failure	The institution signs obligations it lacks the people to perform.
Legitimacy High Value Low	Relevance Failure	Impeccable process thoroughly engaged communities, but the wrong material digitised.
Capacity High Value Low	Overcapacity Failure	Everything runs smoothly and nothing much changes for the public.

All three moderate and none are strong	Drift Risk	Nothing fails and nothing is anchored. Deals in this state will degrade quietly as people and priorities change.
--	------------	--

Determination Rules

After appraisal and evaluation, a PPP can:

Outcome	Requirement
Proceed	• Whenua passes clean • No cell below 2 • No vertex below 2 • Worse compliant outcome acceptable
Proceed – Subject to Clauses	• Whenua passes clean, or with clauses • Every cell below 2 has a drafted consequence or a recorded acceptance • Worst compliant outcome acceptable once clauses apply.
Decline	• Any whenua failure or, • Worst compliant outcome unacceptable and unfixable by clause.
Note: Most viable PPPs will land in the middle row.	

6. References

Public value

- Moore, M. H. (1995). *Creating Public Value: Strategic Management in Government*. Harvard University Press.
- Moore, M. H. (2013). *Recognizing Public Value*. Harvard University Press. <https://www.hks.harvard.edu/publications/recognizing-public-value>
- Moore, M. H. (2013). Public Value Propositions and the Strategic Triangle. <https://markmoore.scholars.harvard.edu/publications/public-value-propositions-and-strategic-triangle>
- Alford, J. & O'Flynn, J. (2009). Making sense of public value: concepts, critiques and emergent meanings. *International Journal of Public Administration*, 32(3–4).

Te Whare Tapa Whā and Māori health models

- Durie, M. (1985). A Māori perspective of health. *Social Science & Medicine*, 20(5), 483–486.
- Ministry of Health New Zealand. Te Whare Tapa Whā model of Māori health. <https://www.health.govt.nz/maori-health/maori-health-models/te-whare-tapa-wha>

- Health Quality & Safety Commission New Zealand. Te Whare Tapa Whā — the four pillars of hauora. <https://www.hqsc.govt.nz/assets/Our-work/National-trauma-network/Publications-resources/Te-Whare-Tapa-Wha-resource.pdf>
- MAS. Well in every way — Te Whare Tapa Whā (includes Durie's own reflections and the NZDF application). <https://www.mas.co.nz/hub/well-in-every-way-te-whare-tapa-wha/>
- Waihangā Ara Rau. Enhancing workplace morale and safety with Māori concepts. <https://www.waihangaararau.nz/maori-concepts-lift-culture/>
- Pitama, S. et al. Improving Māori health through clinical assessment: Waikare o te Waka o Meihana. *New Zealand Medical Journal*, 127(1393). <https://nzmj.org.nz/media/pages/journal/vol-127-no-1393/improving-maori-health-through-clinical-assessment-waikare-o-te-waka-o-meihana/b9fe05db1b-1696478814/improving-maori-health-through-clinical-assessment-waikare-o-te-waka-o-meihana.pdf>
- Kaitiaki Nursing New Zealand. Rethinking Māori health models: a kōhanga reo generation perspective. <https://kaitiaki.org.nz/article/rethinking-maori-health-models-a-kohanga-reo-generation-perspective/>

PPP evaluation and performance measurement

- Grimsey, D. & Lewis, M. K. (2004). *Public Private Partnerships: The Worldwide Revolution in Infrastructure Provision and Project Finance*. Edward Elgar.
- Grimsey, D. & Lewis, M. K. (2005). Are public private partnerships value for money? Evaluating alternative approaches and comparing academic and practitioner views. *Accounting Forum*, 29(4), 345–378. <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/abs/pii/S0155998205000037>
- World Bank PPP Reference Guide. Assessing value for money of a PPP. <https://ppp.worldbank.org/assessing-value-money-ppp>
- Osei-Kyei, R. & Chan, A. P. C. (2015). Review of studies on the critical success factors for public–private partnership projects from 1990 to 2013. *International Journal of Project Management*, 33(6), 1335–1346.

Institutional context

- Archives New Zealand Te Rua Mahara o te Kāwanatanga. <https://www.archives.govt.nz/>
- Archives New Zealand. New way of working begins for National Library and Archives New Zealand. <https://www.archives.govt.nz/about-us/whats-new/new-way-of-working-begins-for-national-library-and-archives-new-zealand>
- LIANZA. Update on NALI review of Archives and National Library structure. <https://www.lianza.org.nz/resources/lianza-news/update-on-nali-review-of-archives-and-national-library-structure/>