

Pacific Executive (PACE) Program

**AidWorks Initiative Number:
INI304 (activities 08B119 and 08B347)**

FINAL INDEPENDENT PROGRESS REPORT

14 December 2010¹

Authors:

John Mellors (through PDP Australia Pty Limited)

Peter Deacon (independent consultant)

¹ As agreed with AusAID this Final Report is the Draft Report dated 29 October 2010 with correction of minor typographical errors.

Aid Activity Summary

Aid Activity Name	Pacific Executive Program (PACE) and PACE Extension		
AidWorks initiative number	INI304 (activities 08B119 and 08B347)		
Commencement date	1 July 2008	Completion date	31 December 2011
Total Australian \$	\$7.528 million for PACE and an estimated \$0.65 million for PACE Extension (the funding agreement for the latter is under re-negotiation).		
Total other \$	\$0		
Delivery organisation(s)	Australia New Zealand School of Government		
Implementing Partner(s)	Public Service Commissions (or equivalents) of the countries below		
Country/Region	Cook Islands, Fiji, Kiribati, Nauru, Papua New Guinea, Samoa, Solomon Islands, Tonga and Vanuatu		
Primary Sector	15140 – Government administration		

Acknowledgments

The Evaluation Team wishes to acknowledge the support and insights provided by all those consulted in Australia and the sample of three Pacific Island Countries visited by the Team. It particularly acknowledges the willing cooperation and support provided by the Australia New Zealand School of Government for the conduct of the evaluation and the valuable insights provided by all those past and present PACE participants who met with the Team.

Authors' Details

John Mellors (Team Leader) and Peter Deacon (Capacity Building Advisor). John Mellors is a panel member for AusAID's current Governance Support Services Period Offer (public sector management and public financial management categories). Peter Deacon is a member of AusAID's current Capacity Development Panel of Experts.

Contents

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	1
INTRODUCTION.....	6
EVALUATION FINDINGS	9
EVALUATION CRITERIA RATINGS.....	22
CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS	23
ANNEX A: TERMS OF REFERENCE	27
ANNEX B: REVIEW METHODOLOGY REPORT	29
ANNEX C: PRINCIPAL DOCUMENTS REVIEWED	33
ANNEX D: PERSONS CONSULTED	35
ANNEX E: AIDE MEMOIRES (EXCLUDING ANNEXES)	38
ANNEX F: SOME COMPARISONS OF EXECUTIVE DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM COSTS	57

Acronyms

ANZSOG	Australia New Zealand School of Government
APSC	Australian Public Service Commission
AusAID	Australian Agency for International Development
CEO	Chief Executive Officer
M&E	Monitoring and Evaluation
MDGs	Millennium Development Goals
PACE	Pacific Executive (Program)
PPSCC	Pacific Public Service Commissioners' Conference
PIC	Pacific Island Country
PiSGP	Pacific Islands Scholarships for Governance Program
PNG	Papua New Guinea
PICPA	Pacific Islands Centre for Public Administration

Executive Summary

The Pacific Executive (PACE) Program is targeted at Pacific public sector officials approaching CEO level who are viewed as potential leaders. Cohorts of up to 40 officials attend a three-week residential program in Canberra, undertake a work project in their home countries and return to Canberra 11 months later for a further week of training to consolidate their learning. Each year around 5 of the top performers in PACE are offered extended work placements of up to eight weeks in Australia immediately following their graduation from PACE in an area relevant to the work project that they developed through PACE. The funding agreement for the program provided up to some \$7.5 million over three years to fund three cohorts of PACE participants and related activities with the final cohort completing Stage 3 of the program in August 2011.

The declared goal of the Pacific Executive Program (PACE) is “To improve public sector capacity in the Pacific region.” Its declared purpose is “To improve the management and leadership capacity of senior public servants in each of the countries participating in the program.”

PACE is a high-quality executive development program. Individual participants in PACE, the PACE Extension placements and PACE Alumni activities value highly the learning opportunities and wider networking opportunities that PACE provides. Formal evaluations by PACE participants conducted by ANZSOG rate the learning outcomes for participants at consistently high levels over time. The Evaluation Team’s consultations with PACE participants confirm these formal evaluations. The views of others consulted, including Public Service Commissions in three participating countries and additional informal discussions held with delegates at the 8th Pacific Public Service Commissioners Conference (PPSCC) recently held in Vanuatu, on the value of in-Australia professional development programs for Pacific officials were more mixed but a majority appeared to favour a continuation of PACE, at least pending the development of effective in-country alternatives.

Other than through its significant learning impact on participating individuals and their agencies there is little evidence of a PACE contribution to the broader goal of improving public sector capacity in the Pacific region. This conclusion does not reflect adversely on PACE. Rather, it reflects the following factors amongst others:

- the long-term nature of institutional strengthening and capacity building;
- the difficulties inherent in attempting to isolate from all other contributing factors (and measure) the impact of training activities on wider public sector capacity and reform;
- the fact that participants’ work projects through PACE address issues relevant to their individual agencies that may be but are not necessarily relevant to partner governments’ wider capacity building priorities.

Program delivery and management by ANZSOG is also rated highly by participants with very few (and minor) suggestions for Program management. The Evaluation Team nevertheless recommends several refinements for consideration by ANZSOG, AusAID and/or PIC partner governments. For reasons detailed in this report it also proposes extension of the current funding agreement between AusAID and ANZSOG to enable one further cohort of PACE participants to commence Stage 1 of the program in 2011 and graduate from the program in 2012.

Beyond this, the Evaluation Team recommends a detailed review of options for future delivery of executive development training for senior Pacific officials of the kind currently delivered in-Australia through PACE before any extension of the program beyond 2012.

Principal recommendations

Recommendation 1: Over the balance of the current PACE program:

- Provide PIC central agencies (notably Public Service Commissions and Aid Coordination Units) of participating countries together with the relevant AusAID Post opportunities to review the work projects proposed by PACE nominees and their CEOs and to comment on whether they are consistent with whole-of-government capacity building priorities and parallel bilateral programs.
- Related to this, give preference to PACE nominees proposing work projects that have potential to deliver results that are replicable beyond their individual agencies.
- Take steps to ensure the learning outcomes achieved by PACE participants and the results of their work projects are shared more systematically with their peer groups and the relevant AusAID Post.

Recommendation 2: Provide the Pacific Public Service Commissioners Conference (with input from PICPA) ample opportunity to advise its views on the longer-term future of the PACE program, having regard to the options identified in this report for future delivery arrangements.

Recommendation 3: To facilitate implementation of Recommendation 2 and provide adequate lead-time for the design of any follow-on to the current PACE program, in whatever form, extend the current funding agreement for the PACE program to enable one further cohort of PACE participation commencing Stage 1 in 2011 and concluding Stage 3 in 2012.

Recommendation 4: Within the term of the current PACE program, address the following program management matters:

- Clarify the roles and responsibilities of PACE mentors and ANZSOG staff respectively for monitoring of PACE participant progress during Stage 2 and communicate these roles and responsibilities more clearly to participants.
- Inclusion in future ANZSOG annual reports on PACE to include a brief update on perceived risks, any significant new risks emerging and proposed responses thereto.
- Broaden the scope of the annual AusAID/ANZSOG program review meetings for PACE to brief ANZSOG on developments relating to parallel learning and capacity development programs (e.g. progress on the establishment of PICPA).
- Proactive facilitation by AusAID to resolve any remaining tensions between ANZSOG and the APSC in relation to roles and responsibilities for the arrangement of work attachments for PACE Extension participants.
- Provision of advice at the earliest opportunity to Australian agencies hosting PACE Extension participants of the individual's work project and learning objectives for the work attachment.

Recommendation 5: If, following PIC input to decision-making pursuant to Recommendation 2, it is proposed to renew delivery of an executive development program in-Australia for a further period of years then this renewal should be subject to a competitive tendering process for selection of the future service provider. The call for tenders should define learning and any other desired outcomes but not be prescriptive as to how these outcomes are to be delivered. One or more representatives of PICs nominated by the Commissioners' Conference should be included on the tender assessment panel.

Recommendation 6: Within the term of the current PACE program and (if extended) beyond, the program should take steps to ensure that gender and equity priorities are actively integrated within program content and associated work projects having regard to the suggestions made in this report.

Recommendation 7: Monitoring and evaluation arrangements for the current PACE program be refined in the following ways:

- ANZSOG prepare, update annually and present in its annual reports consolidated statistical data on PACE participation for all PACE cohorts to date (including the PACE pilot program) and for each PACE component (PACE Stages 1, 2 and 3; PACE Extension and attendance at PACE alumni conferences) to indicate the number of participants by year, by country and by sex.
- The mean averages of the Likert scale evaluations published in ANZSOG's annual reports be gender disaggregated (i.e. the mean averages be derived and presented for all participants and for female/male participants respectively).
- Monitoring by ANZSOG of (and periodic mentor support for) the work projects undertaken by PACE/PACE Extension participants continue for a period of, say, one year beyond participants' completion of PACE Stage 3/PACE Extension (this was the most common request voiced by PACE participants in discussions).
- Copies of ANZSOG's annual reports to AusAID on PACE be formally circulated by AusAID to participants in the Pacific Public Service Commissioners' Conference (out of session) and relevant AusAID Posts with an invitation to supply comments on PACE's contribution to the enhancement of senior executive skills.
- ANZSOG ensures that its data base of individual PACE participants enables it to monitor PACE alumni mobility and report on personnel movement at the completion of the current PACE program.²

Recommendation 8: Encourage and fund ANZSOG to examine opportunities to use and apply information in the public (or AusAID) domain which might impact upon PACE, for example:

- How can transformative change be supported and what is the critical mass of participating cohorts necessary to support transformational change?³
- Pacific Public Sector Workforce Mapping⁴, Experiencing the Public Sector: Pacific Women's Perspectives⁵, Pacific Public Sector Capacity⁶.
- Examine the value, outcomes and impacts associated with work attachments, particularly with regards to past and future attachments associated with PACE Extension.
- Develop and implement mechanisms capable of monitoring and tracking participants and the impacts those individuals are having with regards to regional networking and contextual and professional activities on return to their work environment. This should be established as a longitudinal study (see also M&E above).

² Data on mobility will be necessary to evaluate the extent to which 'emerging leaders' participating in PACE have in fact, over the life of the current program, moved 'onwards and upwards' to leadership positions. The PACE Participant Experience Survey includes questions enabling mobility to be tracked and will, if responded to by an adequate sample of participants, provide data on alumni mobility.

³ Whilst PACE is premised on transformational change, no effort has been made to determine the appropriate size of cohorts or how they should be targeted in country. A number of participants emphasized the importance of having companions from their own workplace to support change.

⁴ AusAID document, February 2009.

⁵ <http://rspas.anu.edu.au/melanesia/research.php>

⁶ Refer to PICPA Design Document page 43.

Recommendation 9: If an in-Australia executive development program continues in 2012 and beyond then future interaction between PICPA and the service provider should ensure:

- The content of and target group for the program logically ‘nest’ with (do not duplicate) the in-country learning programs facilitated by PICPA.
- Two-way information exchange and feedback between PICPA and the program service provider in relation to, in particular: the in-country training programs most likely to produce ‘feeder groups’ for potential participation in the program; timetables, content and application procedures; the membership country-by-country of the alumni network; and the evaluation of outcomes and impacts.
- Direct linkage between the service provider’s website (currently the PACE website maintained by ANZSOG) and the proposed PICPA website as and when the latter becomes operational.

Wider issues

Recommendation 10: AusAID should progress and complete, at the earliest opportunity, an over-arching framework for its capacity building programs in the Pacific Region, including learning programs, as foreshadowed by AusAID’s Pacific Public Sector Capacity Building Concept Paper of June 2008.

Recommendation 11: Pursuant to Recommendation 10, AusAID should provide clearer guidance to Posts and play a more proactive role in relation to the capacity building (and leadership) activities it manages across the Pacific to ensure there is coordination of support at regional and national levels and that coordination decisions are made with full PIC engagement.

Recommendation 12: Realign leadership programs supported by AusAID to deliver greater cohesion of the objectives and methodology supporting leadership development initiatives across the agency.

Evaluation Criteria Ratings

Evaluation Criteria	Rating (1-6)	Explanation
Relevance	4	At a broad level PACE contributes to regional and bilateral public workforce development priorities as expressed in a number of regional and country-specific strategy documents. At the program delivery level there is little evidence that the PACE program is ‘owned’ by either individual PICs or AusAID Posts. It is essentially an ‘add-on’ to bilateral Partnerships and bilateral programs attracting little interest or involvement from either PICs (other than participating individuals) or AusAID Posts.
Effectiveness	5	PACE is effective in achieving its declared purpose and the rating places most weight on this. Beyond its contribution to raising the professional capacity of individual participants PACE’s contribution to the higher-order program goal cannot be assessed in any measurable way. There is little evidence to date of a contribution to the higher-order goal.
Efficiency	5	Program management is efficient but some refinements should be considered. The program is high-quality but there is no robust benchmark at this stage against which to judge cost efficiency and this should be remedied in future through market testing.
Sustainability	4	There is no evidence to suggest that PACE is financially sustainable without ongoing AusAID funding although this is true of many AusAID programs. The learning outcomes achieved for participating individuals appear to be durable. The program is doing little direct to build the capacity of participating PICs to design and deliver in-country executive development programs of this kind.
Gender Equality	4	ANZSOG has actively managed gender equality with respect to the mechanics of program implementation. A greater effort needs to be made to integrate gender and equity issues into the program content and participants’ work projects.
Monitoring & Evaluation	4	ANZSOG evaluates and reports on the delivery of the PACE program, PACE Extensions and PACE Alumni workshops in a systematic and ongoing way using both formal and informal means. Broader impacts claimed for the program are not monitored and that may not, in any event, be cost effective for a program of this nature and scale. Some refinements should nevertheless be considered.
Analysis & Learning	4	ANZSOG has adapted details of the PACE program in the light of participant feedback. However little effort appears to have been made to examine and understand how PACE has impacted upon leadership and development issues across the target countries.

Rating scale: 6 = very high quality; 1 = very low quality. Below 4 is less than satisfactory.

Introduction

1. The Australian Agency for International Development (AusAID) has supported the building of networks and provision of training opportunities for middle and senior Pacific Island public sector administrators for some years. In recent years two such activities have been the Pacific Executive (PACE) program and the AusAID-APSC Pacific Governance Partnership (APSC Partnership). This Independent Progress Report addresses the PACE program. A concurrent report addresses the APSC Partnership while a (briefer) third report addresses issues common to both programs and linkages between them.

Activity Background

2. The PACE program was developed by the Australia and New Zealand School of Government (ANZSOG) in collaboration with AusAID to build capacity and strengthen reform in the Pacific region. It is designed for public sector officials in the executive ranks who have been identified as emerging and future leaders. The Goal of the program is “To improve public sector capacity in the Pacific region” while its Purpose is “To improve the management and leadership capacity of senior public servants in each of the countries participating in the program.” Participation in the program for 2010 is open to public officials drawn from nine countries.⁷

3. The expected outcomes of the program have been described as follows:

“The program is expected to enhance the management and leadership capacity of senior public servants in each of the countries participating in the program, and thus contribute to improving administrative governance in these countries. More specifically, participants should gain increased competency and capacity in the following areas: project management, understanding the concept of ‘public value’, managing relations with ministers, administering and interpreting rules, formulating and advising government on public policy, public expenditure and budgeting, human resources management, ethics and accountability, and leadership (including mentoring). The program will also strengthen regional relationships and enhance professional opportunities for long-term institutional and personal linkages across the Pacific, including French Territories.”⁸

4. Annual cohorts of up to 40 PACE participants attend a three week residential program in Canberra directed by ANZSOG (Stage 1), undertake a work project in their home countries (Stage 2) and return to Canberra a year later for a further week of training to consolidate their learning (Stage 3). Following a pilot program undertaken in 2007-2008 the current funding agreement between AusAID and ANZSOG provides for the delivery of PACE to three cohorts, the first having graduated from Stage 3 in August 2009 and the last to graduate from Stage 3 in August 2011.

5. Each year around 5-6 of the top performers in PACE Stages 1 and 2 are offered extended work placements of up to eight weeks in Australia, immediately following their completion of PACE Stage 3, in an area relevant to the work project that they developed through PACE (‘PACE Extension’). PACE Extension participants are selected by a tri-partite committee of AusAID, APSC and ANZSOG representatives. The APSC arranges suitable work placements with Australian government agencies for those selected.

⁷ Cook Islands, Fiji, Kiribati, Nauru, PNG, Samoa, Solomon Islands, Tonga and Vanuatu. It is understood the question of Tuvalu’s future inclusion may be considered further.

⁸ See paragraph 52, Schedule 1 to AusAID Funding Agreement Deed No.48262 dated 8 February 2009

6. Funding of the program also provides for the establishment and maintenance of a PACE Alumni Network including funding of two annual (two-day) alumni conferences to date, a PACE website accessible by PACE participants and the production of a PACE Newsletter.

7. The current AusAID-ANZSOG funding agreement for PACE provided for maximum funding of the program of some \$7.5 million (plus GST) payable in three tranches but provided also for CPI increases.⁹ Funding of PACE Extension is the subject of a separate agreement currently under re-negotiation but with an expected total upper limit of some \$650,000 for the years 2008-2010.

8. PACE is a regional program managed within AusAID by the Governance and Public Administration Section located in Canberra. Some consequences of this and linkages between PACE and Australia's wider strategies in relation to capacity building in the Pacific are outlined in later sections of this report.

Evaluation Objectives and Questions

9. The core Terms of Reference for this independent progress report are at Annex A. The Evaluation Team was tasked to address AusAID's standard evaluation questions and, additionally, questions relating to the program's approach to capacity building and relationship to other Pacific public sector capacity building programs, its 'fit' with AusAID's emerging approaches to leadership, opportunities for future interaction with the Pacific Islands Centre for Public Administration and the program's contribution to the development of networks. Specific questions identified in the Terms of Reference are addressed under the relevant sections of Evaluation Findings (below).

Evaluation Scope and Methods

10. The Evaluation Team's terms of reference required it to first prepare a Review Methodology Report for consideration by AusAID. This report, reproduced at Annex B, was submitted to AusAID on 27 July 2010 and subsequently endorsed. In summary, the evaluation has been undertaken in two main ways:

- review and analysis of documentation and data relating to the PACE program;
- structured consultations with a range of stakeholders in Australia and in-country, notably: AusAID (in Australia and at Posts); ANZSOG; APSC; participants in PACE activities from Kiribati, Samoa and Tonga, representatives of their agencies (as available) and representatives of relevant central agencies in these countries¹⁰. In addition, formal and informal discussions took place with country representatives at the 8th Pacific Public Service Commissioners Conference recently held in Vanuatu.

11. Documents reviewed by the Evaluation Team are itemised at Annex C while persons consulted are listed at Annex D. The review team structured the questions pursued in consultations to enable cross-matching of findings. At the conclusion of each visit the Evaluation Team presented an Aide Memoire to the AusAID Post and Chairperson or Chief

⁹ AusAID Funding Agreement Deed No. 48262 Section 14.1. The term of the agreement commenced 1 July 2008 and concludes 31 August 2012.

¹⁰ The evaluation methodology anticipated in-country visits to Kiribati, Samoa and Solomon Islands. Having regard to advice from AusAID (Honiara) the planned visit to Solomon Islands was replaced by a visit to Tonga. The visits lasted three (Kiribati) to five (Samoa, Tonga) working days.

Executive of the country's Public Service Commission. These Aide Memoires are reproduced at Annex E.¹¹

12. The Evaluation Team's terms of reference required it to organise its own schedule of consultations in the three countries visited. This proved more difficult than anticipated with many initial emails to PACE participants seeking meetings going unanswered. However, with assistance from ANZSOG and, in some cases, the relevant country's Public Service Commission together with the Team's direct approaches to individuals following arrival in-country, a majority of each country's PACE participants were consulted.¹² The Team Leader also attended, as an observer for two days, the PACE Stage 1 program held in Canberra from 23 August to 9 September 2010.

Evaluation Team

13. The Evaluation Team comprised John Mellors (Team Leader) and Peter Deacon (Capacity Building Advisor). John Mellors is a panel member for AusAID's current Governance Support Services Period Offer (public sector management and public financial management categories). Peter Deacon is a member of AusAID's current Capacity Development Panel of Experts. Both team members have prior experience in the evaluation of training/professional and public sector development programs.

¹¹ The Aide Memoires encompassed findings in relation to both the PACE program and APSC Partnership activities. The Aide Memoire for Samoa was not presented in person to that country's Public Service Commission but was to be provided through the AusAID Post.

¹² Over the past three years a total of some 29 officials from the three countries have participated or are currently participating in one or more PACE activities. Of these 8 were either overseas, on leave or similarly unavailable for interview in-country. Of the remaining 21 persons the Evaluation Team met with 16 PACE participants (76%).

Evaluation Findings

Relevance

14. The Australian Government continues its commitment to accelerate progress towards the achievement of the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) and this has been well articulated by regional leaders at recent Pacific Island Forums¹³. Bilateral and regional partnerships and programs have been established across the Pacific to support public workforce development needs¹⁴ and PACE is a part of the portfolio of programs doing this.

15. At a broad level PACE contributes to regional and bilateral public workforce development priorities as expressed in a number of Partnership and other strategy documents.¹⁵ Through its professional development of senior officials PACE has the potential to strengthen PIC capacity to respond to the Paris Declaration, the Accra Agenda for Action and the related Pacific Aid Effectiveness Principles, although little evidence of this occurring was observed.

16. As elaborated below (Effectiveness), all participants consulted expressed the view that PACE was highly relevant to their professional development needs in terms of providing external support, advice, learning opportunities and access to useful resource documentation. Individual projects and attachments appeared to align with, and support documented agency plans and priorities. In general, high level government support and endorsement for participation in the program was required in all countries.

17. The extent to which true national coordination and monitoring of program participation and evaluation takes place is less clear. There was little evidence that PIC central agencies (including aid coordination units) and/or AusAID Post(s) play any direct role in reviewing participants' proposed projects or evaluating the outcomes of their participation. 'Ownership' of PACE appears to reside primarily with the service provider. For the larger PICs in particular it is doubtful whether, given direct control over their 'share' of funding currently allocated to the program, they would choose to allocate that share to ongoing participation in PACE as opposed to using the funding for in-country training purposes.

Effectiveness

18. 'Effectiveness' assesses the extent to which a program's outputs contribute to the achievement of desired program outcomes. The 'outputs' of PACE are its graduates. PACE outcomes can be defined at two levels: strengthened management and leadership capacity of individual PACE graduates (which equates to the PACE 'purpose'); and strengthened capacity of

¹³Leadership support and development was the first principle enunciated in the 2000 Biketawa Declaration. The commitment was further reinforced at the 2007 38th Pacific Islands Forum, where Leaders supported the need to progress issues of Good Governance. The 2009 Cairns Compact and the 2008 commitment to pursue 'Pacific Partnerships for Development' further supported the MDG priorities.

¹⁴ These include: country specific Partnership Development Agreements (all countries); Australia Leadership Awards; APSC Pacific Governance Partnership; Pacific Islands Centre for Public Administration; Economic and Public Sector Program (PNG), Machinery of Governance (Solomon Islands) and the Public Sector Improvement Facility (Samoa)

¹⁵ Examples include: Australia Samoan Partnership for Development priority areas i.e. Priority Outcome 4 - public sector capacity, in particular: executive and personnel training; PNG/AusAID the Public Sector Development Workforce Development Program in PNG; Solomon Islands Partnership Framework – Theme 3.1 Support for Executive Development; Kiribati is establishing a whole-of-government system for identifying public service demand and aligning it to the supply of skills, and Nauru's participatory National Sustainable Development Strategy has set the basis for linking public service HRM to broader strategic objectives support.

the agencies and wider public services from which PACE participants are drawn to perform at higher levels (which broadly equates to the PACE ‘goal’).

19. PACE is highly effective at the first outcome level. Individual participants in PACE, the PACE Extension placements and PACE Alumni activities value highly the learning opportunities and wider networking opportunities that PACE provides. Formal evaluations by PACE participants conducted by ANZSOG rate the learning outcomes for participants at consistently high levels over time. The Evaluation Team’s consultations with PACE participants confirm these formal evaluations. PACE is seen as delivering learning in a way that relates to the practical needs and experiences of participants while expanding their professional horizons¹⁶ Work projects undertaken by PACE and PACE Extension participants are relevant to the needs of their agencies. The views of others consulted, including Public Service Commissions in three participating countries¹⁷, on the value of in-Australia professional development programs for Pacific officials were more mixed but two of the three appeared to favour continuation of the PACE program, at least pending the development of effective in-country alternatives.

20. The Evaluation Team found little evidence that PACE is contributing to outcomes at the higher level – strengthened public sector capacity in the Pacific region – and this evidence was confined to anecdotal examples of how work projects undertaken by participants had contributed to the work of their individual agencies. This finding does not reflect adversely on PACE or its service provider but stems from the following key factors:

- The tracing of links between individual professional development, institutional strengthening and long-term capacity building poses major challenges in any context¹⁸. Institutional strengthening and capacity building are long-term endeavours. The extent of progress is influenced by a wide range of factors. The contribution of each factor is hard to assess in isolation from the others, especially over a short time period.
- Prior studies of the role of training point strongly to the conclusion that if it is to contribute to capacity development it must be linked to complementary measures to address dysfunctional public administration environments and target a critical mass of people equipped to spearhead change. PACE has no direct links to other bilateral or regional capacity building programs. Participants’ selection of work projects address the needs of their agencies but, in the absence of input to this selection by central agencies of their jurisdictions, may or may not be consistent with whole-of-government capacity building priorities. For the smaller participating countries in particular nominating 2-3 participants each year (i.e. a total of perhaps 12 officials or less over the life of the current program including its pilot) it is highly questionable whether this will achieve a ‘critical mass’ of officials to spearhead change.¹⁹

21. In the short-term (balance of the current PACE program) there are three relatively simple steps that can be taken to partially address these issues:

¹⁶ The following participant comments are typical of those made by virtually all participants interviewed: “the best training program I have ever been on”; “the program gave me far greater confidence that I can do the things I need to do in my job”; “the program exposed me to new ways of doing things”; “A high level program – great speakers with a practical focus – the organisation was fantastic”; “I would certainly recommend the program to colleagues”.

¹⁷ These comments were in general replicated during informal discussions held with other Commissioners during the recent 8th PPSCC held in Vanuatu.

¹⁸ Little, if any effort is made to do so in a developed context (e.g. Australia), yet alone in a developing context.

¹⁹ The design of PACE itself recognised the importance of these factors, noting the need for “strong articulation and interface with parallel programs” and that “subject to capacity constraints, multiple participants from a single agency is [sic] desirable to help sustain learnings and motivation.” (PACE Funding Agreement, Schedule 1, page 24). In the event there is no direct interface with parallel programs and, with the limited exception of participants drawn from some Public Service Commissions, no multiple participation from single agencies.

- The central agencies (notably Public Service Commissions and Aid Coordination Units) of participating countries together with the relevant AusAID Post should be given the opportunity to review the work projects proposed by PACE nominees and their CEOs and comment on whether they are consistent with (or not inconsistent with) whole-of-government capacity building priorities and parallel bilateral programs.²⁰
- Related to this, preference should be given to PACE nominees proposing work projects that have potential to deliver results that are replicable beyond their individual agencies.
- The learning outcomes achieved by PACE participants and the results of their work projects should be shared more systematically with their peer groups and the relevant AusAID Post.²¹

22. In considering the possible longer-term future of PACE the Evaluation Team suggests, firstly, that AusAID review expectations that a learning program of this kind, however effective in strengthening the management and leadership capabilities of individuals, can also deliver directly attributable and measurable impacts on the capacities of public administrations more broadly. It is perhaps relevant to ask the question: should AusAID place such a high emphasis on prescribing and associating high level development outcomes to a program such as PACE given the relatively low cost and low risk of the investment? This is particularly so given that this is rarely done in a non-development context (e.g. support for executive development programs in the Australian Local, State and Federal public sectors). The ‘goal’ of any renewed/extended PACE program should be reviewed accordingly.

23. This said, two key steps would have the potential to strengthen PACE’s future contribution. First, the articulation of an over-arching framework for learning and related bilateral and regional programs that clearly identifies the anticipated contribution of each to Pacific capacity building objectives and ensures, both in principle and through coordination arrangements for their implementation in practice, that each complements the others. Second, full consultation with the PICs in order that their capacity building priorities are reflected in both the over-arching framework and the individual learning programs that it encompasses including their delivery arrangements.

24. Consistent with the latter the Evaluation Team proposes that the Pacific Public Service Commissioners Conference be provided ample opportunity to advise its views on the longer-term future of PACE, assisted in this by future input from the Pacific Islands Centre for Public Administration (see PICPA below). This should include consideration of the following future delivery options:

- continued delivery of an in-Australia program managed on a regional basis;
- devolution of funding to the PICs with their future participation in an Australia-based program decided at their option;
- bilateral AusAID funding for national in-country executive development programs linked to national priorities;
- PICPA coordination and facilitation of an executive development program for countries continuing to lack in-country programs.

To provide adequate lead-time for this and for the design of any follow-on of (or successor to) the PACE program the Evaluation Team also proposes that the current funding agreement for

²⁰ This central agency/AusAID Post input was not occurring in any of the three countries visited.

²¹ With few exceptions in the three countries visited the reports by PACE participants on their work projects were presented to their CEOs and forwarded to their Public Service Commissions for information but not otherwise disseminated.

PACE be extended to enable one further cohort of PACE participation (commencing Stage 1 in 2011 and concluding Stage 3 in 2012).²²

Efficiency

25. 'Efficiency' assesses the productivity of a program's inputs in delivering the program's outputs.

26. The structure, content and delivery of the PACE program incorporate many lessons learned from prior learning programs directed at similar aims and target groups. The Evaluation Team's review of ANZSOG documentation for the program and (brief) participation to observe part of the 2010 program for Stage 1 indicate that inputs to the program are of high quality and high relevance to the learning objectives of participants. ANZSOG seeks formal feedback from participants on its management of the program using the same methodology as that for the evaluation of learning outcomes (see Monitoring and Evaluation). This indicates consistently high degrees of satisfaction amongst participants with ANZSOG's management of the program. With the exception of a desire for more follow-up following completion of Stage 3 participants interviewed made no substantive suggestions for changes in the way the program is delivered.

27. The program is undoubtedly of high quality. On a 'per participant' basis the basic cost of delivering the program appears neither unduly high nor low relative to a sample of other executive development programs delivered in Australia. Travel and accommodation costs, daily allowances and insurance for participants do, however, add significantly to the basic cost (see Annex F).

28. Annex F is open to the potential criticism that it compares 'apples and oranges' and/or makes insufficient allowance for unique features of the PACE program. The Evaluation Team acknowledges the potential for such criticism. Its principal concern is not whether PACE appears (superficially) to be relatively high- or low-cost but, rather that its quality and cost have not to date been market-tested - the most reliable mechanism for reaching judgments on the potential cost efficiency and effectiveness of competing service providers. If an executive development program is to be extended beyond the one-year extension proposed above (see Effectiveness) then further delivery of the program should be subject to a competitive tendering process. The Evaluation Team is confident that such a process would attract a significant field of potential service providers; and that several would likely offer services of competitive quality.

29. For the shorter-term the Evaluation Team has identified the following – relatively minor – matters that should be addressed in relation to PACE program management.

- Mentoring of PACE participants during Stage 2. Based on the Evaluation Team's interviews, arrangements for distance mentoring of participants while they undertake their work projects in-country appear somewhat 'patchy'. While being provided with mentors' contact details, several participants suggested that it appeared to be up to them to make contact with their mentors during this Stage (some did, some didn't). It is also unclear to the Evaluation Team whether responsibility for monitoring participants' progress during Stage 2 rests with their mentors or ANZSOG staff through the latter's in-country visits. This could usefully be clarified and made clear to participants.
- Risk management. The PACE Funding Agreement outlined critical risks and risk management strategies associated with PACE.²³ ANZSOG's annual reports do not update

²² While not directly linked, this extension would also align the conclusion of the current PACE program with that for activities delivered by the APSC under the current APSC Partnership funding agreement, enabling the longer-term future of both to be considered in parallel.

the original risk assessment. While the Evaluation Team sees PACE as being exposed to relatively low risk, ANZSOG's future reports should incorporate brief risk updates noting the emergence of any significant new risks.

- AusAID/ANZSOG annual program review meetings. The Evaluation Team understands that these annual review meetings focus primarily if not wholly on the PACE program. It would almost certainly assist ANZSOG to relate the PACE program to broader capacity building objectives in the Pacific if these discussions served also to brief ANZSOG on developments relating to parallel programs (e.g. progress towards the establishment of PICPA and its work plans).
- ANZSOG/APSC interaction in relation to work placements for PACE Extension participants. The APSC's annual reports on APSC Partnership suggest that some tensions have arisen with ANZSOG as to their respective roles and responsibilities. While these appear to be moving towards a resolution, the Evaluation Team encourages AusAID to proactively mediate that resolution.

Impact

30. Positive impacts of the PACE program at the level of individual participants are clearly positive and significant. As noted (see Effectiveness), all participants interviewed believed that their participation in the program resulted in improved: self esteem and confidence; planning and communication skills; operational understanding of their portfolios; and the ability to better manage and lead within the public sector. Public Service Commissioners broadly endorsed that assessment. Participants also believed that, generally, their participation provided them an opportunity to directly influence in a positive way corporate outcomes for their agencies and that they were well supported by their senior management (CEOs) in this regard. The Evaluation Team was provided with several examples where PACE participants believed their participation had supported them to subsequently innovate and/or better manage their agencies' programs.²⁴

31. While based on a limited sample, the Evaluation Team also encountered several cases of PACE alumni that, since their participation in PACE, have been transferred to new positions with more senior responsibilities (with or without formal promotion) including a number just below CEO level. While it is 'early days', PACE does appear to be targeting and attracting cohorts from which will emerge a significant number of future CEOs within Pacific administrations. This should be further tested on completion of the current PACE program (see Monitoring and Evaluation).

32. As noted earlier (see Effectiveness) the PACE program cannot be linked to wider impacts (either positive or negative) on the capacity building of Pacific public administrations²⁵. The Evaluation Team detected no obvious negative impacts arising from the program. It does, however, note that overseas qualifications tend to be considered more 'prestigious' than local qualifications. In addition, incentives to travel and network internationally are clearly significant factors which indirectly support and drive PACE. So long as externally funded and delivered programs exist, local programs supporting executive and leadership development may tend to be devalued.

Sustainability

33. PACE enjoys very good support at high levels of government within PICs and Australia. The design appears sound and (indirectly at least) supports public sector agendas within the

²³ Funding Agreement, Schedule 1, paragraphs. 75-78.

²⁴ ANZSOG has supplied documentation providing further examples.

²⁵ Also refer to the sections on capacity building and lessons learned.

Pacific region. However, there is no evidence to suggest that PACE would be sustainable in the absence of ongoing AusAID funding.²⁶ As noted earlier, there is a widely-held perception that PACE is a ‘stand-alone’ AusAID regional program with little or no ownership at the country level. It is doubtful whether the absence of the PACE would adversely affect, to any marked extent, public sector leadership, management and service delivery as they currently occur within PICs. PACE’s current delivery arrangements do nothing directly to strengthen the capacity of PICs to design and deliver their own executive development programs.

34. As noted (see Relevance) the PICs have clearly articulated the need for executive and workforce development programs. Samoa, PNG and the Solomon Islands have regularly stated that they would like to see executive development programs based in-country as they judge that the potential for sustainability and strengthening of local institutions is greater when these initiatives are localised with direct funding channelled through their own budget processes. The 2009 design of the Pacific Islands Centre for Public Administration (PICPA) also recognises this need and indicates that the Centre will ‘need to work closely with each PIC to identify priorities for immediate support to improve the quality and relevance of nationally delivered training. Identifying and facilitating efficient ways to improve quality will be a major element of the Centre’s work in its first few years’²⁷ (see also PICPA, below).

Gender Equality

35. ANZSOG and partner governments have managed gender equality with respect to the mechanics of program implementation:

- PACE is actively managed and monitored from a statistical perspective. See Table 1 below.
- PACE was consciously designed and structured to minimise the amount of time participants spend away from home to actively ensure that women, especially those with family responsibilities, may participate in the program.
- Gender data collected by ANZSOG is comprehensive.

36. However, even taking account of the above considerations, ANZSOG still had to actively intervene to ensure that appropriate female representation was achieved and as Table 1 demonstrates true statistical equity has not been achieved as of 2010.²⁸

Table 1: PACE participation numbers by year and gender								
	2007 Participants		2008 Participants		2009 Participants		2010 Participants	
	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female
Total participants	14	9	21	12	21	18	16	24
Per cent	61%	39%	64%	36%	54%	46%	40%	60%
Four-year aggregates: Male 55%; Female 45%								
Notes: The above figures are for PACE cohort participation and completion only i.e. they represent successful completion of stages 1 to 3. It should be noted that PACE extension data shows a slight regression of the above data with Males at 62% and Females at 38%.								

²⁶ But the same could be said of any number of AusAID-funded programs and is not necessarily a criticism.

²⁷ 2009 PICPA Design document, page 26.

²⁸ One country attempted to send only males in 2009 and ANZSOG quickly negotiated a solution to the potential issue.

37. Whilst there has been good management of operational gender and equity issues, little active effort is made to ensure that gender and equity priorities are pursued from a development perspective. There is ample opportunity, and sufficient policy support²⁹ to actively integrate gender and equity principles/priorities within the overall implementation of PACE, examples would include:

- Ensuring that project proposals include and/or specifically target initiatives which will support gender and equity priorities within targeted countries.³⁰
- Becoming more proactive in the support of workforce planning and gender and equity issues and principles in course programming.
- Targeting individuals with regards to technical opportunities to support gender and equity principles and programs in the workplace, for example actively supporting PACE candidates proposing work projects to identify impediments to equal employment opportunities and to develop strategies to address impediments.³¹

38. The Evaluation Team believes that ANZSOG could do considerably more in pursuing gender and equity objectives through the PACE program. A greater effort needs to be made to proactively integrate gender and equity programming within the program content and supported projects.

Monitoring and Evaluation

39. ANZSOG evaluates the delivery of the PACE program, PACE Extensions and PACE Alumni workshops in a systematic and ongoing way using both formal and informal means. PICs and AusAID have no input to this process other than through annual visits by ANZSOG staff to the PICs, the findings of which are not reported.

40. Formal evaluations of each year's Stage 1 and Stage 3 programs are undertaken by all participants through daily written response sheets and an overall evaluation at the conclusion of each program. The evaluations rate presenters, individual sessions, site visits, the program's pace/teaching level/workload, residential facilities and support services, and each program as a whole on a five-point Likert scale. Feedback is also sought by ANSOG staff in informal discussion with participants and presenters. The progress of participants in undertaking Stage 2 (in-country work projects) is monitored periodically by participants' mentors and visits from ANZSOG staff.

41. Each year's PACE Extension is formally evaluated by participants who are asked to rate each Extension program overall, residential facilities and support services, and the value added by workplace mentors and ANZSOG mentors (again using the five-point Likert scale). The two PACE Alumni Workshops conducted to date have also been formally evaluated by their participants using the same overall methodology and covering similar topics to those evaluated for the Stage 1 and 3 programs.

²⁹ Most of the PICs have active policy initiatives in support of gender and equity program which could be targeted and/or supported through PACE. Examples include: Samoa has a women in government program, PNG's Equal Participation of Women in Development Program, and Vanuatu's Priority and Action agenda (2006-2015) which specifically acts to promote gender equality and empower women.

³⁰ One project proposal was put forward by a Samoan candidate which supported programs within the Ministry of Women, Community and Social Services and on interviewing the candidate it was clear that they believed the support provided by PACE significantly enhanced the potential of the proposal.

³¹ Such analysis should consider recruitment, promotion and employment policies and practices, and human resource management practices, as well as the educational and social impediments to equal employment opportunities.

42. The mean ratings derived from these evaluations are reported comprehensively each year by way of annexes to ANZSOG's annual report to AusAID. As noted (see Effectiveness) the mean ratings by participants for each of the PACE activities area almost invariably at the upper end of the rating scale.

43. Progress towards the higher-level Goal of the program ('to improve public sector capacity in the Pacific region') is monitored by ANZSOG on an ongoing basis in terms of the contributions made by PACE participants' work projects to strengthening of the agencies from which they are drawn. Progress in the wider sense of PACE's contribution to Pacific administration governance is not monitored in any systematic way by either ANZSOG, partner governments or AusAID.

44. As noted (see 'Effectiveness') the wider capacity building impacts of training programs are inherently difficult to measure, especially for a regional program like PACE. Moreover the wider impacts to be assessed would need to encompass not only development benefits but also the benefits that flow from fostering personal relationships between emerging leaders in the Pacific and between them and Australian officials and agencies. While undoubtedly real, the latter benefits are even harder to quantify.

45. For this reason the Evaluation Team questions whether significant additional investment in monitoring and evaluation of PACE would represent worthwhile value for money. It is broadly sufficient for a program of this nature that the learning experiences of participants are systematically monitored and clearly positive, as they are for PACE.

46. The Evaluation Team does, however, see a need for refinements to current monitoring arrangements. Its proposals are presented as Recommendation 7 below (see Conclusions and Recommendations).

Analysis and Learning

47. As outlined above, ANZSOG conducts continuous reviews of its teaching programs as they occur and modifications are made as appropriate to improve program delivery and management. However there is little evidence that analysis and learning is applied with regards to developmental and professional impacts from a participant and/or country perspective.³²

48. The design of PACE is premised upon an opportunity to support transformational change within leadership cohorts from participating countries. In doing so, the PACE design and related documentation highlights a number of key issues which the program would seek to address, significant amongst these being:

- Addressing capacity gaps and supporting the development and implementation of succession planning.
- Addressing and supporting the standardisation of service delivery standards across the Pacific.
- Supporting and enhancing regional networking structures.
- Addressing contextual and professional issues.
- Supporting a sustainable program and outcomes.

³² The review team recognises that analysis and learning of development and professional outcomes and objectives is quite problematic, and not normally pursued in a developed context. Nevertheless it is important to attempt to track and apply learning outcomes to improve the development opportunities of the program.

49. To date, little effort appears to have been made to understand how PACE has impacted upon these matters. It is important that a greater effort is made to do this and the Evaluation Team suggests several research initiatives be sponsored by ANZSOG (through PACE) to further strengthen and inform the program and its anticipated outcomes. These are itemised under Recommendation 8 below (see Conclusions and Recommendations).

Approach to Capacity Building

50. The PACE program's design and implementation strategy recognises a number of capacity building priorities which need to be targeted and supported by PACE, the critical ones being:

1. The employment and utilisation of practical, experiential and action learning methodologies that are linked to in situ environments (on-the-job) and result in minimal disturbance to the workplace.
2. Relationship building and development that allows for long term trust and communication.
3. Total ownership, understanding and commitment to the program which is demand driven.
4. Transparency, inclusiveness and empowerment of targeted partners.
5. Whole of Government support for the program is critical.
6. Existing systems, structures and processes should be used and built upon where ever possible.
7. Performance monitoring frameworks that are simple, understood and owned by all.
8. A medium to long term commitment to the program.

51. ANZSOG evaluations and comments from participants confirm PACE implementation has done a good job of addressing priority points 1 and 2 above, particularly with regards to the participants and the course structure and implementation (including PACE Extension).

52. There is, however, little evidence that PACE has made much progress against the other six criteria outlined above. The significant factor which appears to limit PACE's progress against the other criteria is a direct function of the lack of ownership of the program by stakeholders other than ANZSOG and PACE participants.

53. If it is to continue, PACE and especially AusAID will need to make a greater effort to establish in-country ownership and support the facilitation, management and monitoring of the program locally. And perhaps more significantly, acknowledge that capacity building is not time dependent (as highlighted in point eight above) and that the partners would need to commit to a medium to long-term investment.

54. Little research had been done with regards to support for transformative change within a capacity building or development framework and PACE is a brave attempt to support public sector leadership and management by targeting existing and emerging leaders. The Evaluation Team acknowledges that PACE has initiated the establishment of leadership cohorts in at least three countries (i.e. Samoa, Tonga and Kiribati) which have the potential to 'transform' and directly change the organisations they now manage or work within.³³ The current deployment of three Assistant CEOs within the Samoan Public Service Commission may test how homogenous cohorts can impact upon transformative change when a conducive environment for change exists.

³³ Examples include: the General Manager within the Kiribati Housing Corporation, Assistant CEOs within the Ministry of Works; Transport & Infrastructure, Samoa; Assistant CEO Ministry of Commerce, Industry & Labour, Samoa; and Justice, Education and Agriculture in Tonga

Relationship to other Pacific public sector capacity building programs

55. AusAID through the Governance and Public Administration Section sponsors some 17 AidWorks Initiatives directed at public sector capacity building programs within a regional context across the Pacific which had a 2009-2010 budget allocation of some \$26 million.³⁴ In addition, there are a number of significant regional and bilateral programs that inject considerable funds into the Pacific in support of capacity building initiatives. Noteworthy programs include:

- Solomon Islands (RAMSI - multilateral) – the three pillars of Economic Governance, Machinery of Government and Law and Justice.
- Samoa – Public Sector Improvement Facility (PSIF - multilateral).
- PNG – Economic and Public Sector Program (EPSC), Strongim Gavman Program (SGP) – amongst others.
- Kiribati – Public Support Program (KPSP).
- Pacific Islands Centre for Public Administration (PICPA) – a regional program based in Suva. To start in late 2010 or early 2011.
- Australian Leadership Awards (ALA) – Regional.
- Pacific Regional Infrastructure Facility – Regional.

56. The Evaluation Team's consultations indicated that little if any collaboration, consultation or coordination exists across these programs. The lack of collaboration across programs appears to be a function of a number of factors including:

- Little or no ownership of regional programs at a country level.
- Pacific programming founded primarily upon bilateral partnerships derived from country and country-sector plans and priorities.
- The absence of any consolidated list or summary of AusAID Pacific capacity development programs to provide client groups (including AusAID Posts and Desks) with information to facilitate informed decisions as to how alternative programs may be accessed or used within a cohesive country or regional capacity development framework.

57. To address this AusAID needs to provide clearer guidance to Posts and play a more proactive role in relation to the capacity building (and leadership) activities it manages across the Pacific to ensure there is coordination of support at regional and national levels and that coordination decisions are made with full engagement from each PIC.

Emerging approaches to Leadership

58. Whilst AusAID has invested considerable resources in researching, implementing and supporting capacity building initiatives across a range of bilateral and multilateral activities it is only relatively recently that AusAID has begun to invest similar resources in support of leadership practice. Key leadership initiatives currently emerging and being supported by AusAID include:

³⁴ These AidWorks Initiatives are in turn divided into individual projects/programs. Thus AidWorks Initiative INI304 sub-divides into the PACE (including PACE Extension) program and the APSC Pacific Governance Partnership.

- The establishment of a Governance and Leadership Branch under an Assistant Director General to forward systemic programming support for leadership and governance across the organisation
- Review and development of policies and strategies to enhance AusAID's understanding and application of leadership theory in a development context (e.g. a comprehensive literature review was commissioned in 2007³⁵ which provided insight for AusAID's (co-) sponsorship of the Leadership Program: Developmental Leaders, Elites and Coalitions (LPDLEC)³⁶.
- Establishment and support for the Pacific Leadership Program based in Suva. This program was developed as a response to growing recognition in the Pacific that new forms of leadership are needed which, while retaining the best features of traditional leadership, meet the demands of modern societies.
- The Australian Leadership Awards which to assist country and regional programs to achieve development outcomes through strengthened individual and institutional skills and knowledge, and by supporting leadership.

PACE (including PACE Extension) and its precursors are/were efforts to provide direct support for leadership within PIC public administrations. The PACE program targets emerging leaders with a significant focus on developing pacific leadership with regards to:

- Good Governance – i.e. supporting participation, fairness, decency, transparency, accountability and efficiency.
- Culture – i.e. practices are perpetuated on the basis of culture, custom and tradition.
- Leadership – i.e. leadership entails both *process* (e.g. structures, procedures) and *property* (e.g. qualities and characteristics). Within the Pacific, leadership is culturally contingent.

59. The PACE program and its precursors were implemented on the assumption that they would/will facilitate the establishment of leadership cohorts, current and future, who have the potential to support and catalyse (transform) public sector reform, management and governance. However, this has been done without any deep understanding of critical and contextual factors impacting upon sustainable (leadership) change, particularly with regards to:

- Cohort establishment – size, mix, stability, empowerment and the enabling environment.
- Treating leadership as a development challenge and opportunity rather than addressing it from an individual's perspective.
- Creating the support and establishment of functional networks and alliances within the cultural context of each PIC and the Pacific region as a whole.

60. The Evaluation Team believes there is a need to realign leadership programs supported by AusAID so that there is a greater cohesion of the objectives and methodology supporting leadership development initiatives across the agency.

Pacific Islands Centre for Public Administration (PICPA)

61. PICPA is being established under the Pacific Public Sector Capacity Building Initiative announced in the 2008-09 Budget. The aim of the initiative is to foster a regional approach to public sector reform and human resource development challenges for Pacific Island Countries. The aim of PICPA is to provide timely advice and services to each Pacific Island Country with the objective of improving the workforce development capabilities of their public

³⁵ http://www.ausaid.gov.au/publications/pdf/leadership_models.pdf

³⁶ <http://www.lpdlec.org/>

administrations at national and sub-national levels, and the individual competencies of public servants. In addressing individual competencies PICPA is expected to support the development/delivery of in-country learning programs and help PICs access regional and international training opportunities where needed.

62. The Evaluation Team understands that while a selection process is underway the Centre's Director has yet to be appointed. Given this it appears unlikely that the Centre will recruit the remainder of its staff and commence substantive operations before mid-2011 at earliest.³⁷ PICPA's establishment therefore appears to have no immediate implications for the delivery of PACE over the balance of the current funding agreement for PACE. However, extension of the current funding agreement with ANZSOG by one year as recommended by the Evaluation Team would provide PICPA a better opportunity to input (alongside the PICs) to decision-making on the longer-term future of PACE.

63. PICPA's longer-term role in relation to the professional development of the emerging leadership group currently targeted by PACE depends in part on whether PACE is to continue as a regional program delivered in-Australia. PICPA's design does not prejudice this question. While the design places considerable emphasis on the development of in-country learning programs it also recognises that international training "... is an important part of the training system for staff who fill senior positions" and indicates that PICPA "will play a role in identifying opportunities, facilitating access and potential funding sources for short international training or attachments where this is clearly the most cost effective means to achieve a priority outcome."³⁸

64. The main challenge for PICPA and the PICs is to bring together a cohesive and mutually reinforcing suite of in-country and regional training and professional development activities funded by AusAID, other donors and the PICs. The main risk is that that PICPA may further complicate and crowd an already complex set of relationship that exist within the Pacific capacity building context.

65. If in-Australia delivery of an executive development program continues in 2012 and beyond then the main needs for future interaction between PICPA and the service provider would appear to be to ensure:

- The content of or target group for the program logically 'nest' with (do not duplicate) the in-country learning programs facilitated by PICPA.
- Two-way information exchange and feedback between PICPA and the program service provider in relation to, in particular: the in-country training programs most likely to produce 'feeder groups' for potential participation in the program; timetables, content and application procedures; the membership country-by-country of the alumni network; and the evaluation of outcomes and impacts.
- Direct linkage between the service provider's website (currently the PACE website maintained by ANZSOG) and the proposed PICPA website as and when the latter becomes operational.

³⁷ PIC representatives expressed frustration at the delay in the establishment of PICPA. Guarded concerns were also raised at the 8th PPSCC re the appropriateness of PICPA given the potential to diminish 'local' ownership, management and implementation of PSC initiatives. However there was general optimism with respect to the potential for PICPA to succeed as long as PICs were fully involved in the program.

³⁸ PICPA Design, July 2009 page 26.

Networks

66. The PACE program was intended to create and extend networks amongst the Pacific target group in three main ways.³⁹ Implementation has been most visible in respect of the development of the PACE alumni program including the holding of two annual alumni conferences to date, maintenance by ANZSOG of the PACE website (recently upgraded) and the regular production and distribution of PACE Newsletters. Having regard to both ANZSOG's formal evaluations of the alumni conferences and feedback from alumni interviewed by the Evaluation Team these activities are valued by PACE participants. However, the extent to which the networks they support contribute to wider capacity building objectives is problematic. The Evaluation Team's consultations suggest the following.

- Across the participating countries PACE alumni do maintain some level of contact with each other, both through the annual conferences and in between them. However, outside the conference context these contacts appear to be of a primarily social nature. The Evaluation Team was given no examples of PACE alumni engaging fellow-alumni in other countries on a one-to-one basis to help address common problems. Given the diverse range of agencies from which PACE participants are drawn (with the partial exception of Public Service Commissions) this is not surprising.⁴⁰
- More surprising, the Evaluation Team also saw little evidence of networking amongst the PACE alumni within the three countries visited and such networking as occurred appeared to be largely confined to social interaction between PACE participants from the same cohort. In only a few cases did officials considering nominating for PACE participation consult PACE alumni in their country as to how they could expect to benefit.
- Ongoing contact between PACE alumni and their mentors following PACE participation appears to be the exception not the rule.
- With very few exceptions PACE Extension participants do not appear to have maintained ongoing contacts of a professional (as distinct from social) nature with the Australian agencies that hosted their work placements.⁴¹
- There is no formal or informal linkage between the PACE alumni network and others fostered by other AusAID-funded programs (e.g. Australian Development Scholarships; the APSC Partnership HRM Network). AusAID could usefully take stock of the various networks its funding supports and the scope, if any, to rationalise them.

67. None of this is to suggest that the PACE alumni network serves no useful purpose. There are almost certainly broad, if intangible, benefits in maintaining avenues for continuing contacts amongst the Pacific's emerging leadership group of officials who have shared the common experience of PACE. Moreover such benefits have some potential to increase over time if/as the number of PACE alumni expands. However, the extent to which these potential benefits are realised in practice is largely in the hands of the alumni themselves. ANZSOG can and does provide facilitating mechanisms but cannot 'force' the emergence of either a regional or within-country networks.

³⁹ "The Program is developing a pan-Pacific network of emerging public sector leaders which will grow over time. PACE will foster and provide support for these networks in the form of the development of an alumni program, provision of ongoing mentoring, and continued opportunities for professional development and learning for participants." (PACE Funding Agreement, Schedule 1, page 28).

⁴⁰ Moreover this finding stands in contrast to that for the APSC Partnership HRM Network which, given its primary focus on HRM issues, does appear to lead to greater networking on work-related issues across the participating countries.

⁴¹ In any event programs such as the Australian Leadership Awards Fellowships and the Pacific Public Sector Linkages Program appear better suited to developing institutional relationships between Australian and counterpart Pacific agencies.

Evaluation Criteria Ratings

Evaluation Criteria	Rating (1-6)	Explanation
Relevance	4	At a broad level PACE contributes to regional and bilateral public workforce development priorities as expressed in a number of regional and country-specific strategy documents. At the program delivery level there is little evidence that the PACE program is ‘owned’ by either individual PICs or AusAID Posts. It is essentially an ‘add-on’ to bilateral Partnerships and bilateral programs attracting little interest or involvement from either PICs (other than participating individuals) or AusAID Posts.
Effectiveness	5	PACE is effective in achieving its declared purpose and the rating places most weight on this. Beyond its contribution to raising the professional capacity of individual participants PACE’s contribution to the higher-order program goal cannot be assessed in any measurable way. There is little evidence to date of a contribution to the higher-order goal.
Efficiency	5	Program management is efficient but some refinements should be considered. The program is high-quality but there is no robust benchmark at this stage against which to judge cost efficiency and this should be remedied in future through market testing.
Sustainability	4	There is no evidence to suggest that PACE is financially sustainable without ongoing AusAID funding although this is true of many AusAID programs. The learning outcomes achieved for participating individuals appear to be durable. The program is doing little direct to build the capacity of participating PICs to design and deliver in-country executive development programs of this kind.
Gender Equality	4	ANZSOG has actively managed gender equality with respect to the mechanics of program implementation. A greater effort needs to be made to integrate gender and equity issues into the program content and participants’ work projects.
Monitoring & Evaluation	4	ANZSOG evaluates and reports on the delivery of the PACE program, PACE Extensions and PACE Alumni workshops in a systematic and ongoing way using both formal and informal means. Broader impacts claimed for the program are not monitored and that may not, in any event, be cost effective for a program of this nature and scale. Some refinements should nevertheless be considered.
Analysis & Learning	4	ANZSOG has adapted details of the PACE program in the light of participant feedback. However little effort appears to have been made to examine and understand how PACE has impacted upon leadership and development issues across the target countries.

Rating scale: 6 = very high quality; 1 = very low quality. Below 4 is less than satisfactory.

Conclusion and Recommendations

68. The Evaluation Team's overall conclusions are summarised in the Executive Summary of this report. Its recommendations are in two parts: specific recommendations in relation to the PACE program as such; and wider issues the Evaluation Team suggests AusAID needs to consider.

Recommendation 1: Over the balance of the current PACE program:

- Provide PIC central agencies (notably Public Service Commissions and Aid Coordination Units) of participating countries together with the relevant AusAID Post opportunities to review the work projects proposed by PACE nominees and their CEOs and to comment on whether they are consistent with whole-of-government capacity building priorities and parallel bilateral programs.
- Related to this, give preference to PACE nominees proposing work projects that have potential to deliver results that are replicable beyond their individual agencies.
- Take steps to ensure the learning outcomes achieved by PACE participants and the results of their work projects are shared more systematically with their peer groups and the relevant AusAID Post.

Recommendation 2: Provide the Pacific Public Service Commissioners Conference (with input from PICPA) ample opportunity to advise its views on the longer-term future of the PACE program, having regard to the options identified in this report for future delivery arrangements.

Recommendation 3: To facilitate implementation of Recommendation 2 and provide adequate lead-time for the design of any follow-on to the current PACE program, in whatever form, extend the current funding agreement for the PACE program to enable one further cohort of PACE participation commencing Stage 1 in 2011 and concluding Stage 3 in 2012.

Recommendation 4: Within the term of the current PACE program, address the following program management matters:

- Clarify the roles and responsibilities of PACE mentors and ANZSOG staff respectively for monitoring of PACE participant progress during Stage 2 and communicate these roles and responsibilities more clearly to participants.
- Inclusion in future ANZSOG annual reports on PACE to include a brief update on perceived risks, any significant new risks emerging and proposed responses thereto.
- Broaden the scope of the annual AusAID/ANZSOG program review meetings for PACE to brief ANZSOG on developments relating to parallel learning and capacity development programs (e.g. progress on the establishment of PICPA).
- Proactive facilitation by AusAID to resolve any remaining tensions between ANZSOG and the APSC in relation to roles and responsibilities for the arrangement of work attachments for PACE Extension participants.
- Provision of advice at the earliest opportunity to Australian agencies hosting PACE Extension participants of the individual's work project and learning objectives for the work attachment.

Recommendation 5: If, following PIC input to decision-making pursuant to Recommendation 2, it is proposed to renew delivery of an executive development program in-Australia for a further period of years then this renewal should be subject to a competitive tendering process for selection of the future service provider. The call for tenders should define learning and any other desired outcomes but not be prescriptive as to how these outcomes are to be delivered. One or

more representatives of PICs nominated by the Commissioners' Conference should be included on the tender assessment panel.

Recommendation 6: Within the term of the current PACE program and (if extended) beyond, the program should take steps to ensure that gender and equity priorities are actively integrated within program content and associated work projects having regard to the suggestions made in this report.

Recommendation 7: Monitoring and evaluation arrangements for the current PACE program be refined in the following ways:

- ANZSOG prepare, update annually and present in its annual reports consolidated statistical data on PACE participation for all PACE cohorts to date (including the PACE pilot program) and for each PACE component (PACE Stages 1, 2 and 3; PACE Extension and attendance at PACE alumni conferences) to indicate the number of participants by year, by country and by sex.
- The mean averages of the Likert scale evaluations published in ANZSOG's annual reports be gender disaggregated (i.e. the mean averages be derived and presented for all participants and for female/male participants respectively).
- Monitoring by ANZSOG of (and periodic mentor support for) the work projects undertaken by PACE/PACE Extension participants continue for a period of, say, one year beyond participants' completion of PACE Stage 3/PACE Extension (this was the most common request voiced by PACE participants in discussions).
- Copies of ANZSOG's annual reports to AusAID on PACE be formally circulated by AusAID to participants in the Pacific Public Service Commissioners' Conference (out of session) and relevant AusAID Posts with an invitation to supply comments on PACE's contribution to the enhancement of senior executive skills.
- ANZSOG ensures that its data base of individual PACE participants enables it to monitor PACE alumni mobility and report on personnel movement at the completion of the current PACE program.⁴²

Recommendation 8: Encourage and fund ANZSOG to examine opportunities to use and apply information in the public (or AusAID) domain which might impact upon PACE, for example:

- How can transformative change be supported and what is the critical mass of participating cohorts necessary to support transformational change?⁴³
- Pacific Public Sector Workforce Mapping⁴⁴, Experiencing the Public Sector: Pacific Women's Perspectives⁴⁵, Pacific Public Sector Capacity⁴⁶.
- Examine the value, outcomes and impacts associated with work attachments, particularly with regards to past and future attachments associated with PACE Extension.
- Develop and implement mechanisms capable of monitoring and tracking participants and the impacts those individuals are having with regards to regional networking and

⁴² Data on mobility will be necessary to evaluate the extent to which 'emerging leaders' participating in PACE have in fact, over the life of the current program, moved 'onwards and upwards' to leadership positions. The PACE Participant Experience Survey includes questions enabling mobility to be tracked and will, if responded to by an adequate sample of participants, provide data on alumni mobility.

⁴³ Whilst PACE is premised on transformational change, no effort has been made to determine the appropriate size of cohorts or how they should be targeted in country. A number of participants emphasized the importance of having companions from their own workplace to support change.

⁴⁴ AusAID document, February 2009.

⁴⁵ <http://rspas.anu.edu.au/melanesia/research.php>

⁴⁶ Refer to PICPA Design Document page 43.

contextual and professional activities on return to their work environment. This should be established as a longitudinal study (see also M&E above).

Recommendation 9: If an in-Australia executive development program continues in 2012 and beyond then future interaction between PICPA and the service provider should ensure:

- The content of and target group for the program logically ‘nest’ with (do not duplicate) the in-country learning programs facilitated by PICPA.
- Two-way information exchange and feedback between PICPA and the program service provider in relation to, in particular: the in-country training programs most likely to produce ‘feeder groups’ for potential participation in the program; timetables, content and application procedures; the membership country-by-country of the alumni network; and the evaluation of outcomes and impacts.
- Direct linkage between the service provider’s website (currently the PACE website maintained by ANZSOG) and the proposed PICPA website as and when the latter becomes operational.

Wider issues

Recommendation 10: AusAID should progress and complete, at the earliest opportunity, an over-arching framework for its capacity building programs in the Pacific Region, including learning programs, as foreshadowed by AusAID’s Pacific Public Sector Capacity Building Concept Paper of June 2008.

Recommendation 11: Pursuant to Recommendation 10, AusAID should provide clearer guidance to Posts and play a more proactive role in relation to the capacity building (and leadership) activities it manages across the Pacific to ensure there is coordination of support at regional and national levels and that coordination decisions are made with full PIC engagement.

Recommendation 12: Realign leadership programs supported by AusAID to deliver greater cohesion of the objectives and methodology supporting leadership development initiatives across the agency.

ANNEXES

Annex A: Terms of Reference

The following reproduces the core Terms of Reference for the Evaluation Team.

1.1 The [Evaluation Team] shall provide the following Services:

- (a) Act as [the Evaluation Team] for the mid-term reviews of:
 - (i) the Pacific Executive Program (PACE) and
 - (ii) the AusAID-Australian Public Service Commission Pacific Governance Partnership (the APSC Partnership).

The Team Leader undertakes ultimate responsibility for delivery to AusAID of the reports required in accordance with this Services Order and AusAID's quality standards. The Team Leader will be supported by a Capacity Building Adviser, who will be contracted separately. Collectively, the Team Leader and Capacity Building Adviser are referred to below as the review team;

- (b) **Preparation:** The review team must review relevant documents for PACE and the APSC Partnership and have initial working level discussions with AusAID. The team will then formulate a methodology of how they propose to conduct the review. The preparation stage will also include logistic organisation by the review team of travel plans and proposed meetings (with limited assistance from AusAID in Canberra and at Posts);
- (c) **Consultation with stakeholders in Australia:** The review team must consult with relevant AusAID officers, the APSC, federal/state agencies that have participated in PACE and/or the APSC Partnership and the Australia New Zealand School of Government (which implements PACE). Topics covered in consultations will include, but not be limited to: (i) issues arising from the team's review of activity documents; (ii) discussion of AusAID's expectations; (iii) AusAID's current approaches to leadership; (iv) progress and achievements of each activity; (v) ideas for the future of each activity and (vi) feedback on AusAID's management of the programs.
- (d) **Consultation with stakeholders in Pacific countries:** As part of the review process, the review team must visit Kiribati, Samoa and the Solomon Islands to consult with stakeholders. Once in country, the team will meet with: (i) AusAID officers involved with public sector strengthening/reform activities at Posts; (ii) other donors involved in such activities (if judged relevant by the Post); (iii) officers of Public Service Commissions or equivalent agencies to consult on how the programs have contributed to public sector capacity and scope for improvements; (iv) individuals who have participated in PACE and APSC Partnership activities, and their managers if possible, to consult on the benefits to individuals and their capacity to apply the skills gained to their work.
- (e) **Analysis:** The review team must assess the past performance of PACE and the APSC Partnership and suggest improvements for the future using AusAID's standard evaluation criteria. These criteria and standard evaluation questions for

each criterion are attached as **Schedule 3**. In addition to these standard criteria, the team must also consider:

- (i) *Approach to Capacity Building:* Both PACE and the APSC Partnership aim to improve public sector capacity. The review team must consider the strengths and weaknesses of each activity's approach to capacity building and, if possible, suggest how to enhance the learning outcomes of participants and/or opportunities for participants to bring about change in their workplaces;
- (ii) *Emerging approaches to leadership:* To varying degrees, both PACE and the APSC Partnership target leadership levels of the public service. The review must consider other AusAID leadership programs, including the Pacific Leadership Program and the Australian Leadership Awards Fellowships, to draw comparisons on the leadership approach of each modality and their relative costs;
- (iii) *Relationship to other Pacific public sector capacity building programs:* Many of AusAID's individual country programs are making significant investments in strengthening public sector capacity. The review must consider the scope for PACE and the APSC Partnership to complement AusAID or other donor projects in the sector and identify any consultation processes that would foster closer alignment;
- (iv) *Pacific Islands Centre for Public Administration (PICPA):* PICPA is being established under the Pacific Public Sector Capacity Building Initiative announced in the Commonwealth of Australia 2008-09 Budget. The aim of the initiative is to foster a regional approach to public sector reform and human resource development challenges for Pacific Island Countries. The aim of PICPA is to provide timely advice and services to each Pacific Island Country with the objective of improving the workforce development capabilities of their public administrations at national and sub-national levels, and the individual competencies of public servants. The review team must consider opportunities for interaction between PICPA and each of the activities. PICPA is at a very early stage of development, so it is recognised that the review team may only be able to make general recommendations on this point.
- (v) *Networks:* An important aim of both activities is to facilitate public service networks within the Pacific. The review must outline what steps have been taken to facilitate these networks, their likely sustainability and their potential to contribute to the sustainability of outcomes.
- (f) **Peer Review:** If considered necessary by AusAID, the Team Leader will attend a peer review meeting in Canberra to present the findings and recommendations of the review to a range of AusAID officers.

Annex B: Review Methodology Report

1. The outputs for the review are defined by the Service Orders for the assignment, namely reviews of progress to date for each activity and preparation of three reports:
 - a mid-term review report for the APSC Partnership;
 - a mid-term review report for the PACE/PACE Extension program;
 - a summary report on linkages and scope for future synergies between the two activities.
2. The overall process for conduct of the review has also been defined by the Service Orders, namely:
 - review of activity documentation;
 - preparation of this Outline Methodology;
 - in-Australia consultations in Canberra and Melbourne;
 - in-country consultations, currently planned for Kiribati, Samoa and Solomon Islands;
 - preparation of draft reports, peer review and final reports.
3. The template for the review's reports and additional issues raised by the Service Orders identify the evaluation criteria to be adopted for the review. **Table 1** (below) identifies these. In addition to the standard evaluation questions identified for the evaluation criteria by the template the review team will address a number of program-specific matters including those listed at Table 1.
4. The review team will undertake its evaluation in two main ways:
 - review and analysis of documentation and data relating to the activities;
 - structured consultations with a range of stakeholders in Australia and in-country, notably: AusAID (in Australia and at Post); APSC; ANZSOG; participants in the activities from Kiribati, Samoa and Solomon Islands, representatives of their agencies and representatives of relevant central agencies in these countries.

The review team will structure the questions to be pursued in consultations so as to ensure a consistent approach to each enabling cross-matching of findings.

5. Following the review team's initial scrutiny of activity documentation, **Table 2** identifies the review team's current assessment of additional data/activity documentation needs.
6. **Table 3** identifies the review team's proposed program of consultations. The proposed program for in-country consultations will be reviewed and refined as the review proceeds.

John Mellors
Peter Deacon
27 July 2010

Table 1: Program-specific matters	
Evaluation Criteria/topic	Program-specific matters
Relevance	Have there been specific developments since commencement of the APSC Partnership/PACE serving to increase or decrease their relevance to Australian/Partner Government priorities and the needs of beneficiaries? To what extent have program outcomes had impacts on any other AusAID bilateral programs currently in place?
Effectiveness	To what extent has the programs' training of individuals been linked to complementary measures to address dysfunctional public administration environments? Have the programs provided an opportunity to strengthen institutional relationships between agencies in Australia and partner/target countries?
Efficiency	What are the programs' total costs and their fixed/variable components? Would alternative delivery arrangements (e.g. the APSC proposal for in-country delivery of modified work attachment activities) be more cost effective? To what extent have the programs had a capacity impact on participating agencies, both in Australia and participating countries? Has any study been done to determine any additional transactional costs associated with participation in the programs? Can the programs be better interfaced and managed in a bilateral context at a country level?
Impact	See Monitoring & Evaluation below.
Sustainability	How should 'sustainability' be interpreted for activities funded through the programs? Would they be maintained in the absence of AusAID funding? Do Australian agencies see participation in the programs as 'core business' for the agency or an Australian whole of government responsibility? To what extent should resources be redirected directly to Australian agencies to support international programs?
Gender Equality	Are any gender-specific trends apparent in the composition of program participants in conferences, work attachments and ongoing networking activities? What are their causes? What type of gender specific initiatives can be supported through the 'work projects' e.g. supporting gender analysis within budget preparation?
Monitoring & Evaluation	Both APSC and ANZSOG reports note the difficulty of relating program activities to impacts on the quality of public administration in the Pacific. How can this best be addressed? The programs are classed as 'regional' and managed from Canberra - to what extent can the programs be better embedded at a country level so that M&E can be incorporated into the country partnership frameworks?
Analysis & Learning	No additional matters at this stage. ⁴⁷
Lessons	No additional matters at this stage.
Approach to Capacity Building	To what extent do the programs' activities and approaches to learning reflect prerequisites for successful capacity building as identified by prior reviews? Successful capacity building initiatives are founded upon 'ownership' - who 'owns' these programs and what are their relevance at a country level? How can we strengthen country/agency ownership of the programs?
Emerging approaches to leadership	Is there evidence that program participants have been or are being successfully groomed to assume higher leadership positions? Are the programs linked to agency corporate strategies/plans and/or succession management at an agency or national level?

⁴⁷ I.e. No matters additional to those identified in AusAID's evaluation template or the Service Order for the review.

Table 1: Program-specific matters (continued)	
Evaluation Criteria/topic	Program-specific matters
Relationship to other Pacific public sector CB programs	Is there any formal mechanism for linking the programs to other Pacific public sector capacity building programs?
PICPA	No additional matters at this stage.
Networks	Is there evidence that the networks established by the programs have a growing, active membership and are being used to useful effect? To what extent can the program networks be interfaced with the AusAID scholarship alumni systems established in participating countries?
APSC Partnership/ PACE interrelationships	Are the respective roles and responsibilities of the APSC and ANZSOG for planning and implementation of PACE Extension work attachments clear and satisfactory? Is there an opportunity to further strengthen the interface between the two programs?
Table 2: Additional data/documents ⁴⁸	
APSC Partnership	
Data/documents	Proposed source
Strategic policy and M&E framework for the ‘Investing in Pacific Public Sector Capacity Building Initiative’	AusAID
APSC Partnership M&E Template (referenced in letter covering 2008-09 annual report)	AusAID
Report of the review of Australian Government Scholarships (review foreshadowed for Q3-4 2008)	AusAID
Non-Australian donor funding contributions to APSC Partnership (e.g. part NZAID funding of participants in annual Commissioners’ Conference)	AusAID?
APSC 2008-09 Partnership annual report provided individual details of names, designations, organisations, sex and countries for participants in: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pacific Public Service Commissioners annual conference • Annual HR Managers’ Conference • Workplace attachments (in-Australia and regional) Comparable data is requested for these events/activities in 2009-10 (data already available on PiSGP/PACE Extension attachments for both years).	APSC
Evaluation reports on 2010 HR Manager’s Conference submitted by participants from Kiribati, Samoa, Solomon Islands	APSC
Minutes of the 3 HRM Network teleconferences held in 2009-10	APSC
Reports/evaluations submitted by participants from Kiribati, Samoa, Solomon Islands on their 2009-2010 Work Attachments	APSC
Access to (password protected) website: www.thepacificvillage.org (PVO)	APSC?
Sample of records of on-line HRM chat sessions 2009-10	APSC or via access to PVO website
Any update on World Bank Governance Indicators 1996-2006	Team to search WB website
PACE/PACE Extension	
Minutes of PACE Program Concept Peer Review meeting (August 2007)	AusAID
Pacific Islands Centre for Public Administration: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • design document • minutes of recent Centre Advisory Group meetings 	AusAID

⁴⁸ As at 27 July 2010, additional to that provided by AusAID to date.

Table 2: Additional data/documents (continued)	
Data/documents	Proposed source
Update/reports on PACE/PACE Extension participation and activities since December 2009, notably (if/as occurring) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • participation in and evaluations of Stage 3 for the 2009 PACE cohort • participation in and evaluations of 2010 PACE Alumni workshop (June 2010?) 	ANZSOG
Sample of 2009 cohort participants' reports in 2010 on their Stage 2 assignments (participants from Kiribati, Samoa and Solomon Islands)	ANZSOG
Last four PACE Quarterly Newsletters	ANZSOG
Access to password-protected PACE Alumni website	ANZSOG
Table 3: Proposed Consultations (as at 27 July 2010)	
Location	Consultations
Canberra Day 1	AusAID (morning): Governance and Public Administration Section; officers managing/oversighting Public Sector Capacity Building Initiative, Pacific Leadership Program, Australian Leadership Awards Fellowships, PNG Public Sector Workforce Development Program, Pacific Islands Centre for Public Administration APSC (afternoon): APS Commissioner Stephen Sedgewick (subject to availability); APSC International Section
Canberra Day 2	Meetings with 3 or (time permitting) 4 agencies which have hosted workplace attachments for the APSC Partnership and/or PiSGP-PACE Extension, preferably participants from Kiribati, Samoa, Solomon Islands: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Department of Finance and Deregulation; Department of Customs and Border Protection; Australian Electoral Commission; National Archives of Australia Subject to availability, meeting with Andrew Podger (former APS Commissioner)
Melbourne Day 1	Meetings with ANZSOG: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Academic Director, PACE • International Programs Manager and Coordinator • Manager, Marketing and Events (PACE Alumni matters)
In-country visits (5 working days in each of Kiribati, Samoa, Solomon Islands)	Meetings with: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • AusAID Post • NZAID Post • Aid coordination office or equivalent • Commissioner(s) and/or Secretary of Public Service Commission (or equivalent) • APSC Partnership/PACE participants and their managers (see Note) • Host agencies for APSC Partnership regional work attachments
Note: The review team will: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • identify for each country all 2008, 2009 and 2010 (to date) participants in APSC Partnership activities and PACE/PACE Extension activities (including alumni activities); • seek to identify their current workplaces and duties; • seek to interview them and their managers with a view to assessing, in particular, impacts of their participation, work assignments and networking on the reform programs and capacities of their agencies. In the case of Kiribati (small numbers to date) it is envisaged that one-on-one meetings will be feasible. In the case of Samoa and Solomon Islands a combination of one-on-one meetings and group discussions may be feasible. The approach will be finalised following analysis of the participation data.	

Annex C: Principal Documents Reviewed

APSC Partnership Participant Evaluation Forms, HRM Conferences and Work Attachments (samples).
AusAID Leadership literature review (2007). http://www.ausaid.gov.au/publications/pdf/leadership_models.pdf
AusAID Leadership Program: Developmental Leaders, Elites and Coalitions (LPDLEC). http://www.lpdlec.org/
Australian Leadership Awards Fellowships: Guidelines for Submission, AusAID (2010).
Australian Leaderships Awards Handbook, AusAID (August 2010).
Cairns Compact on Strengthening Development Coordination in the Pacific (August 2009).
Capacity Building in Public Finance: An Evaluation of Activities in the South Pacific, AusAID (September 2004).
Comments on the Terms of Reference for the APSC/PACE Mid-Term Review - Yeshe Smith, AusAID (2010).
Desk Review of Technical Assistance: Emerging Lessons on Australia's Technical Assistance. Baser, H. (2008).
Draft AusAID-APSC Pacific Governance Partnership Monitoring and Evaluation Plan, APSC (17 April 2009).
Experiencing the Public Sector: Pacific Women's Perspectives (2009). http://rspas.anu.edu.au/melanesia/research.php
Funding Agreement Deed between Commonwealth of Australia and Australia New Zealand School of Government for Pacific Executive Program (8 February 2009).
Joint Evaluation Study of Provision of Technical Assistance Personnel: What can we learn from promising experiences? European Centre for Development Policy Management for AusAID (September 2007).
Kiribati-Australia Partnership for Development (27 January 2009).
PACE Consolidated Report to AusAID on 2009 Program Activities, ANZSOG (December 2009).
PACE Participant Experience Survey Form, ANZSOG (2010).
PACE Participant Final Reports on Work Projects (samples).
PACE Program General Information - 2010 Cohort, ANZSOG (2010).
PACE Program Newsletters (various issues).
PACE Program Report to AusAID on the 2007 Pilot Program, ANZSOG (November 2008).
Pacific Governance Partnership Annual Report 2008-2009, APSC (19 June 2009).
Pacific Governance Partnership Annual Report 2009-2010, APSC (undated).
Pacific Islands Centre for Public Administration Design, for AusAID (July 2009).
Pacific Public Sector Capacity Building Concept Paper, AusAID (June 2008).
Pacific Public Sector Linkages Program, 2010-2011 Guidelines and Activity Concept Form, AusAID (2010).
Pacific Public Sector Workforce Mapping, author(s) unknown (February 2009).
PNG/AusAID the Public Sector Development Workforce Development Program in PNG (2009).
PNG's Equal Participation of Women in Development Program (2008).
Public Service Commissions in Post-Conflict Fragile State Contexts – Barriers and Pathways to Success, AusAID (2010).
Review of Pacific and Papua New Guinea Public Sector Capacity Building, Peter Deacon for AusAID (February 2007).
Samoa-Australia Partnership for Development (19 August 2008).

Schedule 14 to Record of Understanding 14146 in relation to cooperation between the Australian Public Service Commission and the Australian Agency for International Development for the AusAID-APSC Pacific Governance Partnership, (undated).
Scholarship Effectiveness Review Parts 1-3, AusAID (June 2008-June 2009). (Discussion draft).
Solomon Islands Partnership Framework (2009).
Three Generations of Technical Assistance Desk Review of Technical Assistance: Emerging Lessons on Australia's Technical Assistance (2009).
Tonga-Australia Partnership for Development (7 August 2009).
Tracking Development and Governance in the Pacific. AusAID (August 2009).
Vanuatu's Priority and Action agenda (2006-2015).
Workforce Development in the Pacific: An Issues Paper. AusAID (12 December 2007), (unpublished).

Annex D: Persons consulted

People consulted are listed in order met. They include participants in both the PACE program (PACE) and/or APSC Partnership activities (Partnership) and these people are identified accordingly.

Name	Position	Agency
Lynette Mathews	Program Officer, Governance & Public Administration	AusAID
Nerida Dalton	A/g Director Governance & Public Administration Section	AusAID
Gnari Michael	Program Officer, Governance & Public Administration	AusAID
Eloise Saif	Indonesia Program Officer	AusAID
James Marshall	PNG Program Officer	AusAID
Danielle Sever	Director East Asia Regional Section	AusAID
Isolde Macatol	Scholarships Officer	AusAID
Steve Hogg	Assistant Director General, Governance & Leadership Branch	AusAID
Joe Hedger	Director, Leadership Program	AusAID
Adrian Cunningham	Director, Strategic Relations	National Archives of Australia
Helen Woittiez	Assistant Director, International Team	APSC
Deborah Knight	Director International	APSC
Kay Stoquart	Assistant Director, International Team	APSC
Annwyn Godwin	Merit Protection Commissioner	APSC
Matthew King	Assistant Secretary, Financial Reporting Branch	Department of Finance & Deregulation
Brett Kaufmann	Assistant Secretary, Cash Management Branch	Department of Finance & Deregulation
Pauline Clancy	General Manager	ANZSOG
Deirdre O'Neill	Former Academic Director, PACE	ANZSOG
David Hegarty	Current Academic Director, PACE	ANZSOG
Miire Awira-Raiata - PACE	Deputy Secretary	Ministry of Commerce, Transport & Tourism, Kiribati
Joanne Craigie	First Secretary (Development Cooperation)	Australian High Commission, Kiribati
Tamaroa Tekeiaki - PACE	Assistant Secretary	Public Service Office, Kiribati
Kura Hakaraia	Deputy High Commissioner	New Zealand High Commission, Kiribati

Wiriki Tooma - Partnership	Secretary	Public Service Office, Kiribati
Henry Khaisum	National Human Resource Planning Adviser	Public Service Office, Kiribati
Meere Tarereua - Partnership	Senior HRD Officer	Public Service Office, Kiribati
Tomwa Tehume - PACE and Partnership	General Manager	Kiribati Housing Corporation
Matilda Ueanimaraki - Partnership	HR Manager	Kiribati Housing Corporation
Amina Uriam - PACE	Director of Local Government	Ministry of Internal and Local Affairs, Kiribati
Asenati Tuiletufuga	Senior Program Officer	Australian High Commission, Samoa
Peseta Noumea Simi	Assistant CEO	Aid Coordination and Debt Management, Ministry of Finance, Samoa
Ian Bignall	Counsellor (Development Assistance)	Australian High Commission, Samoa
Sealiimalietoa Mulitalo Vui - Partnership	Commissioner	Public Service Commission, Samoa
Tafua Maluelue Tafua - Partnership	Commissioner	Public Service Commission, Samoa
Henry Tamasese - PACE	Assistant CEO	Public Service Commission
Ianesi Faasisila-Enosa - PACE and Partnership	Assistant CEO	Public Service Commission, Samoa
Viola Levy - PACE and Partnership	Assistant CEO	Public Service Commission, Samoa
Cam Wendt	Facility Manager	Public Sector Improvement Facility, Samoa
Tuiolo Schuster - Partnership	Principal Capacity Building Officer	Ministry of Natural Resources and Environment, Samoa
Veronica Levi - PACE	Assistant CEO	Ministry of Commerce, Industry & Labour, Samoa
Kolone Tikeiri - Partnership	Human Resources Adviser	Samoa Water Authority
Faauga Muilitalo - PACE	Assistant CEO	Ministry of Women, Community and Social Development, Samoa
Peter Zwart	First Secretary, NZAID	New Zealand High Commission, Samoa
Christine Saaga	Development Programme Coordinator, NZAID	New Zealand High Commission, Samoa
Tiatia Ferila Lokeni-Lepa - Partnership	Principal Accounts and Administration Officer	Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade, Samoa
Vincent Vermeulen - Partnership	Assistant CEO	Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade

Beth Onesemo-Tuilaepa - Partnership	Secretary (CEO)	Public Service Commission, Samoa
Faamaini Vaa - Partnership	Assistant CEO	Ministry of Works, Transport & Infrastructure, Samoa
Mataafa Sepelini - PACE	Assistant CEO	Ministry of Works, Transport & Infrastructure, Samoa
Dr Matagialofi Lua'iufi	Former CEO Public Service Commission and current PACE Scholar in Residence	Samoa
Rachel Rawlings	Scholarships Section	AusAID
Debbie Reschke	First Secretary	AusAID, Tonga
Asi Fonua Vanisi	Assistant Program Manager	AusAID, Tonga
Mishka Tu'ifua - Partnership	Chairperson	Public Service Commission, Tonga
Filimone Fifita - Partnership	Commissioner	Public Service Commission, Tonga
Nunia Mone - PACE	Deputy Secretary	Ministry of Justice, Tonga
Pulupaki Ika - PACE	Deputy Secretary	Ministry of Education, Tonga
'Ana Lautaimi Soakai	Senior Economist	Project & Aid Management Division, Ministry of Finance & National Planning, Tonga
Tevita Ma'u - PACE	Deputy Secretary	Ministry of Education, Tonga
Leody Vainikolo - PACE	Deputy Secretary	Ministry of Agriculture & Fisheries, Tonga
Tiofilusi Tiueti - PACE	Acting Secretary	Ministry for Finance, Tonga
Malakai H Kaufusi	Development Programme Coordinator	New Zealand High Commission, Tonga
Meleoni Uera - PACE	Deputy Director	Ministry of Training, Employment, Youth and Sports, Tonga
Sinama Fa'anunu - Partnership	Principal Training & Employment Officer	Ministry of Training, Employment, Youth and Sports, Tonga
Lupeolo Fisi'ikaile - Partnership	Principal Assistant Secretary	Ministry of Lands, Survey & Natural Resources, Tonga
Selalina Prescott - Partnership	Principal Assistant Secretary	Public Service Commission, Tonga
Charlotte Vuki - Partnership	Senior Computer Programmer	Public Service Commission, Tonga
Vatulele Tuputupu - Partnership	Deputy Secretary	Ministry of Justice, Tonga

Annex E: Aide Memoires (excluding annexes)

Aide Memoire for mid-term review of the AusAID-APSC Pacific Governance Partnership (APSC Partnership) and the Pacific Executive Program (PACE): Kiribati 11 August 2010

Evaluation Background

The Australian Agency for International Development (AusAID) has supported the building of networks and provision of training opportunities for middle and senior Pacific Island public sector administrators for some years. In recent years two such activities have been the APSC Partnership and PACE/PACE Extension.

AusAID – APSC Pacific Governance Partnership (APSC Partnership)

AusAID is providing funding support for the APSC Partnership for four years commencing 1 July 2008 and concluding 30 June 2012.

The objective of the APSC Partnership is to extend the capability of Pacific public sector officials at senior executive and middle management levels to better lead and implement public sector reforms particularly in, but not limited to, the area of human resource management.

The APSC Partnership includes:

- Support for the annual Pacific Public Service Commissioners' Conference
- Supporting and providing networking opportunities for the regional network of Pacific human resource managers, including through the annual Human Resource Managers' Network Conference
- Providing up to 30 work attachments per year (of no more than a week) for Pacific officials to develop their human resource management skills. The attachments are mainly in Australian public service agencies at Federal or State levels, with a smaller number in Pacific public sector agencies
- Organising work placements for the PACE Extension program (see below).

Pacific Executive Program (PACE/PACE Extension)

The high level objective of PACE is to improve public sector capacity in the Pacific region. The middle level objective is to improve the management and leadership capacity of senior public servants in each of the countries participating in the program.

PACE is designed for public sector officials in the executive ranks who have been identified as emerging and future leaders. Annual cohorts of up to 40 participants attend a three week residential program in Canberra directed by the ANZ School of Government (Stage 1), undertake a work project in their home countries (Stage 2) and return to Canberra a year later for a further week of training to consolidate their learning (Stage 3).

Each year around 5-6 of the top performers in PACE Stages 1 and 2 are offered extended work placements of up to eight weeks in Australia, immediately following their completion of PACE Stage 3, in an area relevant to the work project that they developed through PACE. PACE Extension participants are selected by a tri-partite committee of AusAID, APSC and ANZSOG representatives. The APSC arranges suitable work placements with Australia government agencies for those selected.

Since 2007 some 13 Government of Kiribati (GoK) public servants have participated in one or more APSC Partnership and/or PACE activities of whom some 40% were located within the GoK Public Service Office at the time of their participation. A substantial majority of these participants were at the level of Assistant Secretary or above.

Objectives and methods of the mid-term review

The basic objective of the mid-term review is to evaluate how key program outputs of the APSC Partnership and PACE/PACE Extension respectively have contributed to date to the achievement of outcomes attributable to these programs. Two separate mid-term evaluation reports will be produced as each program is a discrete activity. However, there are also similarities in program objectives and potential synergies between the two programs. The review team will also produce a (brief) third report examining these similarities and potential synergies.

The evaluations will address AusAID's standard evaluation criteria including relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impacts, sustainability, gender equality, monitoring and evaluation arrangements and lessons learned to date. They will also address several program-specific issues including the programs' approaches to capacity building, their relationships to other Pacific capacity building programs and the extent to which they are building sustainable networks of current and future leaders of Pacific public administration.

The review team is undertaking its evaluations of the two programs in two main ways:

- review and analysis of documentation and data relating to the activities;
- structured consultations with a range of stakeholders in Australia and in-country, notably: AusAID (in Australia and at Post); APSC; ANZSOG; participants in the activities from Kiribati, Samoa and Solomon Islands, representatives of their agencies (as available) and representatives of relevant central agencies in these countries.

The review team is structuring the questions being pursued in consultations so as to ensure a consistent approach enabling cross-matching of findings.

Description of Evaluation Activities

The terms of reference for the mid-term review required the review team to organise its own schedule of consultations in Kiribati. Accordingly, prior to arrival the review team made contact via email with more than half of Kiribati's participants in the APSC Partnership/PACE, focussing on recent and current participants and PACE Alumni. This led to initial scheduling of meetings with four participants prior to arrival in-country.

The review team arrived on Tarawa early on Monday 9 August 2010. It transpired on arrival that a public holiday associated with Youth celebrations concluding the previous week had been scheduled for 9 August, hence government offices were closed on that day. The review team

was nevertheless able to visit the Australian and New Zealand High Commissions briefly and arrange later meetings with Australia's First Secretary (Development Cooperation) and the New Zealand High Commission. It spent the rest of Monday identifying additional meetings to be sought and reviewing documentation relating to individual APSC Partnership/PACE participants from Kiribati.

The review team commenced formal consultations on Tuesday 10 August, concluding on Wednesday 11 August. The review team met with 7 past, present and impending Kiribati participants in the APSC Partnership/PACE programs, representing some 53% of Kiribati participants over the past three years or, allowing for officers who have since left the Kiribati public service or were on leave at the time of the mission, some 70% of these participants.

Questions and discussion revolved around two main topics: for participants, the relevance, value to them as individuals and value to their agencies of their participation (past, current or prospective); for participants and other stakeholders, the nature and extent of linkages between training/networking benefits for individual participants and wider institutional strengthening and capacity building outcomes from participation in the programs. The latter focus of questioning was prefaced by the review team's recognition that direct linkages may be difficult to demonstrate in the short-term given the longer-term nature and impacts of capacity building initiatives.

Initial Findings

The review team notes that its in-country consultations in Kiribati covered a relatively small sample of total APSC Partnership/PACE participants. Furthermore, as for the other participating nations, Kiribati's development challenges and capacity building needs are unique to Kiribati. The following observations should be viewed in this light and, pending further consultations in Samoa and the Solomon Islands, are no indication of the review team's final findings. Accordingly, the review team makes no specific recommendations at this stage.

This said, the review team has formed some preliminary and Kiribati-specific conclusions in relation to the programs.

Relevance:

- The programs contribute indirectly to the Australia Kiribati Partnership for Development priority areas i.e. provide opportunities for people to develop their Workforce Skills in areas of industry demand both domestically and abroad and strengthens economic management in support of mutually agreed Government of Kiribati-led economic reforms.
- All GoK participants consulted expressed the view that the programs remain highly relevant to Kiribati's needs in terms of providing external support, advice, learning opportunities and access to useful resource documentation relevant to the strengthening of Kiribati's public administration.
- Senior GoK stakeholders consulted endorsed this view - the APSC Partnership and PACE are seen as providing valued training inputs and access to regional resources until such time as the GoK has fully developed and implemented country-specific systems and procedures for training and professional development of its public service.
- Nobody consulted expressed the view that the programs were no longer relevant to GoK development priorities or the personal development needs of its middle and senior managers.

Effectiveness:

- Feedback from GoK participants and other stakeholders suggests that the programs are effective in improving the management and leadership capacities of individuals participating in the programs.
- However, there is no evidence at this stage that the programs have contributed in any direct way to organisational capacity development or the achievement of public sector reforms in Kiribati (see also ‘impacts’).
- While capacity building and public sector reform are long-term endeavours the review team believes there is scope to strengthen the programs’ contributions in these regards.
- Contributions are indirect and appear piecemeal because they are not directly integrated or aligned to a locally articulated development framework.
- There appears to be no interface to other development initiatives supporting public sector reform in Kiribati. The review team will develop proposals to strengthen this interface, including through more systematic identification and deployment of participants.
- Individual projects do not align to higher order priorities - they tend to reflect and are relevant to personal or local (agency) needs.
- Within a limited context i.e. MoF, some participants have the opportunity to contribute to strengthened economic management.
- Within the Kiribati public service, participant effectiveness is hindered by the lack of stability of middle/senior management structures required to enable observable impacts.

Efficiency:

- In response to questions, nobody consulted made any suggestions for significant improvements in the ways that the APSC Partnership/PACE activities could be better administered in terms of their delivery to individual participants. On the contrary, they appeared to be fully satisfied with the way in which their individual participations had been organised and managed.
- The Kiribati PSO would like to have a more strategic understanding and role in supporting and facilitating both programs from a national development perspective.
- The review team did not discuss with stakeholders the cost-efficiency of the programs on the basis that they were in little if any position to comment on this without prior notice of current costs, alternative delivery options and their potential relative costs.
- The efficiency of both programs is limited by the lack of ownership at a country level, both from a GoK and an AusAID perspective. Program ownership for both activities appears at this stage to be embedded within the managing agents.
- Both agencies providing the services i.e. APSC and ANZSOG appear to have allocated appropriate resources to efficiently manage and support delivery of the programs.

Impacts:

- A significant number of program participants now hold senior positions within the public service – they therefore are better placed to provide leadership and support change and reform opportunities to improve public sector performance.
- Impacts on individual participants appear to have been substantial and beneficial. Feedback mirrored the more structured feedback from all participants gathered by the APSC and ANZSOG during program delivery with comments along lines such as “the program was great”, “the program exposed me to new ways of doing things”, “the program gave me much greater confidence that I could do the things I need to do in my job here”, and “I would certainly recommend the program to colleagues”.
- From the various cases reviewed there is no evidence that participation in the programs can be linked to wider positive impacts on public administration or reform in Kiribati.

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This conundrum, namely substantial evidence of training benefits for individuals but little if any evidence of organisational capacity development or a wider impact will – if confirmed by further consultations - be addressed in some detail in the review team's report.
<p><i>Sustainability:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It would not be possible for GoK to financially support either program, as they are currently structured, without direct support from AusAID and/or other donors. • The PSO has indicated that it is actively pursuing opportunities to develop localised executive/leadership programs which may have the potential to replace the current PACE/APSC programs. However the localised program would not provide opportunities for activities within an international context. • There is an opportunity for GoK/ PICPA interface to support the development and implementation of a localised program in support of public sector development.
<p><i>Monitoring and evaluation:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Both programs, through their managing agents, have put in place appropriate M&E systems to monitor and evaluate the delivery of their programs. • At the level of monitoring the impacts of the two programs on broader public sector reform and capacity building objectives it is safe to say – albeit recognising the substantial difficulties in attempting to make and monitor such a link – that there is no evidence of any such monitoring or evaluation effort by either the donor providers or the GoK. • It is clear that several participants are no longer located in the agencies for which their work projects were designed and/or have taken leave since their participation and/or have since left the GoK public service. • Both managing agents are proposing and developing strategies to better monitor and evaluate impacts within and across countries. AusAID has approved, in principle, the request by the APSC for in-country visits to further develop impact monitoring and evaluation. • The Commissioners' Conference would appear to be an ideal environment to establish an M&E framework to track the outcomes associated with both programs. • GoK participation in M&E procedures is minimal. GoK has not initiated any independent mechanisms or processes which allows it to monitor or evaluate program impacts. AusAID Post has not actively participated in any M&E practices which support its understanding of program processes or impacts.
<p><i>Gender equality:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Gender equity is actively managed and monitored from a statistical perspective. • Of some 13 individual officers from Kiribati participating in APSC Partnership/PACE activities over the past 3½ years, 7 persons or 53% were female. The percentage of female participants (past, present and imminent) undertaking the PACE/PACE Extension program targeting future leaders was around 43%. • Little active effort is made to ensure that gender and equity priorities are pursued from a development or operational perspective i.e. active integration of gender and equity principles/priorities within project design and implementation.
<p><i>Analysis and learning:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No stakeholder consulted in Kiribati has, based on their participation experience or wider considerations, proposed any substantial change in the structure or delivery of the APSC Partnership/PACE programs over the remaining lives of these programs. • Both programs have developed and supported tracking mechanisms to facilitate networking and collaborative learning derived from the programs. The Pacific Village On-Line Forum managed by the APSC on behalf of the activity appears relevant and

used to support learning and discussion across alumni/participants,

- Interviewed participants indicated that they actively communicate and network with alumni and mentors associated with their own intakes, however little networking is apparent across programs, or even across cohorts.
- Little active learning and analysis is, as yet, apparent beyond efforts to improve program delivery. Both programs have indicated they are looking to address this issue.
- No active analysis or learning of program initiatives appears to be taking place in Kiribati, from either a government or AusAID Post perspective.
- The PSC and HRM conferences have the potential to facilitate and support broad based learning and analysis for both programs if they were empowered (and resourced) to do so.

The review team's next steps will be:

- travel to Samoa for comparable consultations in that country;
- attendance as an observer at the 2010 Pacific Public Service Commissioners' annual conference (Port Vila, Vanuatu, 27th September – 1st October, one review team member only);
- travel to Solomon Islands in October for comparable consultations in that country;
- if/as necessary, further consultation with stakeholders in Australia in the light of emerging findings and possible recommendations;
- preparation and submission to AusAID of the three draft evaluation reports no later than 29 October 2010.

Acknowledgements

As noted, the terms of reference for the mid-term review required the review team to organise its own schedule of consultations in Kiribati. It proved difficult to do this in advance at a distance. The review team acknowledges with gratitude the willingness of GoK officials and others listed at Annex B to share their insights into the programs with the review team at relatively little (and in some cases no) prior notice. The review team also acknowledges with equal gratitude the willingness of Australia's First Secretary (Development Cooperation) and New Zealand's Deputy High Commissioner to meet with the review team at very little prior notice to share their insights.

Aide Memoire for mid-term review of the AusAID-APSC Pacific Governance Partnership (APSC Partnership) and the Pacific Executive Program (PACE):

Samoa

20 August 2010

Evaluation Background

The Australian Agency for International Development (AusAID) has supported the building of networks and provision of training opportunities for middle and senior Pacific Island public sector administrators for some years. In recent years two such activities have been the APSC Partnership and PACE/PACE Extension.

AusAID – APSC Pacific Governance Partnership (APSC Partnership)

AusAID is providing funding support for the APSC Partnership for four years commencing 1 July 2008 and concluding 30 June 2012.

The objective of the APSC Partnership is to extend the capability of Pacific public sector officials at senior executive and middle management levels to better lead and implement public sector reforms particularly in, but not limited to, the area of human resource management.

The APSC Partnership includes:

- Support for the annual Pacific Public Service Commissioners' Conference
- Supporting and providing networking opportunities for the regional network of Pacific human resource managers, including through the annual Human Resource Managers' Network Conference
- Providing up to 30 work attachments per year (of no more than a week) for Pacific officials to develop their human resource management skills. The attachments are mainly in Australian public service agencies at Federal or State levels, with a smaller number in Pacific public sector agencies
- Organising work placements for the PACE Extension program (see below).

Pacific Executive Program (PACE/PACE Extension)

The high level objective of PACE is to improve public sector capacity in the Pacific region. The middle level objective is to improve the management and leadership capacity of senior public servants in each of the countries participating in the program.

PACE is designed for public sector officials in the executive ranks who have been identified as emerging and future leaders. Annual cohorts of up to 40 participants attend a three week residential program in Canberra directed by the ANZ School of Government (Stage 1), undertake a work project in their home countries (Stage 2) and return to Canberra a year later for a further week of training to consolidate their learning (Stage 3).

Each year around 5-6 of the top performers in PACE Stages 1 and 2 are offered extended work placements of up to eight weeks in Australia, immediately following their completion of PACE Stage 3, in an area relevant to the work project that they developed through PACE. PACE Extension participants are selected by a tri-partite committee of AusAID, APSC and ANZSOG representatives. The APSC arranges suitable work placements with Australian government agencies for those selected.

Under the current AusAID-APSC funding agreement 12 Government of Samoa (GoS) public servants have participated in one or more APSC Partnership activities of whom all but two were either Public Service Commissioners or PSC officers. Eight of the 12 APSC Partnership participants are women. Fourteen GoS officers have participated in PACE (including its pilot program) or are about to do so. Of these, four were/are PSC officers and 11 are women. The majority of participants in both programs, especially PACE, have been at the Assistant Chief Executive Officer level or above.

Objectives and methods of the mid-term review

The basic objective of the mid-term review is to evaluate how key program outputs of the APSC Partnership and PACE/PACE Extension respectively have contributed to date to the achievement of outcomes attributable to these programs. Two separate mid-term evaluation reports will be produced as each program is a discrete activity. However, there are also similarities in program objectives and potential synergies between the two programs. The review team will also produce a (brief) third report examining these similarities and potential synergies.

The evaluations will address AusAID's standard evaluation criteria including relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impacts, sustainability, gender equality, monitoring and evaluation arrangements and lessons learned to date. They will also address several program-specific issues including the programs' approaches to capacity building, their relationships to other Pacific capacity building programs and the extent to which they are building sustainable networks of current and future leaders of Pacific public administration.

The review team is undertaking its evaluations of the two programs in two main ways:

- review and analysis of documentation and data relating to the activities;
- structured consultations with a range of stakeholders in Australia and in-country, notably: AusAID (in Australia and at Post); APSC; ANZSOG; participants in the activities from Kiribati, Samoa and Solomon Islands, representatives of their agencies (as available) and representatives of relevant central agencies in these countries.

The review team is structuring the questions being pursued in consultations so as to ensure a consistent approach enabling cross-matching of findings.

Description of Evaluation Activities

The terms of reference for the mid-term review required the review team to organise its own schedule of consultations in Samoa. Accordingly, prior to arrival the review team sent over fifty emails and follow-up emails to participants seeking meetings. Relatively few responses were received and these mainly from persons who would be unavailable due to their absence overseas.

The review team arrived in Samoa on Sunday 15 August 2010 and held meetings on Monday and Tuesday 16-17 August with, or with GoS officials organised through, the AusAID Post. Having obtained clearance from the PSC Commissioners the review team made direct approaches in person to other program participants to seek meetings and this proved more successful. Of the 26 participants in the programs 12 were unavailable due to absence on leave or absence overseas. The team held 45-60 minute discussions with 12 of the available 14 participants over the remainder of the week prior to departure from Samoa on Saturday 21 August 2010. Details of participants and others consulted during the week are at Annex B. The review team is also in email contact with three further participants, currently overseas, who have responded to questions by email.

Questions and discussion revolved around two main topics: for participants, the relevance, value to them as individuals and value to their agencies of their participation (past, current or prospective); for participants and other stakeholders, the nature and extent of linkages between training/networking benefits for individual participants and wider institutional strengthening and capacity building outcomes.

Initial Findings

The review team has yet to complete its consultations in Australia and the Solomon Islands and therefore makes no specific recommendations at this stage. However, the review team has formed some preliminary conclusions, some of which mirror conclusions drawn in Kiribati but others of which are specific to Samoa.

Relevance:

- At a broad level the programs contribute to the Australia Samoan Partnership for Development priority areas i.e. Priority Outcome 4 - public sector capacity, in particular: executive and personnel training. They indirectly support other priority areas e.g. Priority Outcome 1 sector planning and statistical support.
- All GoS participants consulted expressed the view that the programs were highly relevant to their professional development needs in terms of providing external support, advice, learning opportunities and access to useful resource documentation.
- Individual projects and attachments appear to align with and support documented agency plans and priorities – proposals reflect and are relevant to personal or local (agency) needs. Project outcomes are often linked to individual performance outcomes as defined by employment contracts.
- In principle, requirements for Cabinet approval of participation in overseas studies, presentation of written reports following completion and linking of participants' projects to their performance agreements should serve to align participation and participants' projects with Samoa's overall development priorities. The extent to which this occurs in practice is less clear, bearing in mind that neither Samoa's Aid Coordination and Debt Management Unit or the AusAID Post plays any direct role in reviewing participants' proposed projects or evaluating the outcomes of their participation.
- An indirect linkage appears to exist with regards to implementation strategies associated with the Public Administration Sector Plan (executive development support). No direct linkages are apparent to the Public Sector Improvement Facility.
- By their nature, regional programs administered and largely delivered in Australia offer little scope to progress application of the Paris Declaration, the Accra Agenda for

<p>Action and the Cairns Compact.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is highly questionable whether, given direct control over Samoa's 'share' of funding currently allocated to the programs, the GoS would choose to allocate its share to ongoing participation in PACE given the PSC's intention to reintroduce an in-country executive development program.
<p><i>Effectiveness:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The design of both programs appears effective with respect to providing opportunities for individuals to leave their professional and personal environments to participate in the programs. • Initiatives supported by both programs appear to have been effective in enhancing the professional capabilities of participating individuals. All individuals interviewed indicated that they believe they have improved, or at least impacted upon, the effectiveness of the organisations they work within. • However, there is very little evidence at this stage that the programs have contributed in any direct way to institutional strengthening or the achievement of public sector reforms in Samoa and such signs as exist are primarily anecdotal (see also 'impacts'). • Both programs appear as an 'add on' to the bilateral program, thereby reducing the overall effectiveness of the programs relative to the total development investment in Samoa. • The tracing of links between individual professional development, institutional strengthening and long-term capacity building poses major challenges in any context (including that of the Australian public sector, for example). See also Monitoring and Evaluation below. • Executive development and workforce planning do not appear to be supported within a strategic context i.e. competing programs are in place and supported by a variety of funding sources e.g. NZAID, Commonwealth Secretariat, PSIF and AusAID bilateral programming. Effectiveness appears coincidental across programs.
<p><i>Efficiency:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Participants consulted made a few suggestions for improvements in the way APSC Partnership activities are administered (see general comments below) but generally appeared fully satisfied with the way in which their individual participations had been organised and managed. • Participants spoke highly of the quality and relevance of learning provided by presenters and mentors for the programs. • Appropriate resources appear to have been allocated to efficiently manage and support delivery of the programs (but see Monitoring and Evaluation below). • The Samoan Aid Coordination and Debt Management Unit would like to have a more strategic understanding of both programs. Whilst program reports are distributed to key stakeholders (i.e. home agency, PSC and ANZSOG), the Coordination Unit believes there is a need for broader sharing of program reports and outcomes. • At the least the review team considers there is scope to improve the efficiency of the programs' administration through improved information flows including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ distribution to the Aid Coordination Unit and AusAID Post of communiqués from the annual Commissioners' and HR Managers' conferences as they happen; ○ longer lead-times for nomination and selection of applicants; ○ prior notice to and consultation with Samoa's Aid Coordination Unit and the AusAID Post for in-country visits by the program service providers; ○ consolidation of data on program participation over time for both programs on a country-specific basis and dissemination of same to the Aid

<p>Coordination Unit and AusAID Post;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ wider circulation of participants' project reports. • It is clear that within the Samoan context there is a strong emphasis on developing in-country training which is seen to be more cost effective.
<p><i>Impacts:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Program outcomes (including project progress) appear to be systematically reported upon and formally discussed in the work environment in Samoa. • Impact at a personal level is clearly significant. All participants believe the programs they participated in resulted in improved self esteem and confidence; planning and communication skills; operational understanding of their portfolios, and the ability to better manage and lead within the public sector. The Public Service Commissioners endorsed that assessment. • Participating individuals clearly believe they have had the opportunity to directly influence, in a positive way, corporate outcomes and that they have been well supported by senior personnel in this regard. • However as noted (Effectiveness, above) impacts beyond the individual are more difficult to assess. Evidence of agency impacts appears quite patchy.
<p><i>Sustainability:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It would not be possible for GoS to financially support either program, as they currently are structured, without direct support from AusAID and/or other donors. • The GoS has actively pursued the development and implementation of public sector development programs in Samoa, in particular executive development initiatives at the National University of Samoa. AusAID, through the bilateral program will continue to support these initiatives and it would be appropriate to examine opportunities to better align and coordinate resources supporting executive development programs. • Overseas qualifications are considered more 'prestigious' than local qualifications. In addition, incentives to travel and network internationally are clearly significant factors which indirectly support and drive both programs. So long as externally funded and delivered programs exist, local programs supporting executive and leadership development may tend to be devalued.
<p><i>Monitoring and evaluation:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Neither program tracks impacts beyond delivery in any systematic way. The same could perhaps be said for any number of professional development programs, whether in Samoa or Australia. • GoS participation in M&E procedures is minimal, beyond the collection of reports. GoS does not appear to have initiated any independent mechanisms or processes which allow it to monitor or evaluate program impacts. AusAID Post has not actively participated in any M&E practices. • Local participants have emphasised that monitoring of projects and associated initiatives should continue beyond the life of participation in the two programs. • Given the relatively small size of the programs in dollar terms and the challenges inherent in attempting to evaluate impacts beyond program delivery stage it is questionable whether significant additional investment in monitoring and evaluation would represent worthwhile value for money. • The review team does see a case for improved monitoring by more systematic tracking of individuals and their projects over a longer period of time – as opposed to monitoring developmental impacts which would be problematic, notoriously difficult and likely quite costly. • Wider impacts to be evaluated for programs of this kind would need to encompass not

<p>only development benefits but also the benefits that flow from fostering personal relationships between Pacific public sector managers and future leaders, and between them and Australian officials and agencies. These benefits are inherently hard to ‘measure’.</p>
<p><i>Gender equality:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Gender equity is actively managed and monitored from a statistical perspective. • As noted earlier, of the 26 recent participants in APSC Partnership/PACE activities combined, 19 (73%) are women. • Little active effort is made to ensure that gender and equity priorities are pursued from a development or operational perspective i.e. active integration of gender and equity principles/priorities within project design and implementation. • The Ministry of Women, Community and Social Services has successfully nominated representatives to both programs.
<p><i>Analysis and learning:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Most participants believe that the Pacific networking supported by the regional nature of the programs is important and a significant positive feature of both programs. A minority suggested that Samoa had little to learn from other Pacific participants. • Both programs have developed and support tracking mechanisms to facilitate networking and collaborative learning derived from the programs. • The Pacific Village On-Line Forum managed by the APSC on behalf of the APSC Partnership appears to be used by Samoan participants primarily for maintaining personal (social) contacts with fellow participants on their courses. If they need access to resource material several appear to go to the APSC website as a first preference. The ANZSOG Alumni website does not appear to be used any more systematically. • The PSC and HRM conferences have the potential to facilitate and support broad based learning and analysis for both programs if they were empowered (and resourced) to do so.
<p><i>General comments and observations:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Compared to Kiribati, both programs appear somewhat better aligned to Samoa's public sector development priorities – although Samoa does not seem to have a strategic framework governing or managing their implementation. • There appears good support and an appreciation of both programs at senior levels across all participating agencies. • Whilst individual/ministry/agency impacts appear relevant within a local context, the programs do not appear to have facilitated or advanced overall public sector reform within a WoG context. • It was commented that a number of CEOs in Samoa are new appointments with limited executive experience. It was felt that the PACE as it currently exists may not be appropriate for these individuals. GoS may be looking at alternative options to address this issue in the future. • A majority amongst APSC Partnership workplace attachment beneficiaries suggested that the program is ‘misnamed’ (i.e. it is more of a comparative study program) and some were disappointed that it did not provide an opportunity to genuinely work alongside Australian counterparts in Australian agencies. • It was proposed that a post attachment debriefing session be provided at the conclusion of the APSC partnership workplace attachment to allow participants to discuss activity outcomes and to share learning experiences. • As yet there appears to be little awareness in Samoa of PICPA and its potential to support localisation of professional development activities.

The review team's next steps will be:

- attendance as an observer at the 2010 Pacific Public Service Commissioners' annual conference (Port Vila, Vanuatu, 27th September – 1st October, one review team member only);
- travel to Solomon Islands in October for comparable consultations in that country;
- if/as necessary, further consultation with stakeholders in Australia in the light of emerging findings and possible recommendations;
- preparation and submission to AusAID of the three draft evaluation reports no later than 29 October 2010.

Acknowledgements

The review team acknowledges with gratitude the assistance of the AusAID Post in arranging initial meetings with key stakeholders in Samoa and in facilitating other meetings, especially the assistance provided by Asenati Tuiletufuga, Senior Program Officer. The review team also acknowledges with gratitude the willingness of GoS officials and others listed at Annex B to share their insights into the programs with the review team at relatively short notice.

**Aide Memoire for mid-term review of the AusAID-APSC Pacific Governance
Partnership (APSC Partnership) and the Pacific Executive Program (PACE):
Tonga
15 October 2010**

Evaluation Background

The Australian Agency for International Development (AusAID) has supported the building of networks and provision of training opportunities for middle and senior Pacific Island public sector administrators for some years. In recent years two such activities have been the APSC Partnership and PACE/PACE Extension.

AusAID – APSC Pacific Governance Partnership (APSC Partnership)

AusAID is providing funding support for the APSC Partnership for four years commencing 1 July 2008 and concluding 30 June 2012.

The objective of the APSC Partnership is to extend the capability of Pacific public sector officials at senior executive and middle management levels to better lead and implement public sector reforms particularly in, but not limited to, the area of human resource management.

The APSC Partnership includes:

- Support for the annual Pacific Public Service Commissioners' Conference
- Supporting and providing networking opportunities for the regional network of Pacific human resource managers, including through the annual Human Resource Managers' Network Conference
- Providing up to 30 work attachments per year (of no more than a week) for Pacific officials to develop their human resource management skills. The attachments are mainly in Australian public service agencies at Federal or State levels, with a smaller number in Pacific public sector agencies
- Organising work placements for the PACE Extension program (see below).

Since 2007 some 11 Government of the Kingdom of Tonga (GoKT) public servants have participated in one or more activities funded through the APSC Partnership of whom 73% have been female, 73% were/are Commissioners or staff of the Public Service Commission and 7 of whom met with the review team (at least 3 of the remainder being currently overseas).

Pacific Executive Program (PACE/PACE Extension)

The high level objective of PACE is to improve public sector capacity in the Pacific region. The middle level objective is to improve the management and leadership capacity of senior public servants in each of the countries participating in the program.

PACE is designed for public sector officials in the executive ranks who have been identified as emerging and future leaders. Annual cohorts of up to 40 participants attend a three week residential program in Canberra directed by the ANZ School of Government (Stage 1), undertake a work project in their home countries (Stage 2) and return to Canberra a year later for a further week of training to consolidate their learning (Stage 3).

Each year around 5-6 of the top performers in PACE Stages 1 and 2 are offered extended work placements of up to eight weeks in Australia, immediately following their completion of PACE Stage 3, in an area relevant to the work project that they developed through PACE. PACE Extension participants are selected by a tri-partite committee of AusAID, APSC and ANZSOG representatives. The APSC arranges suitable work placements with Australia government agencies for those selected.

Since 2007 seven GoKT public servants have participated in PACE activities 71% of whom are female, 29% of whom were officers of the Public Service Commission at the time of their nomination for PACE and six of whom met with the review team (the remaining participant being currently overseas). Most (possibly all) of these participants were at the level of Deputy Secretary or equivalent at the time of their nomination for PACE.

Objectives and methods of the mid-term review

The basic objective of the mid-term review is to evaluate how key program outputs of the APSC Partnership and PACE/PACE Extension respectively have contributed to date to the achievement of outcomes attributable to these programs. Two separate mid-term evaluation reports will be produced as each program is a discrete activity. However, there are also some similarities in program objectives and potential synergies between the two programs. The review team will also produce a (brief) third report examining these similarities and potential synergies.

The evaluations will address AusAID's standard evaluation criteria including relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impacts, sustainability, gender equality, monitoring and evaluation arrangements and lessons learned to date. They will also address several program-specific issues including the programs' approaches to capacity building, their relationships to other Pacific capacity building programs and the extent to which they are building sustainable networks of current and future leaders of Pacific public administration.

The review team is undertaking its evaluations of the two programs in two main ways:

- review and analysis of documentation and data relating to the activities;
- structured consultations with a range of stakeholders in Australia and in-country, notably: AusAID (in Australia and at Posts); APSC; ANZSOG; participants in the activities from Kiribati, Samoa and Tonga, representatives of their agencies (as available) and representatives of relevant central agencies in these countries.

The review team is structuring the questions being pursued in consultations so as to ensure a consistent approach enabling cross-matching of findings.

Description of Evaluation Activities

The terms of reference for the mid-term review required the review team to organise its own schedule of consultations in Tonga. Accordingly, prior to arrival the review team made contact

via email with a majority of Tonga's participants in the APSC Partnership/PACE, focussing on recent and current participants and PACE Alumni. This led to scheduling of meetings with most of Tonga's participants prior to arrival in-country early on Monday 11 October 2010.

Questions and discussion in meetings during the week revolved around two main topics: for participants, the relevance, value to them as individuals and value to their agencies of their participation (past, current or prospective); for participants and other stakeholders, the nature and extent of linkages between training/networking benefits for individual participants and wider institutional strengthening and capacity building outcomes from participation in the programs.

Initial Findings

The review team notes that its in-country consultations in Tonga covered a relatively small sample of total APSC Partnership/PACE participants. The review team has formed some preliminary and Tonga-specific conclusions in relation to the programs.

Relevance:

- The programs contribute indirectly to Priority Outcome 1 of the (2009) Australia - Tonga Partnership for Development, namely "a more efficient and effective public sector".
- Tonga would still seek and utilise financial support for participation in programs such as PACE and the APSC Partnership even if they were no longer directly funded by AusAID.
- The local work environment must be ready and receptive to change if local impacts are to be achieved – this appears to be the case in Tonga.
- All GoKT participants consulted expressed the view that the programs remain highly relevant to Tonga's needs in terms of providing external support, advice, learning opportunities and access to useful resource documentation relevant to the strengthening of Tonga's public administration.
- Senior GoKT stakeholders consulted endorsed this view - the APSC Partnership and PACE are seen as providing valued training inputs and access to regional resources until such time as the GoKT has fully developed and implemented country-specific systems and procedures for training and professional development of its public service.
- Nobody consulted expressed the view that the programs were no longer relevant to GoKT development priorities or the personal development needs of its middle and senior managers.

Effectiveness:

- PACE is seen in Tonga as delivering learning in a way that relates to the practical needs and experiences of participants while expanding their horizons. It was suggested by some that, by contrast, some presentations at the most recent HRM Network annual conference (hosted by Tonga) may have been somewhat 'over the heads' of participants in terms of relevance to PIC contexts.
- PACE is addressing the needs of emerging leaders; however more support is required for existing CEOs already in place. There has been quite a bit of turnover at this level and little prior support was given to these people.
- Feedback from GoKT participants and other stakeholders suggests that the programs are effective in improving the management and leadership capacities of individuals participating in the programs.
- However, there is no evidence at this stage that the programs have contributed in any

<p>systematic way to organisational capacity development or the achievement of wider public sector reforms in Tonga (see also ‘impacts’).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Contributions are indirect and appear piecemeal because they are not directly integrated or aligned with the locally articulated development framework. • A common view amongst PACE participants is that Tonga’s current (informal) ‘quota’ of around 2-3 places on PACE each year is and will be insufficient to create a ‘critical mass’ of senior executives and future leaders sufficient to catalyse service-wide public sector reform. • More consistently than in the two other sample countries visited by the review team a common suggestion from participants was that work projects undertaken via PACE/APSC work attachments should be potentially replicable across agencies and/or align with higher-order government development priorities rather than be limited to addressing agency-specific needs. • There appears to be little interface with other development initiatives supporting public sector reform in Tonga. • Within a limited context (i.e. the Ministry for Finance) some participants have the opportunity to contribute to strengthened economic management.
<p><i>Efficiency:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is the potential and desire to establish better coordination and management of both programs within a Tongan context i.e. to better align Tongan participation in the programs to national workforce (including succession planning) and sector priorities. • The view was put that a longer term vision and funding platform for the programs would facilitate program(s) efficiency and local planning in association with both activities. • Nobody consulted made any suggestions for significant improvements in the ways that the APSC Partnership/PACE activities could be better administered in terms of their delivery to individual participants. On the contrary, they appeared to be fully satisfied with the way in which their individual participations had been organised and managed although some PACE participants suggested that they would like more formal feedback on their project reports after their presentation. • Both agencies providing the services i.e. APSC and ANZSOG appear to have allocated appropriate resources to efficiently manage and support delivery of the programs.
<p><i>Impacts:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Impacts on individual participants appear to have been substantial and beneficial. Feedback mirrored the more structured feedback from all participants gathered by the APSC and ANZSOG during program delivery with comments along lines such as “the program was great”, “the program exposed me to new ways of doing things”, “the program gave me much greater confidence and insight that I could do the things I need to do in my job here”, and “I would certainly recommend the program to colleagues”. • Participants are using skills acquired through the programs to support them in a number of professional ways, for example managing the EU STABEX and the AusAID/NZAID TVET programs, and modernising systems servicing the judiciary. But from the various cases reviewed there is no evidence that participation in the programs can be linked to wider positive impacts on public administration or reform in Tonga. • This conundrum, namely substantial evidence of training benefits for individuals but little if any evidence of organisational capacity development or a wider impact will be addressed in some detail in the review team’s report.
<p><i>Sustainability:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It would not be possible for Tonga to financially support either program, as they are currently structured, without direct support from AusAID and/or other donors. Tonga

<p>would want to continue the programs even if funding was restricted and/or provided through alternative funding mechanisms.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is an opportunity for GoKT/ PICPA interface to support the development and implementation of a localised program in support of public sector development. • The view was put that sustainability opportunities will be hindered if both programs are not able to maintain ongoing support for HRM and emerging leader cohorts as senior personnel are lost from the system (e.g. through retirement) as there does not appear to be a critical mass of personnel yet available within Tonga to dispense with ongoing technical assistance. • But PACE participants also emphasised the importance of maintaining the seniority of the PACE intake to maintain program quality (i.e. continuing to target senior officials near CEO level).
<p><i>Monitoring and evaluation:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Both programs, through their managing agents, have put in place appropriate M&E systems to monitor and evaluate the delivery of their programs. • At the level of monitoring the impacts of the two programs on broader public sector reform and capacity building objectives it is safe to say – albeit recognising the substantial difficulties in attempting to make and monitor such a link – that there is no evidence of any such monitoring or evaluation effort by either the donor, the service providers or the GoKT. • Both managing agents are proposing and developing strategies to better monitor and evaluate impacts within and across countries. AusAID has approved, in principle, the request by the APSC for in-country visits to further develop impact monitoring and evaluation. The review team has some reservations as to whether, given the nature and relatively small scale of the programs, this will add value commensurate with costs. • The Commissioners' Conference would appear to be an ideal forum to review outcomes associated with both programs. • Tonga and AusAID (Post) participation in M&E procedures is minimal. Tonga has not initiated any independent mechanisms or processes that would allow it to monitor, evaluate or share program impacts.
<p><i>Gender equality:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There was high praise for the way PACE was prepared to support and adapt its participation guidelines to actively support women who were pregnant or with new born babies. • Gender equity is actively managed and monitored by both programs from a statistical perspective. • Female participation from Tonga in both programs in recent years has been 72%. • Little active effort is made to ensure that gender and equity priorities are pursued from a development or operational perspective i.e. active integration of gender and equity principles/priorities within work project design and implementation.
<p><i>Analysis and learning:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It would be good if there was the provision of consolidated information outlining support for public sector development across the region – this might allow Tonga to better access these resource more effectively. • No stakeholder consulted in Tonga has, based on their participation experience or wider considerations, proposed any substantial change in the structure or delivery of the APSC Partnership/PACE programs over the remaining lives of these programs. • There was strong support for the Pacific Village Website – it appeared well used recognising some technical limitations e.g. Tonga has used the site to advertise local positions and to seek external input and support for issues arising locally.

- Both programs have developed and supported tracking mechanisms to facilitate networking and collaborative learning derived from the programs.
- Interviewed participants indicated that they actively communicate and network with alumni and mentors associated with their own intakes. A number of PACE participants suggested that Tonga should establish its own (local) alumni association.
- Little active learning and analysis is, as yet, apparent beyond efforts to improve program delivery. Both programs have indicated they are looking to address this issue.
- The PSC and HRM conferences have the potential to facilitate and support broad based learning and analysis for both programs if they were empowered (and resourced) to do so. However, communication between the two programs appears weak.
- It was proposed that the HRM conference make greater use of case studies and Pacific Islander presenters (beyond the host nation) to allow a better sharing of regional knowledge and experience.

The review team's next steps will be:

- if/as necessary, further consultation with stakeholders in Australia in the light of emerging findings and possible recommendations;
- Preparation and submission to AusAID of the three draft evaluation reports no later than 29 October 2010.

Acknowledgements

As noted, the terms of reference for the mid-term review required the review team to organise its own schedule of consultations in Tonga. It proved difficult to do this in advance at a distance. The review team acknowledges with gratitude the willingness of GoKT and AusAID officials, particularly those in the PSC, who assisted in coordinating in-country meetings on behalf of the team. The review team also wishes to thank all those listed at Annex B for sharing their insights into the programs with the review team.

Annex F: Some comparisons of executive development program costs

The Evaluation Team notes and acknowledges that the following comparisons are based on numerous assumptions and ‘guesstimates’, any one of which might be challenged. The purpose of this Annex is not to present accurate comparisons, not least because no attempt is made to adjust for any differences in the ‘quality’ of programs included, but merely to illustrate that the PACE program would appear to be neither ‘over-priced’ or ‘under-priced’ relative to some potential comparisons. The comparisons included target a broadly similar intake in terms of executive development.

PACE program	Estimated cost per participant per day (2010 prices) ⁴⁹
<p>The PACE Funding Agreement (Annex 5c) budgeted the 2008 costs of PACE at \$59,696 per participant. This appeared to divide the total 2008 budget (\$2,387,831) by 40 Pace participants. However, the budget total also included provisions for Alumni activities. The fixed and variable costs of Course Delivery for PACE excluding Alumni activities were budgeted at \$1,772,758. Adding a pro-rata share of the 15% Administration Fee to this suggests a total PACE Course Delivery cost in 2008 of \$2,038,741 or, divided by an anticipated 40 participants, some \$50,970 per participant.</p> <p>Travel, accommodation, daily allowances and insurance costs for participants were budgeted at a total of \$708,750 or \$17,718 per participant. Subtracting these from the above suggests a ‘course delivery’ cost of some \$1,330,000 or \$33,250 per participant for 25 days participation (Stage 1 plus Stage 3), including weekends, at 2008 prices, translating to \$1,330 per day at 2008 prices. Escalating this by the actual CPI increase since 2008 to date of some 5.4% in total⁵⁰ translates to an adjusted per day participant cost of some \$1,400 per day at 2010 prices.</p>	\$1,400

⁴⁹ This and all following estimates of ‘cost per day’ exclude all costs of travel, accommodation, daily allowances and insurance for participants.

⁵⁰ Annex 5C of the Funding Agreement projected CPI increases of 5% annually. The calculation here adopts a conservative estimate of current (2010) participant costs.

University of Melbourne Business School: Mount Eliza Executive Education	Estimated cost per participant per day (2010 prices)
11 day Executive Residential Course <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • cost \$16,550 • less estimated accommodation costs for PACE participants for 11 days at 2010 prices (\$4,060) • divided by 11 days 	\$1,135

Australian School of Business, University of New South Wales (all non-residential courses)	Estimated cost per participant per day (2010 prices)
Leadership and Decision Making: 3 days total \$3,630	\$1,210
General Managers Program: 6 days total \$11,990	\$2,000
Leading change with impact: 3 days total \$5,779	\$1,926

Macquarie Graduate School of Management (non residential)	Estimated cost per participant per day (2010 prices)
Leadership Development Program: 3 days total \$4,620	\$1,540

University of Queensland Business School (non residential)	Estimated cost per participant per day (2010 prices)
Leading People and Teams: 5 days total \$4,550	\$910