

Stocktake of the Pacific Islands Chiefs of Police (PICP) Secretariat

Stocktake Report

14 August, 2011

Commissioned by:
New Zealand Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade
New Zealand Aid Programme
Manatū Aorere

Prepared by:
James Mc Govern
Independent Contractor
MC Development Services

The views expressed in this report are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the position of the New Zealand Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade, the New Zealand Police, the Pacific Islands Chiefs of Police members and the Pacific Islands Chiefs of Police Secretariat or any other party. Nor do these entities accept any liability for claims arising from the report's content or reliance on it

Table of Contents

Map of Pacific Region	4
Basic Data.....	4
1 Executive Summary.....	6
1.1 Background to the PICP Secretariat Stocktake.....	6
1.2 Stocktake Methodology	6
1.3 Key Findings	7
1.4 Recommendations	11
2 Introduction.....	14
2.1 Purpose of the Stocktake	14
2.2 Intended use of stocktake results.....	14
3 Stocktake Methodology	14
3.1 Stocktake scope	14
3.2 Stocktake objectives	15
3.3 Stocktake criteria and questions	15
3.4 Data sources, data collection procedures and instruments	16
3.5 Performance standards	16
4 Key Findings.....	17
4.1 Alignment and priority (5/6)	17
4.2 Effectiveness: Extent of the Secretariat's contribution to PICP outcomes (3/6)	17
4.3 Relevance (4/6).....	18
4.4 Effectiveness (3/6)	19
4.5 Efficiency (2/6)	20
4.6 Sustainability (2/6).....	21
4.7 Extent to which PICP-S structure and PICP governance arrangements provide for Pacific Ownership of and Capacity Development opportunities for Pacific Police services (1/6).....	21
4.8 Gender Equity (3/6).....	22
4.9 Value for Money (3/6).....	22
5 Analysis of findings.....	23
5.1 Alignment and priority	23
5.2 Effectiveness: Extent of the Secretariat's contribution to PICP outcomes (3/6)	24
5.3 Relevance	25
5.4 Effectiveness.....	26
5.5 Efficiency.....	26
5.6 Sustainability	27
5.7 Extent to which PICP-S structure and PICP governance arrangements provide for Pacific Ownership of and Capacity Development opportunities for Pacific Police services	28
5.8 Gender Equity	29
5.9 Value for Money	29
6 Conclusions and Recommendations	31
6.1 Key conclusions	31
6.2 Recommendations	32
Annex 1: Terms of Reference Pacific Island Chiefs of Police (PICP) Secretariat Stocktake	33
Annex 2: PICP Secretariat Stocktake Matrix	41
Annex 3: Stocktake Methodology – key approaches.....	55

Annex 4: Schedule of Tasks, Activities and Deliverables	58
Annex 5: Description of the PICP and the Secretariat.....	59
Annex 6: PICP Members' Questionnaire.....	64
Annex 7: Summary PICP Questionnaire Responses	82
Annex 8: WAN Questionnaire	101
Annex 9: WAN Questionnaire Results Summary	106
Annex 10: List of Reference Materials	109
Annex 11: List of Persons Consulted	114

MAP OF PACIFIC REGION¹



BASIC DATA

Region:	Pacific
Initiative Name:	Pacific Islands Chiefs of Police Secretariat (PICP-S)
Initiative type:	Bi-lateral, multi-country.
Location of Initiative:	Wellington, New Zealand, with activities throughout the Pacific.
Implementing Agency:	New Zealand Police (NZ Police).
Implementing Partner:	PICP and PICP Secretariat
Funding Agencies:	Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade (MFAT), Government of New Zealand (GoNZ); Australian Agency for International Development (AusAID); NZ Police Australian Federal Police (AFP).
Governance Arrangements:	PICP Chairperson; PICP Members; PICP-S Executive Director;
Stocktake Period:	2004-2011
Approved Cost of Initiative	
GoNZ	TBC
GoA	TBC
Actual Expenditure to 31 December 2010	
PICP-S	TBC
Independent Contractor:	James Mc Govern (MC Development Services).

¹ Source: <http://www.hhs.gov/asl/testify/t040225a.html>

LIST OF ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS

AFP	- Australian Federal Police
AusAID	- The Australian Agency for International Development
BoM	- Board of Management
CP	- Community Policing
CSOs	- Civil Society Organisations
ED	- Executive Director
GoA	- Government of Australia
GoNZ	- Government of New Zealand
ISG	- International Services Group
LJS	- Law and Justice Sector
M&E	- Monitoring and Stocktake
MEF	- Monitoring and Stocktake Framework
MFAT	- Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade (GoNZ)
MoU	- Memorandum of Understanding
NGOs	- Non-Governmental Organisations
NZD	- New Zealand Dollars
NZ Police	- New Zealand Police
OECD/DAC	- Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development/Development Assistance Committee
PIC	- Pacific Island Countries
PICP	- Pacific Islands Chiefs of Police
PICP-S	- Pacific Islands Chiefs of Police Secretariat
PPB	- Pacific Patrol Boats
PPDP	- Pacific Policing Development Program
PPDVP	- Pacific Prevention of Domestic Violence Programme
PRPI	- Pacific Regional Policing Initiative
SPCPC	- South Pacific Chiefs of Police Conference
TA	- Technical Assistance
ToR	- Terms of Reference
ToT	- Train the Trainer
UoF	- Use of Force
WAN	- Women's Advisory Network

1 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

1.1 Background to the PICP Secretariat Stocktake

1. The Pacific Islands Chiefs of Police (PICP) Secretariat, established in 2004, is hosted by the New Zealand Police (NZ Police) in Wellington and provides services across the following three outputs to the 21 PICP members: (a) *Supporting Pacific Islands Chiefs of Police (Chiefs) and an annual conference*; (b) *management of projects*; and (c) *effective representation of the PICP and its members' interests in the region and international environments*. An annual PICP conference provides a governance mechanism, with administration of the Secretariat conducted by the PICP Chair, rotated annually, and the Secretariat itself. The Secretariat has 7 funded posts as follows: Executive Director (NZ Police)², Secretariat Officer (NZ Police), Senior Projects Officer (AFP), Executive Support Officer (NZ Police), Business Planning and Monitoring Officer (BPMO) (externally contracted), and two Project Officer posts (for PICP member countries).³ NZ Police, MFAT and the AFP contribute toward Secretariat costs.

2. The NZ Aid Programme has contributed to funding the Secretariat's salary, travel and operational costs since 2004/5. The current contract expires on 31 December, 2011 and this Stocktake of MFAT's funding to the Secretariat from 2004/5 to date is intended to feed into MFAT's determination of whether it would provide further financial support to the Secretariat, and if so, the scope and scale of support. This Executive Summary presents the Stocktake's key findings and recommendations.

1.2 Stocktake Methodology

3. MFAT contracted an independent contractor who prepared a Stocktake Plan setting out the assumptions and proposed approach to the Stocktake from 2004/5 to date. The Stocktake was conducted of the Secretariat's three outputs against the following criteria: (i) alignment and priority; (ii) effectiveness—extent of the Secretariat's contribution to achievement of PICP outcomes; (iii) relevance; (iv) effectiveness; (v) efficiency; (vi) sustainability; (vii) extent to which the Secretariat's structure and PICP governance arrangements provide for Pacific ownership of and capacity development opportunities for Pacific Police services; (viii) gender equity; and (ix) value for money. For reasons of cost and time efficiency, impact was not considered. The Stocktake explored the Women's Advisory Network (WAN) Project and also considered value for money and potential savings for the Secretariat through different design, methodology and resource allocation. The independent contractor (i) reviewed documents relating to the Secretariat's activities and implementation; (ii) held focused discussions with representatives from PICP member countries, including a number of Commissioners, WAN representatives (by telephone); (iii) held individual and group discussions with Secretariat staff in Wellington; and (iv) distributed two questionnaires (to Chiefs and to WAN representatives). The Secretariat was assessed according to the following rating scale for each criterion: 6 = very high / excellent; 5= good; 4= above average; 3=below average; 2=poor; 1 = very low. Performance standards were only used where there was sufficient evidence in the findings to make a sound judgement. Where insufficient evidence existed to apply the performance standards, this was stated and no rating was given.

² This indicates the source organisation, not the source of funding for the post.

³ Currently only one ex PICP member country is seconded full time to the Secretariat; funding for the second post has been used to bring a number of secondees to Wellington for short-term assignments.

1.3 Key Findings

4. **Alignment and priority (5/6):**⁴ Support to the Secretariat aligns well the NZ Aid Programme policy statement's theme of building safe and secure communities and with the stated aim of prioritising investments to promote good governance. A link is often drawn between the primacy of the rule of law, maintained through an impartial and effective legal system, and sustainable economic development. New Zealand's current policy focus on sustainable economic development actively seeks to strengthen this link through its law and justice sector activities, including through the NZ Police's International Services Group (ISG). Support for a regional approach in policing can be justified, not only in the common interests and challenges present in small island nations across the Pacific and the obvious economic efficiencies in communicating and delivering services on a regional basis, but also in the strength of voice which the PICP member states achieve through the grouping, in seeking resources and meeting policing challenges.

5. **Effectiveness – extent of PICP-S contribution to achievement of PICP outcomes (3/6):** Since 2004/5 the Secretariat has made a significant contribution to the holding of the PICP annual conference, particularly through logistics, financial resources, taking of minutes, preparation of proposals for Chiefs' consideration and production of post conference reports. While some PICP outcomes were driven through the Secretariat's Project management efforts, given overlaps with existing bilateral and multilateral multi-country programmes in the region, attribution of PICP outcomes solely to the Secretariat presents challenges. Given the large scale funding provided by other development partners, particularly Australia, significant PICP outcomes which contribute to the PICP's overall goal appear to be generated from outside the Secretariat. Nonetheless, it is clear that certain projects generated useful data and others have made some positive contributions, providing training and capacity development opportunities. A key challenge for the PICP was project selection for implementation by the Secretariat. The process of needs identification and proposal preparation is driven by the NZ Police and the AFP through officers seconded to the Secretariat. Strategic interests or areas of familiarity of these larger police services are a factor here. Opportunities exist to more clearly define an optimum balance between: (i) researching and identifying Chiefs' (largely operational) needs; and (ii) addressing more strategic policing challenges identified in the region by NZ and Australia. While the Secretariat has made significant contributions to PICP outcomes for the latter, opportunities exist for the Secretariat to adopt research-driven Chiefs' needs identification and proposal development.

6. The Secretariat has represented the PICP members, including at meetings of other regional bodies, such as OCO, circulating reports and information from such meetings to Chiefs. Opportunities exist to increase the Secretariat's contribution to this representation role, through facilitation of individual Chiefs' attendance at such conferences. Here the Secretariat's representation role would be identification of appropriate conferences and seminars and matching these to Chiefs' stated needs/project implementation. Opportunities also exist for the Secretariat to sharpen the focus of the expected tangible benefits to Chiefs of the Secretariat's representation at regional fora to ensure travel costs of such attendances provide value for money and practicalities.

⁴ Rating scale: 6 = very high / excellent; 5= good; 4= above average; 3=below average; 2=poor; 1 = very low / poor.

7. **Relevance (4/6):** MFAT funding to the Secretariat's conference organisation function is highly relevant to both the New Zealand policy objectives and PICP member states' priorities. The majority of stakeholders interviewed viewed the holding of the annual conference as the key governance/decision-making output of the PICP. The annual conference might be better viewed as one step (admittedly an important one) in an ongoing process of needs identification, planning, project implementation and results monitoring. Similarly, a number of Chiefs interviewed indicated a need for the development of the Secretariat as a resource centre of policing initiatives, including through research, and provision of tools for enhancement for Chiefs. Use of the website was noted as low, evidencing a lack of relevance of its information. Response rate to two questionnaires (one targeting Chiefs and one targeting WAN members) was also low. Relevance of the Secretariat's activities to Chiefs was overshadowed by the existence of better resourced bilateral programmes funded by Australia and New Zealand within the Region.

8. **Effectiveness (3/6):** The Secretariat scores high for effectiveness in organising the annual conference, including through ensuring that Pacific police services have sufficient logistics support. Logistics 'surge capacity' was provided to the Federated States of Micronesia (FSM) for the 2011 conference. The degree to which this surge capacity was used as a vehicle to improve logistics capacity development outcomes for the FSM police service is unclear. The annual conference activity scores less well against effectiveness when viewed as the decision-making step in an ongoing process of needs identification, planning, drafting of ToR for projects to meet identified needs, and ongoing results monitoring and reporting. Given the low levels of results monitoring and reporting capacities within Pacific police services opportunities exist for the Secretariat to facilitate enhancement of Pacific police services' results monitoring and reporting, preparation of annual reports, and the annual conference process. The Secretariat did not have up to date information about policing projects within the region, information about which might be of use to Pacific police services, and which might provide a niche role for the Secretariat in facilitating information flow and updates to the PICP of bilateral and multilateral projects. The absence of baseline data for its activities limits the ability of the Secretariat to demonstrate effectiveness. An opportunity also exists for the Secretariat to play a role in strengthening project management, particularly results monitoring and reporting capacities in Pacific police services.

9. Projects (Key Output Area 2) implemented by the Secretariat suffered from poor management practices, including resource management, and low levels or absence of adequate monitoring, and presentation of results. For example, the HIV/AIDS Project was hindered by financial resource management challenges, including communication about budgetary information by the Secretariat. UNAIDS generally considered the research methodology and results to be valuable in assisting identification of behavioural risks within Pacific police services. The failure of the Secretariat to advance this Project, of potentially significant benefit to Chiefs, evidences poor quality project management and development approaches. Similarly, the poor quality of project reporting, (i.e. poor quality of information in the six monthly progress reports), particularly to MFAT, including repetitions of texts from previous reports was evident in past project reporting. While the Secretariat has moved away from major project implementation, through the PICP conference process the Secretariat is expected to play an ongoing role in facilitating needs identification, development of ToRs and identification of resources and projects to meet those needs. Although the quality of representation by Secretariat staff at regional and international fora appears to have

been high, opportunities exist to increase effectiveness of this representation through capacity development of Pacific police service representatives' representation skills.

10. **Efficiency (2/6):** Despite its small size the Secretariat faced significant efficiency challenges. MFAT funding was not on an outputs-based contract model. A number of projects was rolled-over/extended without due regard to efficiency considerations and results. MFAT's expectations of the host agency's quality of project management appear not to have been met. The NZ Aid Programme raised poor performance issues in robust discussions with both the Secretariat and NZ Police (including at Commissioner Level). The Secretariat, together with NZ Police's Human Resource and AC (ISG), undertook an internal consideration and requested additional fixed-term BPMO support from MFAT. This additional support (at additional cost), while meeting an obvious need, militated against efficiency. Given that NZ Police had signed a MoU with MFAT committing itself to deliver against PICP Secretariat outcomes, shoring up planning and monitoring would have been more appropriately met from within the hosting agency's existing resources, including external contractors funded by NZ Police. NZ Aid Programme has subsequently moved to an outputs based contracting model across the Aid Programme. As a result of this, agreement has already been reached with NZ Police and the Secretariat that any future support for the Secretariat (past current contract end date) would be based on an outputs-based contracting model. The salary band level of the establishment posts against which staff from the NZ Police are recruited and staff management practices within the Secretariat have efficiency implications. Opportunities exist to redefine job descriptions and to pitch certain posts at more moderate levels, which would reduce administrative overheads. Annual conferences involving 21 representatives from the Pacific region are inherently expensive affairs; opportunities nonetheless exist to use existing capacity or to build capacity within the region to provide logistics support and conference services, such as transcription services. This might cause some delay in the timing of production of post conference reports and present some challenges to quality, but the long-term efficiency outcomes outweigh these concerns.

11. **Sustainability (2/6):** The Stocktake considered the sustainability of the Secretariat and also of its outcomes. Low levels of Secretariat staff from PICP member states militated against capacity development leading to sustainability, as did cost free membership of the PICP. While many felt that a move of the Secretariat off-shore to a PICP member state might increase its sense of regional ownership, few Chiefs were concerned about the perception of the Secretariat as belonging to the NZ Police. Concern centred more on the need to increase capacity development/leadership development opportunities for PICP member states at the Secretariat, taking full advantage of the opportunities presented by the Secretariat being hosted by one of the two leading police services in the region. The absence of research and needs diagnostics militates against sustainable outcomes flowing from projects proposed by the Secretariat at the annual conference. Similarly, poor quality monitoring and reporting, and unclear results feedback mechanisms leading to project implementation adjustments limited sustainability of outcomes. Delegation of the representation role to the Secretariat staff reduced sustainability of the PICP. While this approach was aimed at reducing disruption to Chiefs' normal working schedules, it diminished sustainability achieved through capacity development of individual Chiefs to attend regional conferences and provide comprehensive reports back to the PICP, including recommendations.

12. Extent to which PICP-S structure and PICP governance arrangements provide for Pacific Ownership of and Capacity Development opportunities for Pacific Police services (1/6):

Stakeholders interviewed, including representatives from NZ Police and the AFP articulated a desire to increase Pacific police service presence within the Secretariat's staffing establishment, and on governance and management arrangements. While the Chair rotates and the AFP-sponsored post incumbent is chosen from the country in which the annual conference would next be held (on the recommendation of the PICP) some concern was expressed that this did not provide sufficient opportunity to develop Pacific police service members' capacity, particularly at middle management level. An overreliance on recruitment to Secretariat posts from within the NZ Police diminished capacity development opportunities for Pacific police services. Further, the small number of posts funded for Pacific police services at the Secretariat and unstructured professional development opportunities presented challenges to ownership and capacity development opportunities for Pacific police services. While a decision by the PICP, the absence of a steering committee for the PICP with oversight responsibility of the Secretariat diminished opportunities for Chiefs to play this role. The vesting of oversight functions between conferences solely in the Chair (for his/her year of tenure) and a delegation of significant responsibilities to the Secretariat, while lessening administrative burden on individual Chiefs, diminished opportunities for the PICP as a body to fully oversee the Secretariat's activities.

13. Gender Equity (3/6): While the enthusiasm and potential for the WAN project to contribute to gender equity outcomes in the Pacific was great, through the Secretariat's work in hosting the WAN Secretariat, significant challenges to this Project were noted. Poor quality activity design and implementation, insufficient engagement by the Secretariat with Chiefs themselves on WAN issues (apart from during the annual conference) and limited reporting diminished the results of this Project. The absence of a range of engagement strategies, particularly with Chiefs on WAN Project initiatives was also noted. While individual exchanges noted favourably their experiences, it is difficult to see tangible results against gender equity indicators from Pacific police services' participation in the WAN Project since 2004/5. Although the WAN provided opportunities for information exchange, a sharper results-based focus was needed. The absence of a pronounced NZ Police management response to this circumstance, which endured for at least a year, affected the Secretariat's performance. Independence of the Secretariat was advanced as reasoning for NZ Police's "*at arm's length*" approach to this situation. This appears to be untenable and confuses the independence of the Secretariat function with the requirement for NZ Police to assure high quality management of any staff it provides to staff the Secretariat in accordance with the MoU signed with MFAT. As Secretariat staff members are engaged through NZ Police contracting processes, the full weight of NZ Police management and human resources processes needed to be applied. Doing so would not have affected the independence of the secretariat function, and would have had a direct positive impact on its quality. For these reasons, a closer integration of the management of the ISG and the Secretariat appears warranted, to increase efficiencies and streamline management responsibilities. It is noted that this process has already commenced. Efforts would need to ensure that the ongoing independence of the Secretariat function (implemented on behalf of the PICP members) is maintained despite closer organisational links with NZ Police).

14. Value for Money (3/6): The Secretariat scores mid-level in terms of value for money. Despite significant investment by MFAT, monitoring and reporting requirements in the past were not adequately met, resulting in the need for further in kind contribution by MFAT staff to bolster

monitoring and reporting. This led to the application for the MFAT-funded BPMO post. Value for money can really only be achieved if activities are implemented efficiently and effectively, results monitored and fed back into project management, and if evidence is available of that. Some good results, such as the HIV/AIDS project, were hidden in poor monitoring and reporting. Addition of the BPMO Post did not immediately translate into increased evidence-based programming, partly due to staffing selection, and also due to the failure to incorporate BPMO functions into the job descriptions of the Secretariat's existing staffing establishment. The BPMO Post is best considered surge capacity support provided by MFAT. The Secretariat would need to improve its score on value for money given the viable alternative of the ISG and its networks. It is noted the AFP has even greater networks throughout the Pacific. Mentioned elsewhere in this document, selection of projects which were implemented by the Secretariat did not represent value for money. There was no clear underpinning rationale or set of criteria to guide the PICP in determining whether projects should be managed by the Secretariat (as opposed to other bilateral programmes). There may be good reasons as to why the Secretariat is the best option, but these needed to be clearly elaborated by the PICP.

1.4 Recommendations

- 1) **Continue MFAT support on outputs-based contracting basis:** MFAT to continue to provide funding support to the Secretariat for a further three years, targeting establishment of development approach across the Secretariat's three outputs, through outputs-based focus.
- 2) **Enhance PICP conference processes:** Increased relevance of Secretariat could be achieved through increasing the quality and frequency of consultation and constituency-building with Chiefs. Continuous engagement on the conference process throughout the year, rather than seeing the conduct of the annual conference only as an output is key. MFAT outputs-based contracting could capture process milestones for the conference process throughout the year, aimed at enhancing involvement, participation, and leadership in the conference as a process from PICP member states. This would require an informal acknowledgement of the dual role played by Australia and New Zealand in being both PICP members and donors and, accordingly, the need to ensure that PICP members are provided with maximum opportunities and stimuli to lead the PICP process with appropriate facilitation from the Secretariat.
- 3) **Review project management processes:** MFAT support should be directed toward supporting a review of project management processes, including the PICP's establishment of a set of criteria for projects to be implemented through the Secretariat. This set of criteria would need to clearly indicate criteria applicable to MFAT-funded activities, including links with New Zealand's sustainable economic development policy priorities, particularly for women. (A bilateral approach with Australia on this might be possible.) Sustainability of projects implemented through the Secretariat could be improved through more targeted selection of the type of projects which the Secretariat conducts, together with increased monitoring and reporting, and a feedback of results into project implementation adjustments. Collection of baseline data is an appealing area for the PICP's attention. Increased value for money for MFAT's investment could be achieved through ensuring that systems and process and internal training are provided by the BPMO leading to project proposals which clearly describe expected outcomes against timelines, with clear reporting responsibilities and reporting format. A sign-off by PICP, the AFP, the NZ Police and MFAT on the tangible advantages of

implementing the proposed project through the Secretariat (against through NZ Police's ISG or AFP's IDG) would also maximise opportunities for value for money to be maximised.

- 4) **Conduct research and develop resource tools:** Establishment of research and resource tools, such as baseline information on policing across the region, a database of projects and activities conducted by bilateral and multilateral partners would be of immediate benefit to Chiefs. Establishment of 'development approach' tools applicable to policing and security, including on approaches to needs identification, project management, results monitoring, report writing, etc., would be also be of use. This would require appropriate staffing with development expertise which may not necessarily be sourced from within NZ Police/AFP.
- 5) **Provide representation opportunities to Pacific Islands Chiefs of Police (Chiefs):** Sustainability of the Secretariat's representation outcomes could also be enhanced through PICP's tasking of representatives to attend regional conferences and provide comprehensive reports back to the PICP, including recommendations. The Secretariat would need to play a capacity development role, including providing any training to the delegate, supporting conference preparation, and provision of reporting template and finalisation of report. This approach would develop effective representation and reporting capacities within the region. Sustainability and ownership could be increased through requiring financial contributions by PICP member states although it is recognised that external financial support is likely to be an ongoing requirement. In the three year period, exploration of options and cost/benefit analyses for the relocation of the Secretariat to one of the PICP member states is recommended.
- 6) **Strengthen oversight mechanisms by the PICP:** PICP oversight of the Secretariat needs to be strengthened. Three governance meetings in addition to the Annual Conference are recommended. These could be conducted by telephone/Skype. Consideration of establishment of a Board of Management is recommended, with one representative from each sub-region. This would enhance engagement and PICP leadership capacity development. Consideration could be given to funding travel to one of these 'in-between' sub-regional governance committee meetings were a Board of Management established.
- 7) **Revise job descriptions to meet business needs:** A review of Secretariat staff job descriptions is required to ensure that current functional roles effectively support the Secretariat's business requirements, including adoption of an enhanced development approach. The BPMO post should be seen clearly as a temporary 'surge capacity' support to the Secretariat, establishing systems and processes which enhance the Secretariat's capacity to conduct the range of generic project management tasks, including project identification, planning, project management, results monitoring and reporting. It is suggested that MFAT fund this post for 18 months over the next three years, (with NZ Police funding the remaining 50% over the three year period) and that the BPMO post works across both the Secretariat and the ISG, ensuring consistency of approaches and improving quality of monitoring and reporting outcomes for NZ Police. Additionally, the functions of the BMPO need to be transitioned into the Secretariat Officer's and the Executive Support Officer's roles. This latter would be better cast as a Finance and Administrative Officer. Following review and amendment of job descriptions, an open market recruitment round is recommended, allowing PICP member

states police service staff to apply, including AFP and NZ Police, and also civilians. This would significantly broaden the pool of potential applicants, increasing the likelihood of identifying individuals with an appropriate mix of security/policing and development skills and expertise. MFAT should participate as a member of the selection panel.

- 8) **Increase the number of MFAT-funded Project Officer Posts:** Funding one additional project officer post sourced from PICP member states is recommended. This should be accompanied by a clear set of criteria for capacity development outcomes for secondees selected, including training needs analyses, capacity development/professional development plans linked to NZ Police professional development programmes and opportunities. The posts should target development of middle management capacity. Conditions should also be placed on this funding so that the funding cannot be reallocated for short-term inputs. It is suggested that a total of four such posts at the Secretariat would be appropriate, one from each sub-region in the Pacific and equally funded by NZ and Australia. This would require securing funding from the AFP for an additional post. This funding should also be contingent upon the Secretariat facilitating a transparent and open recruitment of nominees from PICP member states. The aim here would be to attract the brightest for secondment to the Secretariat, to build capacity, in particular in development approaches and project management. Sourcing secondees from the jurisdiction in which the Annual Conference is next held is recommended to be abandoned in favour of long-term capacity development.
- 9) **MFAT's support to be released against outputs-based contract model:** MFAT's support to contain clear criteria, centred on outputs-based contracting, including quality of planning, implementation, monitoring and reporting, and operational processes. Such criteria could include evidence of consultation with PICP members, need, relevance, clear outcomes, explanation of why the Secretariat is best placed to implement the project (as opposed to other bilateral/multilateral donors), and a monitoring and evaluation plan. This may require rethinking the oversight structure for the Secretariat, including a move to a Board of Management, which sub-regional representatives. Such a structure would support a more regular consultation process with Chiefs throughout the annual cycle. Adoption of this approach would underline to the host agency (NZ Police) the need to ensure that the Secretariat has staff members with appropriate skills, including development skills, and that the host agency's responsibility for hosting the Secretariat is secured, including through closer alignment with NZ Police's internal mechanisms and operations, including the ISG. Steps would need to be taken to assure Chiefs of confidentiality of information.
- 10) **External annual progress reviews:** In addition to regular progress reporting, the Secretariat's progress against outputs-based contracting should be externally reviewed by MFAT annually.

2 INTRODUCTION

2.1 Purpose of the Stocktake

1. The NZ Aid Programme has provided funding to NZ Police (host of the PICP Secretariat) via a Memorandum of Understanding since FY 2004/05 and the current contract expires on 31 December 2011.⁵ It supports both operational (salary, travel, operational expenses) and project delivery costs. In December 2009, MFAT and the Secretariat agreed that a review should be undertaken in 2011 prior to determining whether MFAT support should be renewed beyond 31 December 2011. In October 2010, the Executive Director of the Secretariat requested that the review be called a 'stocktake' and be limited in its scope to assess MFAT funding for the Secretariat. The purpose of the stocktake is:

"To assess the overall effectiveness and efficiency of the PICP Secretariat in order to determine whether or not the NZ Aid Programme should continue to support the PICP Secretariat beyond 31 December 2011, and if so, what form of assistance (focus, scope, scale) that support should take."

2.2 Intended use of stocktake results

2. MFAT will use the findings and recommendations of the Stocktake in assessing whether a future phase of support should be provided beyond 31 December 2011 (and if so, scope and scale of support); and to inform a rationalised and cost-effective model for future regional law and justice architecture. The findings and recommendations of the Stocktake may also be reported to the PICP for their consideration at annual PICP meeting in August 2011. The stocktake Report will provide the PICP, the Secretariat, and NZ Police a basis to make improvements as necessary to the implementation and governance model for the Secretariat going forward. This Stocktake Report is structured in compliance with MFAT guidance. The report addresses a set of stocktake criteria using the stocktake questions as a guide. This Stocktake Report is written using a strengths-based approach to maximise the usefulness of information discovered during the stocktake process to PICP members, Secretariat staff, MFAT and NZ Police for use in future PICP-related initiatives.

3 STOCKTAKE METHODOLOGY

3.1 Stocktake scope

3. The Stocktake was conducted by an independent external contractor. A schedule of tasks, activities and deliverables for the Stocktake is set out in **Annex 4**. The time period the Stocktake was the duration of the NZ Aid Programme funding for the PICP-S (i.e. 2004/05 to present). The Stocktake considered all three output areas of the PICP-S in relation to MFAT funding and assessed what has been achieved against the four DAC criteria relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, and sustainability. In relation to output Area 2, the Stocktake examined in greater depth the results achieved to date under the PICP Women's Advisory Network (WAN) project (for which significant NZ Aid Programme funding has been provided).⁶ Whether the activity provided value for money, and potential savings through different design, methodology, and resource allocation are

⁵ NZ Police, the Australian Federal Police, and the New Zealand Aid Programme contribute towards the costs of the PICP Secretariat. Other donors such as AusAID and the UNAIDS have at times contributed towards specific project costs.

⁶ It is hoped that an update survey of the WAN being undertaken by the PICP Secretariat will be completed in time for the stocktake.

addressed. The Stocktake did not consider impact as this would have required a more expensive and time consuming approach.

3.2 Stocktake objectives

4. There were four main objectives of the PICP-S stocktake which are set out below.

Objective 1: Assess the alignment of the PICP with the mandate of the New Zealand Aid Programme.

Objective 2: Assess the PICP Secretariat's contribution to achievement of the PICP's outcomes.

Objective 3: Assess the effectiveness and efficiency of the PICP Secretariat's structure, operations, quality assurance processes, and PICP Governance mechanisms, and make recommendations for reinforcement and/or revisions (taking into consideration relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, and value for money).

Objective 4: Assess whether the activity was relevant and provided value for money.

3.3 Stocktake criteria and questions

5. The following criteria were used to conduct the stocktake.

- Alignment and priority (MFAT criterion);
- Effectiveness – extent of PICP-S contribution to achievement of PICP outcomes (MFAT criteria);
- Relevance (Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development/Development Assistance Committee (OECD/DAC) criterion);
- Effectiveness(OECD/DAC criterion);
- Efficiency (OECD/DAC criterion);
- Sustainability (OECD/DAC criterion);
- Extent to which PICP-S structure and PICP governance arrangements provide for Pacific Ownership of and Capacity Development opportunities for Pacific Police services (MFAT criterion);
- Gender Equity (MFAT criterion); and
- Value for Money (MFAT criterion).

6. Relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, and value for money criteria were specifically examined with respect to the Secretariat's structure, operations, quality assurance processes, and PICP governance mechanisms. Four OECD/DAC criteria were included in the Stocktake. In addition, MFAT set a number of criteria, including alignment with and priority for continued support under the NZ Aid Programme, the extent of the Secretariat's contribution to achievement of PICP outcomes, the extent to which the Secretariat's current structure and PICP governance arrangements provided for Pacific Ownership of and Capacity Development opportunities for Pacific Police services, as well as the Secretariat's approach to gender equity, and whether the MFAT funding represented Value for Money. The stocktake assessed the PICP's structure and operations, quality assurance processes, M&E, reporting, delivery of projects and analysis. Following on from this, the Stocktake considered whether the expanded role/structure of the Secretariat developed by NZ Police and endorsed by the PICP was based on solid research, analysis and learning, and whether ongoing analysis and learning by implementing partners (NZ Police and PICP-S, PICP) and donors including by MFAT in relation to the scale of its assistance took place over the period 2004 to present, and aided PICP members to realise their objectives. Sustainability of the Secretariat's outcomes was also examined. Gender equity approaches were examined to see if

the Secretariat took cognisance of the differing needs of men, women, boys and girls, including in implementation and reporting.

7. A set of Key Questions and Specific Sub-Questions for the Stocktake is included in the Stocktake Matrix set out in **Annex 2**. MFAT identified key areas of focus of the Secretariat for the stocktake and the Key Questions and Specific Sub-Questions were designed to elicit information to aid in assessing the Secretariat in accordance with the Stocktake Criteria. The answers to the questions provided information which was matched against the Stocktake criteria. This information was used to clarify the Secretariat's relevance, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability, and contributed to thinking about the most appropriate form of future MFAT assistance to the PICP (if there should be any), and potential form of future support (if there should be any) through the Secretariat.

3.4 Data sources, data collection procedures and instruments

8. Key data sources for the Stocktake are set in **Annex 10**. Other reports and documents which are relevant to the PICP and the PICP-S, including academic articles, and reports from development partners, such as the World Bank, as well as other PICP reports and documents also served as data sources for the Stocktake. The key methods and procedures which used to collect data are set out below.

- literature and document review of relevant PICP documentation;
- semi-structured individual interviews with representatives of the Secretariat, MFAT, NZ Police, AFP, and where appropriate, PICP member police services. A list of persons interviewed is set out in **Annex 11**;
- semi-structured group discussions with the above named stakeholders; and
- survey questionnaires distributed to PICP member police service representatives.

9. The key methods outlined above include reference to the Stocktake criteria and were used to elicit responses to a set of focal areas that were the subject of the Stocktake, including: extent to which Secretariat structure and PICP governance arrangements provided for Pacific Ownership and Capacity Development opportunities for Pacific Police services, whether and the extent to which outputs of the PICP-S constituted a value-added service, relevance, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability.⁷

3.5 Performance standards

10. For each of the Stocktake criteria, the Secretariat was assessed according to the following rating scale: 6 = very high / excellent; 5= good; 4= above average; 3=below average; 2=poor; 1 = very low. This six degree rating scale permitted key challenges in performance and results to clearly emerge, while also allowing for sufficient degree of nuancing in the stocktake so that strengths of the Secretariat emerged and guided any future support to the PICP and/or the Secretariat. Performance standards were only used where there was sufficient evidence in the findings to make a sound judgement. Where insufficient evidence existed to apply the performance standards, this was stated and no rating was given. Further details of the Stocktake methodology and approaches are set out in **Annex 3**.

⁷ ToR, Stocktake of the PICP-S, p10.

4 KEY FINDINGS

4.1 Alignment and priority (5/6)

11. Support to the Secretariat aligns well with New Zealand's International Development Policy Statement's theme of building safe and secure communities and with the stated aim of prioritising investments to promote good governance. A link is often drawn between the primacy of the rule of law, maintained through an impartial and effective legal system, and sustainable economic development. New Zealand's current policy focus on sustainable economic development actively seeks to strengthen this link through its law and justice sector activities, including through the NZ Police's International Services Group (ISG). Support for a regional approach in policing is justified, not only in the common interests and challenges present in small island nations across the Pacific and the obvious economic efficiencies in communicating and delivering services on a regional basis, but also in the strength of voice which the PICP member states achieve through the grouping, in seeking resources and meeting policing challenges.

12. The Secretariat's three functions align well with the NZ Aid Programme's policies on law and justice and complement other initiatives supported by MFAT within the Pacific Region, including Partnerships for Pacific Policing, as well as a network throughout the Pacific supported through the NZ Police's International Services Group (ISG). Support to the Secretariat furthers New Zealand's support to the emergence of leadership in policing throughout the Pacific, particularly through providing a mechanism that Chiefs from Pacific Island Countries (PICs) can be given a voice and can exchange information and experiences.

13. New Zealand also supports a variety of projects aimed at promoting the rule of law throughout the Pacific and projects implemented through the Secretariat align well with New Zealand's stated aims on this. Finally, providing opportunities for representation of Chiefs as a group through the Secretariat also resonates with New Zealand's aims at promoting rule of law and improving efficiencies and effectiveness of law and justice sectors (LJS) throughout the Pacific. Some challenges remain in ensuring that the modality of representation at regional fora maximises PIC participation and opportunities for development. *For these reasons the degree of alignment and priority of the support to the Secretariat is considered to score 5/6.*

4.2 Effectiveness: Extent of the Secretariat's contribution to PICP outcomes (3/6)

14. One of the key outputs of the Secretariat is the Annual PICP Conference. This was the provenance of the current Secretariat's role, which was expanded through internal reviews and the *Future Directions in Pacific Policing* strategy document. In the review period (since 2004/5) the Secretariat has made a significant contribution to the holding of the PICP Annual Conference, particularly through logistics, financial resources, taking of minutes, preparation of proposals for PICP's consideration and production of post conference reports. Preparation for annual conferences is a significant piece of work, and Chiefs interviewed overwhelmingly lauded the quality of the conferences, together with the opportunities that they provided for information exchange. In the absence of the Secretariat it is extremely difficult to see how the voice provided to Chiefs through the Annual Conferences would be otherwise achieved. Despite the extensive bilateral programmes implemented by New Zealand and Australia, these do not support similar groupings of similar scale. For this reason alone the Secretariat's contribution to the PICP

outcome of providing voice, opportunities for exchange of information, and learning, is second to none and on this front the Secretariat's contribution scores highly.

15. In terms of project management, while some PICP outcomes were driven through the Secretariat's Project management efforts, given overlaps with existing bilateral and bilateral multi-country programmes in the region, attribution of PICP outcomes solely to the Secretariat presents challenges. Given the large-scale funding provided by other development partners, particularly Australia, significant PICP outcomes which contribute to the PICP's overall goal appear to be generated from outside the Secretariat. For example, given the scale of capacity development activities conducted by Australia and New Zealand through their bilateral programmes, it is extremely difficult to cite key elements of improvement in capacity within the Pacific which are attributable to the Secretariat's work. Further, data on progress is unclear, in part due to poor levels of reporting and the general absence of baseline data and research to underpin projects managed by the Secretariat. Nonetheless, it is clear that certain projects, such as the HIV/AIDS project generated some useful data, and others have made some positive contributions, providing training and capacity development opportunities, such as the Patrol Boats Project and the WAN. A key challenge for the PICP was project selection for implementation by the Secretariat. The process of needs identification and proposal preparation is driven by the NZ Police and the AFP, and appears susceptible to their strategic interests or areas of familiarity. On the one hand this is an entirely sensible approach, as New Zealand and Australia are the two police services which are members of the PICP grouping and which have significant analytical resources. It was also noted that Chiefs indicated a desire for New Zealand and Australia to play this role, contributing the kind of strategic analysis that they did not have the resources to do.

16. The Secretariat has represented the PICP members, including at meetings of other regional bodies, such as OCO, circulating reports and information from such meetings to the PICP. Such meetings provide opportunities for exchange of information and cross-fertilisation between organisations. The expense associated with these attendances needs to be carefully considered, particularly given the weak links with practical outcomes for the Chiefs through the Secretariat. *The Secretariat is considered to score 3/6 in terms of effectiveness of its contribution to the PICP's outcomes.*

4.3 Relevance (4/6)

17. MFAT funding to the Secretariat's conference organisation function is highly relevant to both the New Zealand policy objectives and PICP member states' priorities. The majority of stakeholders interviewed viewed the holding of the PICP Annual Conference as the key governance/decision-making output of the PICP affording opportunities for information exchange and learning. Chiefs from smaller island nations indicated that they felt that the Annual Conference was an important opportunity for them to voice issues, particularly through the Commissioners' retreat mechanism, and that they gained strength of voice from participation in the PICP grouping. For reasons listed above, the Secretariat scores highly on relevance for the Annual Conference.

18. The Secretariat scored less well on relevance in terms of project management. Again for reasons mentioned earlier, the relevance of the Secretariat's project management, in the context of larger bilateral/multilateral programs was low. Where relevant projects were selected, (such as HIV/AIDS) project implementation let the Secretariat down. Further, research and reporting were

of mediocre standard furthering lessening the Secretariat's score on relevance. Use of the website was noted as low, evidencing a lack of relevance of the information available there. Response rate to both questionnaires (Chiefs and WAN) was also low.

19. In terms of representation, the Secretariat played a highly relevant role in terms of representing the interests of the PICP at regional and international fora. Some concern was raised at the travel costs and also the degree to which the results of participation in these fora bear practical fruit for Chiefs. Opportunity costs of having the Secretariat staff (largely NZ Police) representing the PICP at regional fora were noted, lessening the relevance of individual Chiefs' opportunities for leadership and conferencing development. *The Secretariat is considered to score slightly better in terms of relevance at 4/6.*

4.4 Effectiveness (3/6)

20. The Secretariat scores high for effectiveness in organising the annual conference, including through ensuring that Pacific police services have sufficient logistics support. Logistics surge capacity was provided to the Federated States of Micronesia (FSM) for the 2011 conference. The degree to which this surge capacity was used as a vehicle to improve logistics capacity development outcomes for the FSM police service is unclear. The annual conference activity scores less well against effectiveness when viewed as the decision-making step in an ongoing process of needs identification, planning, drafting of ToR for projects to meet identified needs, and ongoing results monitoring and reporting. The Secretariat did not have up to date information about policing projects within the region, information about which might be of use to Pacific police services, and which might provide a niche role for the Secretariat in facilitating information flow and updates to the PICP of bilateral and multilateral projects.

21. The Secretariat scores less well in terms of effectiveness for project management. Projects implemented by the Secretariat suffered from poor management practices, including resource management, and low levels or absence of adequate monitoring, and presentation of results. The HIV/AIDS Project for example was hindered by financial resource management challenges, including a lack of clear reporting and communication about budgetary information by the Secretariat. The failure of the Secretariat to advance this Project, of potentially significant benefit to Chiefs, evidences poor quality project management and development approaches.⁸ The Secretariat managed the Project while an academic institution was contracted to conduct the research. Research methodology and results were considered by external parties, including UNAIDS to be of high quality and provided valuable information assisting identification of behavioural risks within Pacific police services. Despite some challenges with the research methodology, the key benefit of the Secretariat's conduct of this project was the opportunity afforded to dialogue with Chiefs on ethics and behavioural issues. The fact that this opportunity was not capitalised on by the Secretariat due to poor project management practices evidences a key miscomprehension of one of its core roles within the Region.

⁸ MFAT funding for the HIV/AIDS project originally concluded on 31 December 2009 as per the MOU. A further 6-month extension of funds for this project by MFAT to enable the Secretariat to complete the research write-up of the original 2 outputs (Samoa and PNG), was subject to the Secretariat providing documentation (agreed in writing between the MFAT and the Secretariat) for the Letter of Variation. Delay by the Secretariat in providing adequate information for the Letter of Variation for the extension delayed its conclusion.

22. Similarly, the poor quality of reporting, particularly to MFAT, including repetitions of text from previous reports was evident in the past. While the Secretariat has moved away from major project implementation, through the PICP conference process the Secretariat is expected to play an ongoing role in facilitating needs identification, development of ToRs and identification of resources and projects to meet those needs. A key challenge for the Secretariat is having the tools available to demonstrate its effectiveness. In the absence of comprehensive baseline data for its projects and across the Region, the Secretariat's ability to demonstrate effectiveness is severely challenged.

23. Although the quality of representation by Secretariat staff at regional and international fora was high quality, Secretariat staff attending such conferences and Regional fora comes at an opportunity cost, resulting in lessening opportunities for engagement by Chiefs in these fora. This has obvious links to sustainability and capacity development of Chiefs. *Overall, the Secretariat scores 3/6 in terms of effectiveness.*

4.5 Efficiency (2/6)

24. Despite its small size the Secretariat faces significant efficiency challenges and challenges in communicating its successes where they exist. A number of projects was rolled-over/extended without due regard to efficiency considerations and results. The Secretariat had a relaxed attitude toward securing MFAT funding. MFAT funding was not contingent upon milestone deliverables as it was not on an outputs-based contract model. MFAT's expectations of the host agency's quality of project management appear not to have been met. NZ Aid Programme raised performance issues with both PICP-S and NZ Police (at all levels) i.e robust discussions on poor performance were undertaken to underline issues to both the PICP-S and NZ Police.

25. NZ Aid Programme has moved to an outputs based contracting model across the Aid Programme. As a result of this, agreement has already been reached with NZ Police and the Secretariat that any future support for the Secretariat (past current contract end date) would be based on an outputs-based model. The salary band levels of the establishment posts against which staff from the NZ Police are recruited has efficiency implications. Similarly, poor past management practices both within the Secretariat and NZ Police related to performance monitoring of NZ Police staff seconded to the Secretariat resulted in the non-resolution of divisive internal dynamics within the Secretariat. This circumstance existed for an extended period had efficiency implications, particularly for internal communication and team building. Opportunities exist to pitch certain posts at more moderate levels, which would reduce administrative overheads.

26. While meeting an obvious need, the MFAT decision to support a BPMP Post also militated against efficiency. While NZ Police had conducted an internal review and identified that it required the additional support prior to requesting additional fixed-term BPMP support, given that NZ Police had signed a MoU with MFAT committing itself to deliver against PICP Secretariat outcomes, shoring up planning and monitoring would have been more appropriately met from within the hosting agency's existing resources. An appropriate management response from the NZ Police to quality concerns raised by MFAT was not forthcoming and this significantly affected the Secretariat's efficiency, leading to the decision to support the BPMP post.

27. Annual conferences involving 21 representatives from the Pacific region are inherently expensive affairs, particularly when transcription and travel costs are taken into account. While expensive, the costs appear justified given the opportunities they provide, particularly to Chiefs. *The Secretariat scores quite low in terms of efficiency at 2/6.*

4.6 Sustainability (2/6)

28. The Stocktake considered the sustainability of the Secretariat and also of its outcomes. Low levels of Secretariat staff from PICP member states militated against capacity development leading to sustainability, as did cost free membership of the PICP. The approaches mentioned elsewhere in this document of increasing the number of posts for secondees to the Secretariat would significantly increase the sustainability of the Secretariat's outcomes.

29. While there may be good arguments that moving the Secretariat off-shore to a PICP member state might increase its sense of regional ownership, the increased costs associated with such a move militate against sustainability. While some Chiefs interviewed were concerned about the perception of the Secretariat as belonging to the NZ Police the overarching concern was for increased opportunities to be provided for secondees and through recruitment of Pacific staff to the Secretariat. Concern centred more on the need to increase capacity development/leadership development opportunities for PICP member states at the Secretariat, taking full advantage of the opportunities presented by the Secretariat being hosted by one of the two leading police services in the region.

30. The absence of research and needs diagnostics militates against sustainable outcomes flowing from projects proposed by the Secretariat at the annual conference. Similarly, poor quality monitoring and reporting, and unclear results feedback mechanisms leading to project implementation adjustments limited sustainable outcomes.

31. Finally, delegation of the representation role to the Secretariat staff reduced sustainability of the PICP. While this approach was intended at reducing disruption to Chiefs' normal working schedules, it diminished sustainability achieved through capacity development of Chiefs to attend regional conferences and provide comprehensive reports back to the PICP, including recommendations. *Similar to efficiency, the Secretariat scores quite low in terms of sustainability at 2/6.*

4.7 Extent to which PICP-S structure and PICP governance arrangements provide for Pacific Ownership of and Capacity Development opportunities for Pacific Police services (1/6)

32. The Secretariat's current oversight arrangements limit capacity development opportunities for Pacific Police services. The delegation of executive function to the Executive Director, while correctly vesting the Executive Director with authority to act on behalf of the Chiefs, is not complemented by a strong PICP oversight mechanism and processes. The chair is rotated annually, and while this provides reasonable exposure opportunities for the incumbent, infrequent check-in points, diminish the degree to which oversight can be conducted. The absence of a steering committee mechanism for the Secretariat is also noted. The result is that the Executive Director position holds significant authority. While this increases efficiency, it needs equally strong oversight.

33. An overreliance on recruitment to Secretariat posts from within the NZ Police also diminished capacity development opportunities for Pacific police services. Further, the small number of posts funded for Pacific police services at the Secretariat and unstructured and differing professional development opportunities attached to posts (when funded by AFP or by MFAT/NZ Police) presented challenges to ownership and capacity development opportunities for Pacific police services. *Against this criterion of the capacity building opportunities afforded by the Secretariat's structure and governance arrangements, the Secretariat is scored lowest, at 1/6.*

4.8 Gender Equity (3/6)

34. While the enthusiasm and potential for the WAN project to contribute to gender equity outcomes in the Pacific was great, through the Secretariat's work in hosting the WAN Secretariat, significant challenges to this Project were noted. Poor quality activity design and implementation, insufficient engagement by the Secretariat with Chiefs themselves (apart from during the annual conference) and limited reporting diminished the results of this Project. The absence of a range of engagement strategies, particularly with Chiefs on WAN Project initiatives was also noted. It is difficult to see tangible results against gender equity indicators from Pacific police services' participation in the WAN Project since 2004/5; while providing opportunities for information exchange a sharper results-based focus was needed.

35. Past Secretariat management approaches also militated against gender equity, with some Secretariat staff members noting tensions within the Secretariat largely along gender lines. The absence of a pronounced NZ Police management response to this circumstance, which apparently endured for at least a year, affected the Secretariat's performance. Independence of the Secretariat was advanced as reasoning for NZ Police's arm's length approach to this situation. This appears to be untenable and confuses the independence of the Secretariat function with the requirement for NZ Police to assure high quality management of any staff it provides to staff the Secretariat in accordance with the MoU signed with MFAT. As Secretariat staff members are engaged through NZ Police contracting processes the full weight of NZ Police management and human resources processes needed to be applied. Doing so would not have affected the independence of the secretariat function, and would have had a direct positive impact on its quality. *Despite some positive elements, the Secretariat scores mid-range for gender equity at 3/6.*

4.9 Value for Money (3/6)

36. The Secretariat scored mid-level in terms of value for money. Despite significant investment by MFAT, monitoring and reporting requirements in the past were not adequately met, resulting in the need for further in kind contribution by MFAT staff to bolster monitoring and reporting. This led to the application for the MFAT-funded BPMO post. Value for money can really only be achieved if activities are implemented efficiently and effectively, results monitored and fed back into project management, and if evidence is available of that. Some good results, such as the HIV/AIDS project, were hidden in poor monitoring and reporting and in the non-identification of the potential benefits of this research and the dialogue around it.

37. Given that the NZ Police had accepted funds through the MoU mechanism from MFAT, it was incumbent upon the agency to ensure that its monitoring and reporting mechanisms met standards required by the funding agency. In the face of poor quality reporting and planning processes, MFAT provided in-kind contributions. Addition of the BPMO Post did not immediately translate into

increased evidence-based programming, partly due to staffing selection, and also due to the failure to incorporate BPMO functions into the job descriptions of the Secretariat's existing staffing establishment.

38. Mentioned elsewhere in this Report, selection of projects which were implemented by the Secretariat did not represent value for money. There was no clear underpinning rationale or set of criteria to guide the PICP in determining whether projects should be implemented by the Secretariat (as opposed to other bilateral programmes). There may be good reasons as to why the Secretariat is the best option, but these needed to be clearly elaborated by the PICP. A clearer articulation of the benefits of the Secretariat implementing projects, such as cyber safety, is also needed, and should be underpinned with convincing research which indicates that this is a priority emerging issue within the Region or is a strategic regional area of interest for the AFP which considers its advancement through the PICP as a priority. Further, while the WAN provided solid opportunities to advance gender equity within the region, it was noted that some WAN exchanges were sent to countries in which they had previously spent extended time (as students). The value for money aspect of this approach is questionable. *The Secretariat also scores mid-range for value for money considerations at 3/6.*

5 ANALYSIS OF FINDINGS

5.1 Alignment and priority

39. The key challenge facing the Secretariat in terms of alignment with New Zealand policy objectives is that while support to the Secretariat aligns well the NZ Aid Programme's theme of building safe and secure communities and with the Programme policy statement's aim of prioritising investments to promote good governance, the degree of alignment is linked to the efficiency and effectiveness of that support. Given that New Zealand (and Australia) also advance Pacific policing issues bilaterally, there need to be strong arguments to justify the additional investment by New Zealand in an expensive Secretariat supporting a regional grouping. Police Commissioners for both New Zealand and Australia openly stated that they had direct links to most other Chiefs through their own existing networks. So, as a modality, support to the Secretariat did not necessarily present as the most efficient manner of engagement for them.

40. However, if viewed from the Chiefs point of view (excluding New Zealand and Australia), the key strength of the Secretariat lies in its strength of voice through PICP grouping. Despite extensive networks of the NZ Police and the AFP, there is an additional strength of voice provided through the grouping, which provides opportunities for enhancing regional (and sub-regional) approaches and cohesion. This structure and the grouping align well with New Zealand's policy objectives, particularly promotion of leadership, leading to sustainability. The PICP remains a relevant organisation from the Chiefs' perspectives, although steps could be taken to more closely match the Secretariat's activities to the organisational needs and policing operational realities of individual police services in the Pacific. Key elements however are the degrees of effectiveness and efficiency of the Secretariat in promoting these opportunities. This will be explored further below.

5.2 Effectiveness: Extent of the Secretariat's contribution to PICP outcomes (3/6)

41. The Secretariat's contribution to the Annual Conference through logistics support and the opportunity that the annual conference provides is well noted above. The Secretariat could play an enhanced role in supporting the conference if it is viewed as a process rather than an event. This would require the adoption of a series of 'check-in' points throughout the year, in which the PICP is provided with opportunities for oversight of the Secretariat's work, and the Secretariat provides progress updates to the PICP. This would necessitate enhanced monitoring and reporting by the Secretariat to ensure that information is presented in a way that meets Chiefs' needs. It is also suggested that the adoption of this approach, in combination with establishment of a Board of Management (steering group) comprised of one representative from each of the four Pacific sub-regions would provide increased opportunities for Chiefs' engagement. Effectiveness of the Secretariat's contribution to PICP outcomes would be improved by a closer link between the PICP as a leadership grouping and the Secretariat as the implementing body. Here the Secretariat would need to play a role to provide 'space' and foster the emergence of a more pronounced leadership body within the PICP. This would resonate well with bilateral leadership programmes currently implemented by New Zealand and Australia in Pacific police services, providing opportunities for the exercise of leadership roles by Chiefs on a Regional basis.

42. In terms of project management, as mentioned above, given overlaps with existing bilateral and bilateral multi-country programmes in the region, the Secretariat needs to more clearly demonstrate why bilateral agencies would want to implement projects through it as opposed to implementing projects themselves on a bilateral or bilateral multi-country basis. It is suggested here that the key element is the type of projects which could be implemented through the Secretariat, as well as the scope of the Secretariat's involvement in implementation. It is suggested that the Secretariat's role within the regional donor geography is best cast as a researcher and facilitator for projects which emanate from the consultation and dialogue processes which it should facilitate through the PICP conference (year-long) process. The HIV/AIDS project is a good example of one such project whose full potential was not reached. Despite some differences in external views of the quality of research methodology and the usefulness of the results, UNAIDS and the Chiefs themselves were largely supportive of the project, which revealed some challenging behaviours in the countries in which the research was conducted. While deviations from standard HIV/AIDS research approaches were evident in the research methodology, the more important element of the project was the opportunity to use the results as a vehicle for discussion with Chiefs regarding ethics behaviour within their services. The Secretariat was unable to pursue this opportunity largely due to poor project management practices, including securing ongoing donor funding. It is clear, that even if the Secretariat were not well positioned to implement such large scale research projects, it nonetheless is in the best position to coordinate, monitor, and report back to the PICP (and to donors) on progress.

43. A real opportunity exists for the Secretariat to play an enhanced research role, particularly in terms of identification of needs of the PICP and balancing the strategic issues advanced by New Zealand and Australia against practical operational needs of individual Chiefs. A close association with a tertiary research institution to conduct baseline research on policing, and monitor Regional results (including of bilateral programs implemented by New Zealand and Australia) would dramatically impact upon the importance of the PICP. Opportunities exist to more clearly define an optimum balance between: (i) researching and identifying Chiefs' (largely operational) needs; and

(ii) addressing policing challenges in the region identified by NZ and Australia. While the Secretariat has made significant contributions to PICP outcomes for the latter, opportunities exist for the Secretariat to adopt research-driven needs identification and proposal development.

44. Similarly, opportunities exist to increase the Secretariat's contribution to its representation role, through facilitation of individual Chiefs' attendance at such conferences. While there are efficiencies created by the Secretariat performing this role, it comes at the expense of providing opportunities for individual Chiefs to gain experience and opportunity through attendance at regional fora. The Secretariat could play a strong facilitation role for Chiefs selected to conduct such representation roles, through support to identification of appropriate conferences and seminars and matching these to Chiefs' stated needs/project implementation. Support in terms of conferencing capacities, such as presentation of progress reports and results, as well as technical support to the preparation of post conference/meeting reports back to the PICP as a group would also be a viable role for the Secretariat. Opportunities also exist for the Secretariat to sharpen the focus of the expected tangible benefits to the PICP of the Secretariat's representation at regional fora to ensure attendances provide value for money and add to the body of information and tools available to the PICP.

5.3 Relevance

45. Increased relevance of the annual conference could be achieved if it were viewed as a process rather than an output. That is, when viewed as one step (admittedly an important one) in an ongoing process of needs identification, planning, and project implementation and results monitoring, the annual conference process, providing opportunities for dialogue, leadership, feedback and engagement with Chiefs, would be of improved relevance to the PICP. Similarly, a number of Chiefs interviewed indicated a need for the development of the Secretariat as a resource centre on policing issues, including through research, and provision of tools for enhancement for the PICP. Use of the PICP website was noted as low, evidencing a lack of relevance of the information available there. Establishment of a database of current projects and funding sources and training available throughout the Region also appears warranted. It is noted that response rate to both questionnaires distributed during the Stocktake was low. Relevance of the Secretariat's activities to Chiefs was overshadowed by the existence of better resourced bilateral programmes funded by Australia and New Zealand within the Region.

46. Opportunities exist to increase Pacific island representation in the Secretariat's staffing establishment, thereby increasing its relevance to Chiefs. While NZ Police is the hosting agency, there appears to have been an overreliance on staffing the Secretariat with NZ Police. It is suggested that open recruitment, including from civilians and from within PIC police services, might help to not only increase the relevance of skill sets within the Secretariat to the business needs, and also help to give the Secretariat a more Pacific representation.

47. Finally, through the comprehensiveness of its grouping, the PICP represents a key opportunity not only to advance strategic policing interests (Australia and New Zealand are certainly alive to this), but also to identify a Pacific policing baseline. Such a baseline has never been established across the Pacific. There is no other grouping which presents the possibility of doing such research on a regional basis. The results of such research would be highly relevant, not only to development partners, such as Australia and New Zealand, but also to Chiefs themselves. Here

the Secretariat would need to ensure that it has the requisite skill sets in house to advance issues, or to facilitate others to do so. Tied to this, increased relevance of the Secretariat could be afforded by increasing its capacity to conduct results monitoring on behalf of the PICP, including of bilateral projects conducted by Australia and New Zealand. Doing so would afford key opportunities for the PICP themselves to increasingly set policing development agendas throughout the Pacific, a key approach which resonates with Paris Principles.

5.4 Effectiveness

48. Opportunities exist to increase the effectiveness of the PICP conference by viewing it as a process, with a series of check in points, providing opportunities to ensure that the Secretariat's work is more closely attuned to Chiefs' needs. Here there is a real opportunity for the Secretariat to play a development facilitation role, matching needs identified through research with support available through bilateral and multilateral programs in the Region. Monitoring of results and feedback into the PICP conference would therefore increase the effectiveness of the Secretariat's activities for Chiefs.

49. This shift in approach would require some retuning of the Secretariat's internal processes and approaches, including a review of its staffing establishment to ensure that relevant skill sets exist within the Secretariat to meet its business needs. Some review of the level of posts also appears warranted as posts for Executive Director and Secretariat Officer are quite senior.

50. When talking of effectiveness, the Secretariat could provide an opportunity to effectively develop leadership within the Pacific, particularly at middle management level. While NZ Police and the AFP run a number of leadership development programmes throughout the Pacific, there is a real opportunity for the Secretariat, through being hosted by the NZ Police, to provide opportunities for police officers from PICs seconded to the Secretariat to have the full benefit of professional development opportunities provided by the NZ Police. At the time of writing only one Pacific police officer was present at the Secretariat. Although the current and many previous Pacific police officers supported by both the NZ Police and the AFP were of high quality⁹, this was reported to not always be the case. Similarly, the approach to professional development of Pacific police officers seconded to the Secretariat appears to depend on the sponsoring organisation. (The Current officer is sponsored by the AFP.) There is a real opportunity to develop a more consistent approach to professional development opportunities afforded to secondees. NZ Police's tailored leadership and professional development programmes would provide excellent capacity development opportunities. Doing so, would see the emergence of an alumni of Pacific police officers who have passed through the Secretariat, providing capacity development opportunities to those secondees, as well as opportunities to familiarise themselves with strategic policing issues identified by Australia and New Zealand.

5.5 Efficiency

51. Efficiency is the Secretariat's key challenge. More could be done with available resources to improve efficiency. Re-pitching posts to more mid-levels and recruitment of appropriately skilled persons, particularly with development and facilitation expertise would increase efficiency. For example, costs savings could be applied to funding increased posts for secondees from PICs,

⁹ One previous secondee now works in senior management within AFP while another is Deputy Chief of Niue Police.

increasing the efficiency of the Secretariat's operations by making more learning and development opportunities available to Pacific police service members. Innovations in conferencing approaches, including through increased use of local logistics and transcription services, or where these are not available, through training, and contracting, ensuring that local options are explored would also increase efficiency. It is acknowledged that this might result in some inefficiency in time management at the outset, but the Secretariat would need to ensure that appropriate support is provided to developing these capacities within PICs.

52. There is an overwhelming need for the Secretariat to become more responsive and light on its feet, reacting swiftly to the PICP's needs, including through generation of research, databases, tools, and opportunities to advance the Regional policing agenda for which the Secretariat was established to support the PICP grouping.

53. Finally, some rationalisation of the budget process which the Secretariat uses also appears warranted. At present, PICP's budget process is relatively complex. The main budget is agreed on a calendar year basis between NZ Police and MFAT, and includes expenditure broken down to an appropriate level to clarify cost assumptions to enable an assessment of value for money as per public finance regulatory requirements. The budget (approximately \$1m per year) is broken down by project code (e.g. WAN project, e.g. Patrol Boat project) to enable NZ Police/PICP-S to easily track and report on expenditure against projects during implementation. The budget uses NZ Police cost codes as the Secretariat uses the NZ Police's financial accounting system. The AFP also contributes towards a travel fund, and pays the salary and expenses of two members of staff. The finances are handled through the NZ Police systems, but these run on a July-June financial year basis. The budget process could be simplified by developing a single budget that shows contributions from all donors (including PICP members themselves where appropriate). The budget could also show the level of contributions of the various funders against the Secretariat's work programme split by agreed proportions, with the Secretariat fully responsible for its expenditure, and accountable to each donor. This would give the Secretariat a single budget from which funds can be spent and accounted for, rather than having separate budgets with different levels of accountability and different financial years.¹⁰ The new, unified financial year should be aligned with the Conference further simplifying matters. In the context of the shift to outputs-based contracting this approach would afford simplicity while increasing focus on results which are clearly the key interest of donors such as MFAT.

5.6 Sustainability

54. The Stocktake considered the sustainability of the Secretariat and also of its outcomes. Low levels of Secretariat staff from PICP member states militated against capacity development leading to sustainability, as did cost free membership of the PICP. While many stakeholders interviewed felt that a move of the Secretariat off-shore to a PICP member state might increase its sense of regional ownership, few Chiefs were concerned about the perception of the Secretariat as belonging to the NZ Police. Concern centred more on the need to increase capacity and leadership development opportunities for Pacific police service members at the Secretariat, taking

¹⁰ Figures provided by the Secretariat indicate that MFAT contributes approximately 52% of the Secretariat's funds, with the AFP at 35% and the NZ Police at 14%. In terms of personnel costs, the AFP's contribution is 43%, MFAT 37% and NZ Police approximately 20%. For operational costs, MFAT's contribution is 68%, the AFP at 26% and NZ Police at 6%.

full advantage of the opportunities presented by the Secretariat being hosted by one of the two leading police services in the region. The absence of research and needs diagnostics on Pacific policing across the Region militates against sustainable outcomes flowing from projects proposed by the Secretariat at the annual conference. Similarly, poor quality monitoring and reporting, and unclear results feedback mechanisms leading to project implementation adjustments limits sustainable outcomes. There are real opportunities for the Secretariat to play an enhanced sustainable role through researching Pacific policing and through monitoring the sustainability of project outcomes, including for projects delivered by donors. Establishing the PICP's voice on monitoring bilateral and multilateral projects would be a significant and positive contribution to sustainability elements of projects implemented across the Region.

55. Delegation of the representation role by PICP to the Secretariat staff reduced sustainability of the representation function of the PICP. While this approach was intended at reducing disruption to Chiefs' normal working schedules, it diminished sustainability achieved through capacity development of Chiefs to attend regional conferences and provide comprehensive reports back to the PICP, including recommendations. Ultimately, there is great benefit to Pacific policing in seeing the emergence of an alumni of strong Chiefs with solid leadership and representation skills.

5.7 Extent to which PICP-S structure and PICP governance arrangements provide for Pacific Ownership of and Capacity Development opportunities for Pacific Police services

56. Stakeholders interviewed, including representatives from NZ Police and the AFP articulated a desire to increase Pacific police service presence within the Secretariat's staffing establishment, and on governance and management arrangements. As mentioned earlier in this document, establishment of a steering committee, such as a Board of Management, to complement the apparent authority vested in the Executive Director, would aid in ensuring that the appropriate exercise of that authority. If membership of such a committee were established on a sub-regional basis, there might be opportunities afforded in terms of cost efficiency in the representation function.

57. Opportunities exist to cast recruitment nets more broadly to ensure that applicants from PICs as well as from the open market are attracted. The recent re-recruitment of the BPMP post provides a good example of the quality and skill sets available on the open market. Some consideration also needs to be given to the salary bands attached to posts within the Secretariat, including the Executive Director's post. There would be real benefits in opening this post up to the market as well, to ensure that management and planning across the Secretariat's functions can be realised. Given that NZ Police sought assistance from MFAT to fund the BPMP post on the basis that it could not source the kind of planning and reporting skills from within the NZ Police, there are good arguments that the combination of restating senior positions within the Secretariat together with an open market. Admittedly, given the nature of the PICP grouping, the Executive Director role may need to be from a police service, to facilitate dialogue and ensure that Chiefs have confidence in the office. If this is accepted, there are strong arguments that job descriptions for the Executive Support Officer position, the Secretariat Officer position and the Executive Director position would all need to be reviewed. The Secretariat Officer position needs to play a role in strategic planning and monitoring and should be a key driving position within the Secretariat. Similarly, the Executive Support Officer position might be better cast as a Finance and Reporting Administrator position.

58. Finally, through cost efficiencies there are opportunities to increase the number of posts within the Secretariat for secondees. Increasing the number of posts and refining professional development opportunities, more closely linked to NZ Police professional and leadership development programmes would greatly increase Pacific Police service members' capacity development opportunities.

5.8 Gender Equity

59. The key tool available to the Secretariat to advance gender equity within the Pacific is the WAN. While the WAN had some good results, including regular conferences and exchanges, more could be done with this network, particularly within the context of a revamped PICP conference process, to advance gender equity issues within Pacific Police services. Innovation in approach, including more regular check-ins with Chiefs, development of a regional policing gender equity framework, and more results-based terms of reference for WAN exchanges would be of benefit. In particular ensuring that WAN exchanges are of organisational benefit, as well as individual personal benefit to the exchanges involved, would help to strengthen perceptions about the usefulness of WAN to Pacific police services. The facilitation role of the Secretariat, mentioned earlier, could be harnessed to foster dialogue with Chiefs about recruitment practices, promoting women, and ensuring that women within Pacific Police services are appropriately skilled. Given that representation by women within government in the Pacific is extremely low, there is an opportunity for the Secretariat to play a role in continually raising this issue. The fact that all the Chiefs are men is also not unnoticed, and exercises such as bringing high profile international women police leaders, and retired female commissioners to PICP Annual Conferences could impact positively on gender equity. Overall, there is a need for innovation for the WAN, which could translated into tangible benefits for Pacific Police services.

5.9 Value for Money

60. Value for money associated with the Secretariat could be improved by ensuring that projects selected for implementation by the Secretariat are based on research and comply with a sound set of criteria for support. While it is appropriate for Australia and New Zealand to direct support to strategic projects through the Secretariat, given the greater financial resources available to them, nonetheless there is a need to ensure that any such projects are both strategically important and operationally relevant. Here value for money could be increased by ensuring that there is a better balance between such projects and the types of research and baseline data collection which might lead to delivery of more practical results for Pacific Police jurisdictions, even if ultimately funded and implemented by donors bilaterally.

61. Given the expense involved in bringing secondees from PICs to Wellington, increased efforts need to be made to ensure that full advantage is taken of their presence in the same building as one of the leading police services in the Region. NZ Police appears open to the idea of developing tailored professional development training for secondees to the Secretariat. Some shift in thinking about identification of secondees might be required, including consideration of an open merit based selection process, and linking the request for sponsorship to an organisational need in the PIC. These steps would ensure that the brightest candidates and those for whom the organisation feels would most benefit from the experience are selected. This would dramatically increase the value for money of such secondments.

62. Finally, given that NZ Police is hosting the Secretariat and accepts funding from MFAT, realistic reporting and monitoring processes need to be established as between NZ Police and MFAT, and actually implemented. The BPMO post, which is best viewed as surge capacity support provided by MFAT, is of a limited lifespan. Where possible the technical support delivered through this post needs to be transitioned into existing posts within the Secretariat, (in particular the Secretariat Officer post), and possibly more broadly within NZ Police's ISG. A closer association with the ISG is recommended, to ensure that development approaches, which are increasingly strong within ISG, also gain a foothold in the Secretariat, or at least have an increased level of synergy. For this reason, it is suggested that the BMPO post also work across the ISG, increasing the value for money of MFAT's investment in this surge capacity support to planning and monitoring of international development projects implemented by, or associated with (in the case of the Secretariat) the NZ Police.

6 CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

6.1 Key conclusions

63. One of the key aims of this Stocktake exercise was to assess the overall effectiveness and efficiency of the PICP Secretariat in order to determine whether or not the NZ Aid Programme should continue to support the PICP Secretariat beyond 31 December 2011, and if so, what form of assistance (focus, scope, scale) that support should take. As the recommendations bear out, it is suggested that further support be provided to the Secretariat, targeted at a number of points which would increase effectiveness and efficiency. There is no doubt that the Secretariat plays an important role within the Region, both from the point of view of the Chiefs themselves, in providing a voice and opportunities for information exchange, and also from the points of view of the major policing agencies in the Region: Australia and New Zealand.

64. Strong support for the role of the Secretariat was noted by Australia, which, despite its strong presence within the Region, was supportive of the PICP as a grouping, and of the talent which exists within it. Australia was also highly supportive of the hosting role played by NZ Police and was also open to considering requests for increased funding for activities, such as research.

65. A key point noted throughout this Report is the need to shift from viewing the annual conference as an output to a process of dialogue, engagement, and oversight. Given modern communications, there are real opportunities afforded to the Secretariat in communicating, obtaining feedback, and advancing discussions. For the Secretariat to play this role fully, it needs to ensure that it has the requisite set of skills within its walls, which can not only provide effective communication, but can also apply technical knowledge to how best to develop concepts appropriately and advance them with Chiefs, as well as with key donors, such as New Zealand and Australia. Chiefs look increasingly to the Secretariat to play a role in facilitating the identification of resources and to support them in addressing identified needs.

66. The move away from the implementation of large scale projects by the Secretariat is an appropriate one; the Secretariat does not appear to be the natural home to large-scale project implementation, although it is noted that there will likely be an ongoing small-scale project implementation role. Careful consideration needs to be given to a set of criteria which would help guide the Secretariat, the PICP and donors as to when it might be appropriate for projects to be implemented by the Secretariat. A natural role for the Secretariat in terms of project management appears to be needs identification and the development of project proposals and ToRs for projects which can be implemented by other donors. Here there is an obvious research/baseline data collection role which the Secretariat could play, were it appropriately staffed. Developing this capacity and interest, including with secondees, would bode well for evidence-based policing programming across the Pacific in the future. Marrying this approach with close associations with and inputs from academic institutions would be highly beneficial to the professionalism of the Secretariat. Further, creation of the Secretariat as a Pacific policing resource centre, with tools, programmes, a database of policing projects in the Pacific, as well as innovative ideas and opportunities for policing would meet expressed needs of Chiefs who increasingly look to Australia and New Zealand for the source of the latest innovations.

67. Adoption of these measures requires some internal re-jigging, including a functional review of the roles within the Secretariat, to realise a light-footed increasingly responsive organisation. Increasing the number of posts for Pacific Police secondees, as well as strongly linking professional development opportunities from secondment to the Secretariat to home country outcomes would also ensure that secondments are relevant to need. This link should override the current guidance linking secondees to implementation of projects. Strategic planning and business planning and monitoring needs to be centrally housed within the Secretariat, and not an add-on function.

68. Increased oversight of the work of the Secretariat is needed, not only to assure that it remains on track, but also to advance the sustainability and ownership by Pacific Police services. It is suggested that the establishment of a steering committee (Board of Management) would increase oversight and provide additional capacity development opportunities. There appears to be little tangible costs benefit at this stage in relocating the Secretariat off shore and the current NZ Police hosting arrangement appears to meet needs adequately; increased advantage needs to be taken of this arrangement, including through increasing the number of secondees, and a closer alignment of the ISG and Secretariat functions, while guaranteeing functional independence of the Secretariat on behalf of the PICP grouping. Doing so would afford more consistent and professional development approaches to policing, but would need to be balanced to ensure that information provided to the Secretariat by Chiefs remains confidential.

69. Finally, the shift to a outputs-based contracting model with MFAT will provide opportunities for increased scrutiny of results generated through the Secretariat. The combination of ameliorated oversight by a Board of Management, revamped job descriptions, and an increased focus on monitoring and research would set the Secretariat up to service the interests of the Chiefs in a more effective, efficient and relevant manner.

6.2 Recommendations

70. Recommendations are set out above at the conclusion of the Executive Summary.

ANNEX 1: TERMS OF REFERENCE PACIFIC ISLAND CHIEFS OF POLICE (PICP) SECRETARIAT STOCKTAKE

Background

The *Pacific Islands Chiefs of Police (PICP)*, formerly known as the *South Pacific Chiefs of Police Conference (SPCPC)*, is a non-profit organisation made up of 21 police services in the Pacific (including Australia and New Zealand), represented by their Chiefs or Commissioners of Police. The PICP works in line with its Three - Strand Strategy¹¹ to enhance and improve policing in the Pacific. The *PICP Secretariat*, formerly the *SPCPC Secretariat*, is the operational body of the PICP.

PICP Vision Statement

Safe and secure communities for all Pacific Island countries.

PICP Mission Statement

To continuously improve standards within the policing profession and, through collaboration between members, to vigorously and effectively represent the policing interests of all Pacific Island Countries both within and beyond the Pacific Region.

PICP Membership

Membership is open to National Police Services of Pacific Island countries and territories. Currently, there are 21 members: American Samoa, Australia, Cook Islands, Federated States of Micronesia, Fiji (currently suspended), French Polynesia, Guam, Kiribati, Marshall Islands, Nauru, New Caledonia, New Zealand, Niue, Commonwealth of Northern Mariana Islands, PNG, Palau, Samoa, Solomon Islands, Tonga, Tuvalu and Vanuatu.

Within member countries and territories, there are more than 75,000 serving police officers.

PICP Structure and Governance

Historically, NZ Police provided some secretariat services from within its own baseline to the SPCPC on a small scale. In 2003, NZ Police sought to strengthen the PICP and its Secretariat and developed a Strategic Plan 2004-2007. The PICP Secretariat was established in 2004/05. It is hosted by the NZ Police at its Head Quarters in Wellington. It is not a legal entity. The Secretariat staff are recruited by and appointed on NZ Police contracts.

At a governance level, the PICP meets annually. Previously, a SPCPC *Secretary* position reported to the Police Chiefs at the annual conference, and a SPCPC Working Group (comprising of a small number of PICP representatives) oversaw the work of the Secretariat. However, this group was disestablished, and the SPCPC Secretary position was renamed *Executive Director* in 2004/05 and empowered to make decisions on behalf of the PICP. NZ Police undertake performance reviews of the PICP Secretariat Executive Director and staff.

Administration for the PICP is the responsibility of the PICP Chairperson and the permanent Secretariat. The PICP Chairperson is the Commissioner or Head of Police of the country which hosted the latest annual Conference. The Chairmanship is rotated annually and the Office of Chairperson is held until the next annual Conference.

The permanent positions within the current PICP Secretariat structure include:

¹¹ PICP Strategic Direction 2009 - 2014

- Executive Director
- Secretariat Officer
- Senior Projects Officer
- Executive Support Officer

The PICP Secretariat is staffed by NZ Police members who fill the positions of the Executive Director, Secretariat Officer, and the Executive Support Officer roles; and the Australian Federal Police (AFP), who second a staff member to fill the Senior Project Officer position within the PICP Secretariat.

The PICP Secretariat structure also includes provision for two 12-monthly Project Officer positions (to be sourced from the Pacific) and a *fixed-term* Business Planning and Monitoring Officer position¹².

PICP Secretariat Outputs

The PICP-S' outputs fall mainly into 3 areas:

- Area 1: Support the PICPs and Conference.
- Area 2: Management of Projects.
- Area 3: Effectively represent the PICP and its members' interests in the region and international environments.

Under Area 1: Support the PICPs and Conference:

(a) PICP Secretariat will monitor the implementation of the PICP Strategic Direction and provide updates to members, 2-3 times per year, by email, website and other mediums; and prepare an annual report to the PICP Conference.

(b) Answer formal requests for information.

(c) Deliver the annual PICP Conference.

Under Area 2: Management of Projects:

A key part of the rationale for the establishment of the PICP Secretariat in 2004/05 was to deliver a comprehensive project management role for members (i.e. more than organising a conference). However, the PICP Secretariat has moved away from a major project delivery role over recent years.

The decisions regarding inception, continuation, or termination of projects are taken by the Chiefs of Police at the Conference (on the basis of recommendations in papers presented by the PICP Secretariat to Police Chiefs).

Under Area 3: Representation and Cooperation:

The PICP Secretariat notes that they have been mandated by the Chiefs of Police to represent them at a wide variety of regional and international fora.

Rationale and Purpose

The New Zealand Aid Programme has provided funding to NZ Police (host of the PICP Secretariat) via a Memorandum of Understanding since FY 2004/05 and the current contract expires on 31 December 2011¹³. It supports both operational (salary, travel, operational expenses) and project delivery costs.

¹² This position was set up as a fixed-term position by the PICP Secretariat to enable a review of internal staffing efficiencies to be undertaken due to overlaps in functions between the Executive Director, Secretariat Officer, Executive Support Officer, and the BPMO positions. The PICP-S was unable to complete its internal review, and the PICP-S requested the stocktake consider this.

In December 2009, MFAT and the PICP Secretariat agreed that a review should be undertaken in 2011 prior to determining whether MFAT support should be renewed beyond 31 December 2011. In October 2010, the Executive Director of the PICP Secretariat requested that the review be called a 'stocktake' and be limited in its scope to assess MFAT funding for the PICP Secretariat.

The findings of the stocktake will be used by MFAT in assessing whether a future phase of support should be provided to the PICP Secretariat beyond 31 December 2011 (and if so, scope and scale of support); and to inform a rationalised and cost-effective model for future regional law and justice architecture.

The findings of the stocktake may also be reported to the PICP for their consideration at annual PICP meeting in August 2011. The stocktake report will provide the PICP, PICP Secretariat, and NZ Police a basis to make improvements as necessary to the implementation and governance model for the PICP Secretariat going forward.

Purpose

To assess the overall effectiveness and efficiency of the PICP Secretariat in order to determine whether or not the New Zealand Aid Programme should continue to support the PICP Secretariat beyond 31 December 2011, and if so, what form of assistance (focus, scope, scale) that support should take.

Scope

The time period the stocktake will cover is the duration of the New Zealand Aid Programme funding for the PICP Secretariat (i.e. 2004/05 to present).

The stocktake will consider all three output areas of the PICP Secretariat in relation to MFAT funding and assess what has been achieved against the four DAC criteria relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, and sustainability. In relation to output area 2, the stocktake should within available resources examine in greater depth the results achieved to date under the PICP Women's Advisory Network (WAN) project (for which significant New Zealand Aid Programme funding has been provided)¹⁴. It will also address whether the activity provided value for money, and potential savings through different design, methodology, and resource allocation.

The stocktake will not consider impact as this would require a more expensive and time consuming review.

Objectives of Stocktake

Objective 1: Assess the alignment of the PICP with the mandate of the New Zealand Aid Programme.

1. Is the Pacific Island Chiefs of Police (PICP) and the outcomes¹⁵ it is trying to achieve aligned well with the mandate of the New Zealand Aid Programme?

¹³ NZ Police, the Australian Federal Police, and the New Zealand Aid Programme contribute towards the costs of the PICP Secretariat. Other donors such as AusAID and the UNAIDS have at times contributed towards specific project costs.

¹⁴ It is hoped that an update survey of the WAN being undertaken by the PICP Secretariat will be completed in time for the stocktake.

¹⁵ as expressed through its Constitution, Strategic Plan 2004-2007 and Strategic Direction 2009-2014 documents, and the Future Directions in Pacific Policing Strategy

Objective 2: Assess the PICP Secretariat's contribution to achievement of the PICP's outcomes.

2. To what extent were the intended activities, outputs, and outcomes (expressed via PICP-S Business Plans) achieved by the PICP Secretariat? To what extent did they contribute towards achievement of the outcomes of the PICP's Strategic Plan/Direction?

Objective 3: Assess the effectiveness and efficiency of the PICP Secretariat's structure, operations, quality assurance processes, and PICP Governance mechanisms, and make recommendations for improvements.

3. To what extent does the structure and operations of the PICP Secretariat, enable the PICP Secretariat to be responsive to, and meet the needs of, the membership? To what extent do the current PICP governance arrangements enable effective oversight of the PICP Secretariat's operations?

4. Have the operations of the PICP Secretariat (including its quality assurance processes) been effective and efficient in ensuring its planning, delivery (intended outputs and outcomes), monitoring, analysis, and reporting functions are completed on time, to quality standards, and within budget?

5. To what extent does the structure and operations of the PICP Secretariat promote capacity development of Pacific police services?

6. To what extent does the structure and operations of the PICP Secretariat promote gender equity, and to what extent do they promote Pacific ownership during activity identification, design, and delivery phases?

7. Are the staffing numbers, role types, and resourcing provided under current arrangements for the PICP Secretariat appropriate for the delivery of its services?

Objective 4: Assess whether the activity was relevant and provided value for money.

8. Is the PICP Secretariat managing resources provided by the New Zealand Aid Programme effectively and efficiently?; and suggest any improvements that should be made.

9. To what extent do the outputs of the PICP Secretariat constitute a value-added service?

10. Is investment in the PICP Secretariat the most appropriate (including cost-effective and efficient) form of New Zealand Aid Programme assistance to support the PICP objectives?; Are there alternatives that could be more appropriate for future New Zealand Aid Programme support?

11. If the New Zealand Aid Programme continues to support the PICP Secretariat, what form of assistance (focus, scope, scale) could this take to better achieve intended outcomes?

Methodology

The contractor(s) must undertake an **evidence-based** approach to all stages of the stocktake and data, analysis, and findings, conclusions and recommendations must be demonstrably evidence-based (both quantitative and qualitative) and triangulated and presented in a clear and transparent manner. The review methodology and approach should be set out in detail in the review plan. The contractor(s) will submit an evaluation plan to MFAT for approval¹⁶ prior to commencement of the evaluation.

¹⁶ Some examples of questions that the reviewers should answer in their review plan are set out in Annex 1.

Consideration should be given to the New Zealand Aid Programme's mainstreamed and cross-cutting issues, including human rights, gender equality, and conflict prevention and peace building. The stocktake will use a consultative approach and must be conducted in a professional and ethical manner and comply with the Development Assistance Committee (DAC) Evaluation Quality Standards.

The stocktake will not involve travel to the Pacific. It will incorporate a desk review, face-to-face interviews with Wellington-based stakeholders, and telephone interviews with stakeholders outside Wellington.

The evaluation plan, questionnaires (if any), checklists of questions and a summary of survey results should be appended to the review report.

Management and Governance of the Stocktake of the PICP Secretariat

MFAT is commissioning a stocktake of the PICP Secretariat. Coordination and governance of this stocktake will be undertaken through the Regional Growth and Governance team assisted by an evaluation adviser. This will involve approval of terms of reference, selection of contractor, approve the Review Plan, making decisions on any major issues that arise during the Assignment, providing feedback on the draft report, and formally accepting the final report.

The draft review report must meet contracted quality standards (i.e. meet the requirements of the terms of reference/contract, be evidence-based and factually correct, be presented in a clear and transparent manner, and not contain reputational risks for parties). It will be 'peer reviewed' by MFAT staff to ensure it meets contract requirements.¹⁷ Milestone payment will become due upon acceptance by MFAT of the draft report as meeting contract quality standards.

Once the draft report is approved by MFAT as meeting the contract requirements, MFAT may seek feedback from relevant external stakeholders. MFAT will work together with external stakeholders to identify any further changes required and provide consolidated feedback to the reviewer(s).

The final review report will be appraised by MFAT and submitted to the Evaluation and Research Committee (ERC) for consideration of public release. Any information that could prevent release of the report under the Official Information or Privacy Acts, or would breach ethical standards, must be placed in an in-confidence annex. Where it is possible to identify individuals, this should be with the individuals' written consent and noted in the report or removed from the report.

Composition of the evaluation team

The contractor(s) is expected to work in a cost-effective and professional manner.

The contractor(s) will have relevant formal qualifications and/or consulting experience in all or most of the following areas:

Required:

- Expertise and experience in evaluation and application of evaluation ethics.
- Expertise and knowledge of the Pacific law and justice sector including regional organisations.
- Expertise and experience in organisational development or institutional strengthening

¹⁷ Further work or revisions of the report may be requested if it is considered that the report does not meet the contracted standards.

- Cross-cultural communication skills, strong facilitation skills and experience.
- Strong report writing skills (including evidence-based approach to data gathering, analysis, and presentation of findings).

Preferred:

- A strong understanding of the Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness, Pacific Plan, and principles underpinning the New Zealand Aid Programme policy settings.
- Broad knowledge of development issues and sound gender analysis skills.
- Ability to work in a professional manner.
- Good interpersonal skills.

Follow-up

Following acceptance by MFAT of the final report, MFAT will appraise it and submit it to the Evaluation and Research Committee.

The New Zealand Aid Programme will discuss any relevant aspects of the final report with NZ Police and the PICP Secretariat as appropriate.

Sources of Written Information

- NZ Police/PICP arrangement for hosting the PICP Secretariat
- NZ Police framework for subcontracts of PICP Secretariat staff
- NZ Police/MFAT MOUs
- PICP Secretariat M & E framework and updates
- PICP Secretariat's M & E frameworks for its projects
- PICP Constitution 2005
- SPCPC Strategic Plan 2004-2007
- PICP Strategic Direction 2009- 2014
- PICP Secretariat annual Business Plans (2004 – 2011)
- Future Directions in Pacific Policing Strategy
- PICP Secretariat progress reports to PICP
- PICP meeting minutes
- PICP Secretariat WAN Survey report 2006
- PICP WAN strategic plan, WAN conference minutes, exchange programme completion reports prepared by PIC exchange officers, WAN member survey data
- PICP Secretariat progress reports to MFAT
- PICP Secretariat progress reports to regional bodies (eg FRSC, IACP)
- Activity reports completed by PICP Secretariat staff following field visits and completion of activities
- Results of end of workshop evaluations and post-training follow up surveys conducted by PICP Secretariat staff for projects under output area 2
- New Zealand Aid Programme policies and strategies: Draft Development Policy Statement, PPSG Strategic Framework, HR Policy, Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment and others accessible via NZAID website
- Key documents are also available on PICP website: www.picp.org.nz.

Annex 1: Questions for Consideration in a Review Plan

- Who are the stakeholders in the evaluation, what is their interest or stake in the evaluation, what type of stakeholder are they (primary – directly benefit from the activity being evaluated or reviewed, secondary – indirectly involved with the activity etc), what issues or constraints are there in their involvement in the evaluation (e.g. power issues, access, confidentiality)?
- What information will be needed to answer each of the evaluation questions?
- What are the most appropriate methods for data/information collection to address each of the evaluation questions? e.g. Will qualitative or quantitative methods be used and why? How will evaluation participants be selected? What specific methods will be used – surveys, interviews (face-to-face or phone), email questionnaire, workshops, focus groups etc? For quantitative surveys how will the appropriate sample size be decided, and what statistical analysis will be used to allow judgment on the reliability of results?
- From whom will information be collected to answer each of the evaluation questions, and how will the evaluation team ensure that the opinions of all appropriate stakeholders (e.g. women and men, young and old, powerful and less powerful) are included?
- What questions will be asked in questionnaires or interviews?
- How will information gathered be cross checked?
- What procedures will be used for data analysis – how will qualitative data such as interview notes be analysed, how will survey results be analysed?
- How will the way that crosscutting and mainstreamed issues (gender, environment and human rights, and if appropriate HIV/AIDS and conflict) have been addressed in the activity being evaluated or reviewed be assessed, and how will the evaluation/review be conducted in a way that takes crosscutting issues into account? [Refer: NZAID Screening Guide for Mainstreamed and Other Cross Cutting Issues].
- How will the findings be fed back and discussed with appropriate stakeholders during the evaluation process, and how will this be incorporated into the report?
- What risks, limitations or constraints are there likely to be to the evaluation and how can these be mitigated?
- How will ethical issues be addressed? For example how will participants of the evaluation be informed of the purpose and use of information they will provide? How will sensitivity to gender and culture be ensured during the evaluation? Is informed consent required from evaluation participants, if so how will this be obtained? How will confidentiality of participants be ensured and how will confidential material be stored? What potential harm to participants is there and how will potential harm be minimised?

Annex 2 Anticipated indicative timeline:

- Background reading and briefing in WLG: 2 weeks
- Draft and submit an evaluation plan: 1 week
- Finalise evaluation plan (incorporating MFAT feedback): 1 week
- Undertake interviews and research: 3 weeks
- Undertake analysis: 3 weeks
- De-brief with MFAT (including an *aide memoir*): 1 week
- Write draft report: 2 weeks
- Finalise report: 2 weeks

Annex 3 Review Report Structure:

The report (excluding appendices) should be no longer than 15 pages. The executive summary should be no longer than 5 pages. The report should include:

- Executive summary and recommendations;
- Background;
- Methodology (including any limitations);
- Findings in relation to the TOR (objectives/tasks) and review plan;
- Analysis of findings;
- Conclusions/recommendations; and
- Appendices as appropriate. (Note: The TOR, review plan, questionnaires, lists of stakeholder meetings, interviews/consultations, survey results and bibliography should also be appended to review report).

Annex 4 List of Key Stakeholders (not exhaustive):

Wellington-based stakeholders:

- PICP Secretariat staff (including former Executive Director)
- NZ Police
- MFAT: (Regional Growth and Governance programme team including those managing the contract with PIFS, DSAE specialist staff, Post staff, Financial staff, MFAT Pacific division)

Phone interviews and/or written questionnaires with other key stakeholders:

PICP Chairman, PICP members, WAN Pacific police members, Pacific police officers who have received training, OCO, PIDC, PIFS, AFP International Deployment Group staff members, AusAID, and AusAID Office of Development Effectiveness (ODE) staff.

ANNEX 2: PICP SECRETARAIT STOCKTAKE MATRIX

Stocktake Criteria	Key Questions	Specific Sub-Questions	Primary Data Sources	Data collection Methods / Tools	Methods for Data Analysis	Results
Indicators/ Success Standard: 6 = very high / excellent; 5= good; 4= above average; 3=below average; 2=poor; 1 = very low / poor.						
Objective 1: Assess the alignment of the PICP with the mandate of the New Zealand Aid Programme.						
Alignment and priority	Is the PICP and the outcomes it is trying to achieve well aligned with the mandate of the NZ Aid Programme?	<p>What are the key elements of the NZ Aid Programme's mandate? What are the key priorities and anticipated outcomes of the NZ Aid Programme?</p> <p>What are key objectives of the PICP, its outputs and outcomes?</p> <p>Were the outcomes intended through the activities and outputs of the PICP consistent with the objectives and anticipated outcomes of the NZ Aid Programme (previous and in particular current mandate)? To what extent are they a priority for continued support under the NZ Aid Programme</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PICP constitution. • PICP Strategic Direction 2009-2014. • PICP Secretariat Annual Business Plans (2004-2011). • NZ Police/PICP arrangement for hosting the PICP Secretariat. • PICP progress reports to MFAT. • NZ Aid Programme's policies and strategies: Final Development Policy Statement, PPSG Strategic Framework, HR Policy, Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment, et ors. 	<p>Document review</p> <p>Interviews and Group Discussions</p> <p>PICP Member Survey Questionnaire</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Comparison of the goal, purpose and objective statements of PICP documentation with NZ Aid Programme policies. • Comparison of outputs and outcomes of PICP to anticipated outcomes and priorities of the New Zealand Aid Programme. 	(5/6) Support to the Secretariat aligns well the NZ Aid Programme's theme of <i>building safe and secure communities</i> and with the Programme's stated priority of <i>prioritising investments to promote good governance</i> . NZ's sustainable economic development policy focus actively promotes the link between the primacy of the rule of law, maintained through an impartial and effective legal system, and sustainable economic through its LJS activities. Support for a regional policing approach is justified, by both the common interests and challenges present in small Pacific island nations and the obvious economic efficiencies in communicating and delivering services regionally, but also in the strength of voice which the PICP member states achieve through the grouping, in seeking resources and meeting

Stocktake Criteria	Key Questions	Specific Sub-Questions	Primary Data Sources	Data collection Methods / Tools	Methods for Data Analysis	Results
Indicators/ Success Standard: 6 = very high / excellent; 5= good; 4= above average; 3=below average; 2=poor; 1 = very low / poor.						
						policing challenges.
Objective 2: Assess the PICP Secretariat's contribution to achievement of the PICP's outcomes.						
Effectiveness – extent of PICP-S contribution to achievement of PICP outcomes	To what extent were the intended activities, outputs, and outcomes (expressed via PICP-S Business Plans) achieved by the PICP Secretariat?	<p>What were the key PICP-S activities over the period?</p> <p>What were the key PICP-S outputs over the period?</p> <p>What were the key PICP-S results over the period?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PICP Annual Conference Reports. • Progress reports • Annual Reports • Review Reports • Audits • PICP members • NZP reps • MFAT reps • Activities of key regional and bilateral programs targeting PICP members. 	<p>Document review</p> <p>Interviews and Group Discussions</p> <p>PICP Member Survey Questionnaire</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review of PICP, NZ Police and MFAT documents (such as progress reports, reviews etc), as well as key results of regional and bilateral policing programs targeting PICP members to identify key impact/results of the PICP-S within the context of PICP outcomes • Assumptions checked during individual and group interviews. • Triangulation with data elicited in PICP members' survey questionnaire. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • (3/6) Since 2004/5 the Secretariat has made a significant contribution to the holding of the PICP annual conference, particularly through logistics, financial resources, taking of minutes, preparation of proposals for PICPs' consideration and production of post conference reports. • Given overlaps and the large scale funding provided by other development partners, particularly Australia, significant PICP project outcomes which contribute to the PICP's overall goal appear to be generated from outside the Secretariat. Nonetheless, it is clear that certain projects generated useful data, and others have made some positive contributions, providing training and capacity development opportunities. A key challenge was project selection for implementation by the Secretariat. • The process of needs
	To what extent did PICP-S' activities (as opposed to third parties or other factors contribute towards achievement of the outcomes of the PICP's Strategic Plan/Direction?	<p>How do the actual results compare with anticipated results and outcomes (as described in PICP's Strategic Plan/Direction)?</p> <p>Is there a clear logic between PICP-S outputs and the PICP Strategic Plan?</p>				
	What have been the changes	<p>What are the key factors/actors external to PICP-S that influence PICP-S</p>				

Stocktake Criteria	Key Questions	Specific Sub-Questions	Primary Data Sources	Data collection Methods / Tools	Methods for Data Analysis	Results
Indicators/ Success Standard: 6 = very high / excellent; 5= good; 4= above average; 3=below average; 2=poor; 1 = very low / poor.						
	produced by the PICP-S, positive or negative, direct or indirect, intended or unintended?	Outcomes. (i.e. individual PICP member organisations, other regional, bilateral programs, the hosting police service – NZ Police)? What real difference has the activity made to the PICP members? How many people have been affected by the PICP-S' activities?				identification and proposal preparation is driven by the NZ Police and the AFP, and appears overly susceptible to their strategic interests or areas of familiarity. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Secretariat has represented the PICP members, including at meetings of other regional bodies, such as OCO, circulating reports and information from such meetings to PICPs. Opportunities also exist for the Secretariat to sharpen the focus of the expected tangible benefits to PICPs of the Secretariat's representation at regional fora to ensure attendances provide value for money.
Objective 3: Assess the effectiveness and efficiency of the PICP Secretariat's structure, operations, quality assurance processes, and PICP Governance mechanisms, and make recommendations for reinforcement and/or revisions (taking into consideration relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, and value for money).						
Relevance	To what extent do the structure and operations of the PICP-S enable it to be responsive to and meet the needs of its	What is the PICP-S structure? How does the PICP-S respond to needs of its membership?		Document review Interviews and Group Discussions PICP Member	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Comparison of the goal, purpose and objective statements of PICP documentation with NZ Aid Programme policies. Analysis of 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> (4/6): MFAT funding to the Secretariat's conference organisation function is highly relevant to both the New Zealand policy objectives and PICP member states' priorities. The majority of stakeholders interviewed viewed the holding

Stocktake Criteria	Key Questions	Specific Sub-Questions	Primary Data Sources	Data collection Methods / Tools	Methods for Data Analysis	Results
Indicators/ Success Standard: 6 = very high / excellent; 5= good; 4= above average; 3=below average; 2=poor; 1 = very low / poor.						
	membership?	<p>What demands do PICP members make of the PICP-S?</p> <p>What are the expectations of PICP members of the PICP-S?</p>	PICP members' questionnaire.	Survey Questionnaire	<p>information provided during interviews.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Assumptions checked during individual and group interviews. • Triangulation with qualitative data elicited in PICP members' survey questionnaire. 	<p>of the annual conference as the key governance/decision-making output of the PICP. A number of PICPs interviewed indicated a need for the development of the Secretariat as a resource centre of policing initiatives, including through research, and provision of tools for enhancement for PICPs. Use of the website was noted as low, evidencing a lack of relevance of the information available there. Response rate to both questionnaires was also low, even though addressed to PICPs and WAN representatives personally. Relevance of the Secretariat's activities to PICPs was overshadowed by the existence of better resourced bilateral programmes funded by Australia and New Zealand within the Region.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The absence of a Board of Management / Steering Committee reduced engagement by PICPs other than the Chair.

Stocktake Criteria	Key Questions	Specific Sub-Questions	Primary Data Sources	Data collection Methods / Tools	Methods for Data Analysis	Results
Indicators/ Success Standard: 6 = very high / excellent; 5= good; 4= above average; 3=below average; 2=poor; 1 = very low / poor.						
Effectiveness	<p>To what extent do the current PICP governance arrangements enable effective oversight of the PICP-S' operations?</p> <p>Have the operations of the PICP-S (including its quality assurance processes) been effective in ensuring its planning, delivery (intended outputs and outcomes), monitoring, analysis, and reporting functions are completed on time, to quality</p>	<p>What are the current PICP governance and PICP-S oversight arrangements? How is oversight of the PICP-S' operations effected?</p> <p>What are the expectations of PICP members regarding PICP-S oversight?</p> <p>What are the key elements of the PICP-S' Quality Assurance, Planning, Delivery of activities, Monitoring, Analysis and reporting operations?</p> <p>How effective were the PICP-S' QA, planning, delivery, monitoring, analysis and reporting processes? Were these processes conducted effectively in terms of timeliness, quality and within</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Progress reports • Annual Reports • Review Reports • Audits • PICP members • NZP reps • MFAT reps 	<p>Document review</p> <p>Interviews and Group Discussions</p> <p>PICP members' questionnaire.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Comparison of results statements in progress reports, exit reports, etc. for projects and activities against PICP's stated objectives, and any stated objectives for individual projects. • Triangulation with qualitative data elicited in PICP members' survey questionnaire. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • (3/6): The Secretariat scores high for effectiveness in organising the annual conference, including through ensuring that Pacific police services have sufficient logistics support. • The annual conference provides an effective opportunity for decision-making on proposals, although the activity scores less well against effectiveness in terms of needs identification, planning, drafting of ToR for projects to meet identified needs, and ongoing results monitoring and reporting. Insufficient facilitation of results monitoring and reporting by projects within Pacific jurisdictions was noted. The Secretariat did not have up to date information about policing projects within the region, information about which might be of use to Pacific police services, and which might provide a niche role for the Secretariat in facilitating information flow and updates to the PICP of bilateral and

Stocktake Criteria	Key Questions	Specific Sub-Questions	Primary Data Sources	Data collection Methods / Tools	Methods for Data Analysis	Results
Indicators/ Success Standard: 6 = very high / excellent; 5= good; 4= above average; 3=below average; 2=poor; 1 = very low / poor.						
	<p>standards and within budget?</p> <p>What were the major factors (from a PICP-S operations perspective) influencing the achievement or non-achievement of the objectives of individual activities / projects?</p> <p>Did the PICP-S have a sound M&E & reporting system in place which generated</p>	<p>budget?</p> <p>What were funding partners' (NZ MFAT, NZ Police & AFP) and PICP members' expectations of the effectiveness of PICP-S' operations in terms of timeliness, quality and budget, and were they met?</p> <p>Were there changes in effectiveness of PICP-S operations over time?</p> <p>How were factors affecting effectiveness of PICP-S' operations dealt with by the PICP-S management and/or by PICP itself?</p> <p>How well were any PICP-S M&E plans implemented, including adaptive management?</p>				<p>multilateral projects.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Secretariat could have developed results monitoring and reporting capacity in Pacific police services. • Projects implemented by the Secretariat suffered from poor management practices, including resource management, and low levels or absence of adequate monitoring, and presentation of results. Similarly, the poor quality of reporting, particularly to MFAT, including repetitions of text from previous reports was evident in the past. While the Secretariat has moved away from major project implementation, through the PICPs' conference process the Secretariat is expected to play an ongoing role in facilitating needs identification, development of ToRs and identification of resources and projects to meet those needs. • The quality of representation by Secretariat staff at regional and international fora was high, increased effectiveness of

Stocktake Criteria	Key Questions	Specific Sub-Questions	Primary Data Sources	Data collection Methods / Tools	Methods for Data Analysis	Results
Indicators/ Success Standard: 6 = very high / excellent; 5= good; 4= above average; 3=below average; 2=poor; 1 = very low / poor.						
	meaningful information for PICP members and donors?					representation through CD of Pacific police service representatives' representation skills is possible.
Efficiency	Have the operations of the PICP Secretariat (including its quality assurance processes) been effective and efficient in ensuring its planning, delivery (intended outputs and outcomes), monitoring, analysis, and reporting functions are completed on time, to quality standards and within budget?	<p>What are the key elements of the PICP-S' Quality Assurance, Planning, Delivery of activities, Monitoring, Analysis and reporting operations?</p> <p>How efficient were the PICP-S' QA, planning, delivery, monitoring, analysis and reporting processes? Were these processes conducted efficiently in terms of timeliness, quality and within budget?</p> <p>What were funding partners' (NZ MFAT, NZ Police & AFP) and PICP members' expectations of the</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Progress reports • Annual Reports • Review Reports • Audits • PICP members • NZP reps • MFAT reps 	<p>Document review</p> <p>Interviews and Group Discussions</p> <p>PICP member survey Questionnaire</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review of budget expenditure reports, progress reports, extensions of PICP-S funding, audit reports, to identify activities which were delayed (and the reasons why). • Assumptions checked during individual and group interviews. • Triangulation with data elicited in PICP member survey questionnaire. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • (2/6): Despite its small size the Secretariat scores low in terms of efficiency. A number of projects was rolled-over/extended without due regard to efficiency considerations and results. MFAT funding was not contingent upon milestone deliverables. MFAT's expectations of the host agency's quality of project management were also not met despite significant in-kind contributions by MFAT. There are also too many senior-level posts within the Secretariat. • NZ Police, as host agency, fell short in meeting is MoU requirements to assure Secretariat service outcomes (planning, monitoring, reporting, project implementation oversight). • An appropriate management response from the NZ Police to quality concerns raised by

Stocktake Criteria	Key Questions	Specific Sub-Questions	Primary Data Sources	Data collection Methods / Tools	Methods for Data Analysis	Results
Indicators/ Success Standard: 6 = very high / excellent; 5= good; 4= above average; 3=below average; 2=poor; 1 = very low / poor.						
	<p>Were activities cost-efficient?</p> <p>Were objectives achieved on time?</p> <p>Were projects implemented in the most efficient way compared to alternatives?</p>	<p>effectiveness of PICP-S' operations in terms of timeliness, quality and budget, and were they met?</p> <p>What were expenditure rates?</p> <p>Were there significant delays in any projects? If so, why?</p> <p>What were the alternative modalities for delivery of PICP-S activities/projects, and would they have been more or less efficient?</p>				<p>MFAT about planning and reporting was not forthcoming and this significantly affected the Secretariat's efficiency. The BPMO post was a direct result of this however shoring up planning and monitoring would have been more appropriately met from within the hosting agency's existing resources.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Annual conferences involving 21 representatives from the Pacific region are inherently expensive affairs; building capacity within the region to provide logistics support and conference services, such as transcription services was low.
<p>Extent to which PICP-S structure and PICP governance arrangements provide for Pacific Ownership of and Capacity Development</p>	<p>To what extent do the structure and operations of the PICP-S promote capacity development of Pacific police services?</p> <p>To what extent do the structure and</p>	<p>How do PICP-S activities promote CD of Pacific police services? Are there untapped opportunities for CD of Pacific police services through changes to PICP-S structure or operations?</p> <p>How are activities identified, designed and</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Progress reports • Annual Reports • Review Reports • Audits • PICP members • NZP reps • MFAT reps • PICP-S Business Plans and training plans. • SP 2004-2007 outlining the 	<p>Document review</p> <p>Interviews and Group Discussions</p> <p>PICP member survey Questionnaire</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review documents to identify capacity development strategies and activities. • Analysis of information provided during interviews. • Assumptions checked during individual and group interviews. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • (1/6): Low levels of Pacific policing representation in the Secretariat's staffing establishment. PICPs nomination of Pacific project officer (sourcing from the country in which the Annual Conference is next held) is not transparent and does not identify best and brightest candidates. • The small number of posts

Stocktake Criteria	Key Questions	Specific Sub-Questions	Primary Data Sources	Data collection Methods / Tools	Methods for Data Analysis	Results
Indicators/ Success Standard: 6 = very high / excellent; 5= good; 4= above average; 3=below average; 2=poor; 1 = very low / poor.						
opportunities for Pacific Police services	operations of the PICP-S promote Pacific ownership during activity identification, design, and delivery phases?	delivered? When and how are PICP member representatives involved in activity identification, design and delivery?	vision		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Triangulation with qualitative data elicited in PICP members' survey questionnaire. 	<p>funded for Pacific police services, overreliance on recruitment to Secretariat posts from within the NZ Police, and unstructured professional development opportunities diminished capacity development opportunities for Pacific police services within the Secretariat.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • While a decision by the PICP, the absence of a steering committee for the PICP with oversight responsibility of the Secretariat diminished opportunities for PICPs to play this role. The vesting of oversight functions solely in the Chair (for his/her year of tenure) and a delegation of significant responsibilities to the Secretariat, while lessening administrative burden on individual PICPs, diminished opportunities for the PICP as a body to fully oversee the Secretariat's activities.
Gender Equity	To what extent does the structure and operations of	To what degree did the PICP-S facilitate the provision of sex-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Progress reports • Annual Reports • Review Reports • Audits 	<p>Document review</p> <p>Interviews and Group</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review of PICP-S and individual project reporting to see if sex-disaggregated 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • (3/6): While the enthusiasm and potential for the WAN project to contribute to gender equity outcomes in the Pacific

Stocktake Criteria	Key Questions	Specific Sub-Questions	Primary Data Sources	Data collection Methods / Tools	Methods for Data Analysis	Results
Indicators/ Success Standard: 6 = very high / excellent; 5= good; 4= above average; 3=below average; 2=poor; 1 = very low / poor.						
	<p>the PICP-S promote gender equity?</p> <p>To what degree did the PICP-S advance gender equality, or at least not reinforce existing gender discrimination?</p>	<p>disaggregated data to measure the outcomes of the PICP's activities on both men and women?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PICP members • NZP reps • MFAT reps • PICP-S Business Plans and training plans. 	<p>Discussions</p> <p>PICP member survey</p> <p>Questionnaire</p>	<p>data were generated?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Assumptions checked during individual and group interviews. • Triangulation with data elicited in PICP members' survey questionnaire. 	<p>was great, through the Secretariat's work in hosting the WAN Secretariat, significant challenges to this Project were noted.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Poor quality activity design and implementation, insufficient engagement by the Secretariat with PICPs themselves (apart from during the annual conference) and limited reporting diminished the results of this Project. • The absence of a range of engagement strategies, particularly with PICPs on WAN Project initiatives was also noted. It is difficult to see tangible results against gender equity indicators from Pacific police services' participation in the WAN Project since 2004/5; while providing opportunities for information exchange a sharper results-based focus was needed. • Past Secretariat management approaches militated against gender equity, with some Secretariat staff members noting tensions within the

Stocktake Criteria	Key Questions	Specific Sub-Questions	Primary Data Sources	Data collection Methods / Tools	Methods for Data Analysis	Results
Indicators/ Success Standard: 6 = very high / excellent; 5= good; 4= above average; 3=below average; 2=poor; 1 = very low / poor.						
						Secretariat largely along gender lines. The absence of a pronounced NZ Police management response to this circumstance, which endured for at least a year, affected the Secretariat's performance.
Sustainability	<p>Should PICP members consider contributing to the costs of the PICP-S to promote better ownership by members and eventual sustainability?</p> <p>Should funding sources for the PICP-S be diversified to ensure potential risk spreading (given changing mandates and priorities of NZ and other donors) for financial viability, and enhanced</p>	<p>What were the major factors which influenced the achievement or non-achievement of sustainability of the PICP-S outcomes?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Progress reports • Annual Reports • Review Reports • Audits • PICP members • NZP reps • MFAT reps • PICP-S Business Plans and training plans. 	<p>Document review</p> <p>Interviews and Group Discussions</p> <p>PICP member survey</p> <p>Questionnaire</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identification of least sustainable features of PICP-S, including governance and technical support. • Assumptions checked during individual and group interviews. • Triangulation with data elicited in PICP members' survey questionnaire. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • (2/6): Low levels of Secretariat staff from PICP member states militated against capacity development leading to sustainability, as did cost free membership of the PICP. While many felt that a move of the Secretariat off-shore to a PICP member state might increase its sense of regional ownership, few PICPs were concerned about the perception of the Secretariat as belonging to the NZ Police. Concern centred more on the need to increase capacity development/leadership development opportunities for PICP member states at the Secretariat, taking full advantage of NZ Police. • Project sustainability was low due to low levels of research and needs diagnostics, and

Stocktake Criteria	Key Questions	Specific Sub-Questions	Primary Data Sources	Data collection Methods / Tools	Methods for Data Analysis	Results
Indicators/ Success Standard: 6 = very high / excellent; 5= good; 4= above average; 3=below average; 2=poor; 1 = very low / poor.						
	<p>ownership of PICP-S by all its members, including the AFP and NZP?</p> <p>What factors require attention in order to improve prospects for sustainability of PICP-S outcomes?</p>					<p>poor quality monitoring and reporting leading to project implementation adjustments. Delegation of the representation role to the Secretariat staff reduced sustainability as it diminished capacity development opportunities within PICPs to attend regional conferences and provide comprehensive reports back to the PICPs, including recommendations.</p>
Objective 4: Assess whether the activity was relevant¹⁸ and provided value for money.						

¹⁸ Relevance is addressed under Objective 1: Alignment.

Stocktake Criteria	Key Questions	Specific Sub-Questions	Primary Data Sources	Data collection Methods / Tools	Methods for Data Analysis	Results
Indicators/ Success Standard: 6 = very high / excellent; 5= good; 4= above average; 3=below average; 2=poor; 1 = very low / poor.						
Value for Money	To what extent was the activity relevant and provided value for money?	<p>Is the PICP Secretariat managing resources provided by the New Zealand Aid Programme effectively and efficiently?; and suggest any improvements that should be made.</p> <p>Taking into account the PICP-S' effectiveness and the extent to which it has achieved objectives, what assessment can be made of the PICP-S' achievements and outcomes considering MFAT's investment to date?</p> <p>To what extent do the outputs of the PICP Secretariat constitute a value-added service?</p> <p>Is investment in the PICP Secretariat the</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Progress reports • Annual Reports • Review Reports • Audits • PICP members • NZP reps • MFAT reps • PICP-S Business Plans and training plans. • Financial reports. 	<p>Document review</p> <p>Interviews and Group Discussions</p> <p>PICP member survey</p> <p>Questionnaire</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review of budget expenditure reports, progress reports, extensions of PICP-S funding, audit reports, to identify activities which were delayed (and the reasons why). • Assumptions checked during individual and group interviews. • Triangulation with data elicited in PICP members' survey questionnaire. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • (3/6): The Secretariat scores mid-level in terms of value for money. Despite significant investment by MFAT, monitoring and reporting requirements in the past were not adequately met, resulting in the need for further in kind contribution by MFAT staff to bolster monitoring and reporting. This led to the application for the MFAT-BPMO post. Value for money can really only be achieved if activities are implemented efficiently and effectively, results monitored and fed back into project management, and if evidence is available of that. Some good results were masked by poor monitoring and reporting. Addition of the BPMO Post did not immediately translate into increased evidence-based programming, partly due to staffing selection, and also due to the failure to incorporate BPMO functions into the job descriptions of the Secretariat's existing staffing establishment.

Stocktake Criteria	Key Questions	Specific Sub-Questions	Primary Data Sources	Data collection Methods / Tools	Methods for Data Analysis	Results
Indicators/ Success Standard: 6 = very high / excellent; 5= good; 4= above average; 3=below average; 2=poor; 1 = very low / poor.						
		<p>most appropriate (including cost-effective and efficient) form of New Zealand Aid Programme assistance to support the PICP objectives?;</p> <p>Are there alternatives that could be more appropriate for future New Zealand Aid Programme support?</p> <p>If the New Zealand Aid Programme continues to support the PICP Secretariat, what form of assistance (focus, scope, scale) could this take to better achieve intended outcomes?</p>				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project selection did not represent value for money. There was no clear underpinning rationale or set of criteria to guide the PICP in determining whether projects should be managed by the Secretariat (as opposed to other bilateral programmes). There may be good reasons as to why the Secretariat is the best option, but these need to be clearly elaborated by the PICP. • Recommendations for future support are provided separately.

ANNEX 3: STOCKTAKE METHODOLOGY – KEY APPROACHES

Stakeholder participation

1. As this Stocktake was conducted by an external contractor, PICP stakeholders, MFAT and the NZ Police were treated on an equal footing. The external consultant interviewed key MFAT, AFP and NZ Police representatives involved in the Secretariat, including the PICP Chairperson (currently the AFP). PICP member police service representatives' views were canvassed through the PICP members' survey questionnaire and through follow-up telephone communication. While this Stocktake was not a joint process, every opportunity was provided to ensure that both the Stocktake and its results are relevant to, and aid the PICP members, Secretariat staff, NZ Police, AFP and MFAT to contribute to thinking and analysis about future support.

Ethics

2. The independent contractor opened each interview with a clear and concise description of the purpose of the Stocktake and the use of information and opinions provided, including their confidential nature. Permission to use list names was specifically sought. Interviewees and discussion group members were given the opportunity to provide confidential feedback. All information gathered through interviews, group discussions, and survey questionnaires was treated confidentially and direct attribution to any individual did not take place.

Major limitations on Stocktake methodology

3. The following issues were identified as the major limitations to the Stocktake methodology.¹⁹
- **Time:** the Stocktake was completed within a short-time frame, and this affected the ability of the independent contractor to interview all stakeholders and conduct sufficient research across all the PICP projects.
 - **Availability of stakeholders:** Given competing priorities and the seniority of the key PICP stakeholders, some individuals could not be interviewed. Where this occurred, it went to the comprehensiveness of observations rather than their accuracy.
 - **Staff turnover:** Given that the period of the stocktake commenced from 2004, some staff involved in PICP implementation had left their posts. While many were identified and interviewed there remained some whom it was not possible to interview.
 - **Institutional memory:** Linked to the limitation identified above, as staffing turnover takes place, the degree to which comprehensive handover took place within the Secretariat of the background, processes, and objectives of the PICP's implementation, may have affected the availability and quality of the information which the independent contractor accessed from PICP-S and NZ Police. Many individuals interviewed had lengthy involvements with the Secretariat and this limitation had minimal impact on the Stocktake.
 - **Availability and completeness of written and electronic documentation:** As the stocktake was a retrospective exercise it relied on documentation. Comprehensive records were made available to the independent contractor.
 - **Availability of baseline and implementation data:** Assessment of the results of the Secretariat would have been facilitated by the presence of baseline data, either resultant from specific baseline data collection activities, or from various reports and studies which

¹⁹ Mitigation strategies were set out fully in the Stocktake Plan provided to MFAT and these are not repeated here due to limitations of space.

might serve as proxies for baseline data. No specific baseline data were present for the Secretariat.

Cross-cutting issues

4. Consideration was given to the NZ Aid Programme's mainstreamed and cross-cutting issues, including human rights, gender equality, and conflict prevention and peace building. The Stocktake used a consultative approach and was conducted in a professional and ethical manner to comply with the Development Assistance Committee (DAC) Stocktake Quality Standards.

Procedures used to analyse data

5. The Stocktake Matrix used to guide data analysis is set out in **Annex 2** to the Stocktake Report. The Stocktake Matrix sets out the stocktake criteria, key questions and specific sub-questions which are intended to elicit information to against those criteria. The Stocktake Matrix also identifies the primary data sources and data collection methods/tools. The Secretariat was rated against a scale of 1 to 6 for each criterion where evidence was available. Primary data analysis methods are also listed in the Stocktake Matrix and key results against each criterion are recorded in the Stocktake Matrix. Preparatory reading provided key information which was used to formulate questions for interviews, the PICP members' survey questionnaire, WAN questionnaire, and information gathering. Information and opinions elicited from interviewees was triangulated and cross-checked against other information, both written and oral, elicited during the field work, and assumptions verified with interviewees. Some subsequent meetings were conducted for clarification on particular points. The interview schedule was flexible to allow these important follow-up meetings. The Stocktake was conducted using an evidence-based approach to all stages including data-analysis. Findings, conclusions and recommendations were demonstrably evidence-based (both quantitative and qualitative) and triangulated and are presented in a clear and transparent manner.

Stages in analysis including confirmation of accuracy of data

6. Assumptions made about information provided during interviews were checked with interviewees to validate the correctness of those assumptions. The correctness of assumptions made or judgements was verified by cross-checking with other sources (including primary sources). The answers to the PICP members' survey questionnaire provided valuable opportunities to verify assumptions made during interviews. Information sources included the Secretariat's reports, progress reports, completion reports, exit reports produced by Secretariat staff, internal reports, reports and documentation from MFAT and NZ Police. Some performance data was available from MFAT, NZ Police and the Secretariat.

7. Judgments and conclusions were evidence-based and made following robust analysis, and a cross-checking of quantitative and qualitative data. Quantitative data was cross-checked against as many data sources as possible (multiple reports, interviews, and questionnaire). Qualitative data was also be cross-checked against as many data sources as possible; interview techniques were adopted which ensured that qualitative information obtained during interviews could be verified, either through a dot point summary, or through an oral summation and clarification of understandings and assumptions made during the interview. The PICP members' survey questionnaire and the WAN survey were intended to serve to cross-check qualitative information. Given that the sample universe of the PICP members' survey questionnaire and the WAN

questionnaire were small (7 and 5 responses, respectively), the value attributed to survey results is not determinative. These were used for triangulation, and when added together with other information contributed to the drawing of conclusions on which judgements were made.

Appropriateness of analyses to stocktake questions

8. Analysis of information obtained through the stocktake process centred on drawing conclusions about relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, and sustainability of the Secretariat. Stocktake questions were designed to elicit maximum information from stakeholders. An expanded set of stocktake criteria was designed to maximise coverage of the Stocktake so that triangulation and cross-checking could take place to answer the key Stocktake questions.

Information gaps, data analysis weaknesses and challenges

9. The key information gap which affected the results of this Stocktake was the absence of comprehensive baseline data which could have provided a snapshot of the situation prior to MFAT's support to the Secretariat, and aided assessment of effectiveness and efficiency of the Secretariat's operations. No specific baseline data collection activity was conducted by NZ Police, including when moving to the re-designed expanded role/structure of Secretariat and when developing the Strategic Plan 2004-2007. The PICP also did not request baseline data be compiled at the time of approval of the Strategic Plan. Further, a baseline activity for the MFAT support to the Secretariat was not conduct, and the MFAT support, through the NZ Police, was not pitched in terms of conventional development approaches. The quality of baseline data presented challenges to the Stocktake's assessment of achievements against the Stocktake criteria.

ANNEX 4: SCHEDULE OF TASKS, ACTIVITIES AND DELIVERABLES

Date	Activity	MFAT	Consultant
28/04/2011	Commencement		✓
01/05/2011	Consultant travels from Sydney-Wellington		✓
2-6/05/2011	Briefing in Wellington	✓	
7/05/2011	Consultant travels Wellington to Sydney		✓
9-13/05/2011	Review of documents and preparation of Stocktake Plan		✓
13/05/2011	Submission of draft Stocktake Plan to MFAT		✓
18/05/2011	MFAT provides feedback on draft Stocktake Plan	✓	
20/05/2011	Consultant Incorporates MFAT feedback into Stocktake Plan and resubmits to MFAT		✓
22/05/2011	Consultant travels from Sydney-Wellington		✓
23/05-03/06/2011	Stocktake field work: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Conduct research; Conduct interviews with Wellington-based stakeholders; Conduct telephone interviews using MFAT telephone resources; Analyse data, including check for accuracy of data. 		✓
4/06/2011	Consultant travels Wellington to Sydney		✓
18/03-12/04/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Conduct outstanding interviews by telephone; Conduct outstanding research. 		✓
13-18/05/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Analyse information elicited; Draft Stocktake Report. 		✓
20-30/06/2011	Consultant engaged with PJDP, monitoring PJDP activities in Rarotonga, Cook Islands.		✓
1/07/2011	Presentation of Aide Memoire to MFAT (en route back from PJDP PEC Meeting in Cook Islands)	✓	✓
02/07/2011	Consultant travels Wellington to Sydney		✓
4-15/07/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Analyse information elicited; Draft Stocktake Report. 		✓
15/07/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Submit first draft of Stocktake Report 		✓
18/07/2011	MFAT commences peer review of Draft Stocktake Report	✓	
03/08/2011	MFAT approves Draft Report	✓	
04/08/2011	MFAT commences consultations with stakeholders on Stocktake Report	✓	
10/08/2011	Consultant travels Sydney to Wellington (contingency)		✓
11/08/2011	Final Stocktake Report debrief (contingency)	✓	✓
13/08/2011	Consultant travels Wellington to Sydney (contingency)		
15/08/2011	MFAT provides consolidated feedback on Stocktake Report	✓	
15-20/08/2011	Consultant finalises Stocktake Report		✓
20/08/2011	Submission of Final Stocktake Report to MFAT		✓
23/08/2011	Consultant travels Sydney to FSM (contingency)		✓
24/08/2011	Consultant presents Stocktake Report to PICP membership (contingency)		✓
25/08/2011	Consultant travels FSM to Sydney (contingency)		✓

ANNEX 5: DESCRIPTION OF THE PICP AND THE SECRETARIAT

PICP Background

1. The Pacific Islands Chiefs of Police (PICP), formerly known as the South Pacific Chiefs of Police Conference (SPCPC), is a non-profit organisation made up of 21 police services in the Pacific (including Australia and New Zealand (NZ)), represented by their Chiefs or Commissioners of Police. The PICP works in line with its Three - Strand Strategy²⁰ to enhance and improve policing in the Pacific. The PICP Secretariat, formerly the SPCPC Secretariat, is the operational body of the PICP.

PICP Vision Statement

Safe and secure communities for all Pacific Island countries.

PICP Mission Statement

To continuously improve standards within the policing profession and, through collaboration between members, to vigorously and effectively represent the policing interests of all Pacific Island Countries both within and beyond the Pacific Region.

PICP Membership

2. Membership is open to National Police Services of Pacific Island countries and territories. Currently, there are 21 members: American Samoa, Australia, Cook Islands, Federated States of Micronesia, Fiji (currently suspended), French Polynesia, Guam, Kiribati, Marshall Islands, Nauru, New Caledonia, NZ, Niue, Commonwealth of Northern Mariana Islands, Papua New Guinea (PNG), Palau, Samoa, Solomon Islands, Tonga, Tuvalu and Vanuatu. Within member countries and territories, there are more than 75,000 serving police officers.

PICP Structure and Governance

3. Historically, NZ Police provided some secretariat services to the SPCPC on a small scale. In 2003, NZ Police sought to strengthen the PICP and its Secretariat and developed a Strategic Plan 2004-2007. The PICP Secretariat was established in 2004/05. It is hosted by the NZ Police at its Head Quarters in Wellington. It is not a legal entity. The Secretariat staff are recruited by and appointed on NZ Police contracts. At a governance level, the PICP meets annually. Previously, a SPCPC Secretary position reported to the Police Chiefs at the annual conference, and a SPCPC Working Group (comprising of a small number of PICP representatives) oversaw the work of the Secretariat. However, this group was disestablished, and the SPCPC Secretary Position was renamed Executive Director in 2004/05 and empowered to make decisions on behalf of the PICP. NZ Police undertake performance reviews of the PICP Secretariat Executive Director and staff. Administration for the PICP is the responsibility of the PICP Chairperson and the permanent Secretariat. The PICP Chairperson is the Commissioner or Head of Police of the country which hosted the latest annual Conference. The Chairmanship is rotated annually and the Office of Chairperson is held until the next annual Conference. The permanent positions within the current PICP Secretariat structure include:

- Executive Director;
- Secretariat Officer;
- Senior Projects Officer;

²⁰ PICP Strategic Direction 2009 – 2014.

- Executive Support Officer.

4. The Secretariat is staffed by NZ Police members who fill the positions of the Executive Director, Secretariat Officer, and the Executive Support Officer roles; and the Australian Federal Police (AFP), who second a staff member to fill the Senior Project Officer position within the PICP Secretariat. The PICP Secretariat structure also includes provision for two 12-monthly Project Officer Positions (to be sourced from the Pacific) and a fixed-term Business Planning and Monitoring Officer (BPMO) position.²¹

Secretariat Outputs and Implementation Strategies

5. The Secretariat is expected to have the following outcomes and outputs:

- Area 1: Support the PICPs and Conference.
- Area 2: Management of Projects.
- Area 3: Effectively represent the PICP and its members' interests in the region and international environments.

Under Area 1: Support the PICPs and Conference:

- PICP Secretariat will monitor the implementation of the PICP Strategic Direction and provide updates to members, 2-3 times per year, by email, website and other mediums; and prepare an annual report to the PICP Conference.
- Answer formal requests for information.
- Deliver the annual PICP Conference.

Under Area 2: Management of Projects:

- A key part of the rationale for the establishment of the PICP Secretariat in 2004/05 was to deliver a comprehensive project management role for members (i.e. more than organising a conference). However, the PICP Secretariat has moved away from a major project delivery role over recent years.
- The decisions regarding inception, continuation, or termination of projects are taken by the Chiefs of Police at the Conference (on the basis of recommendations in papers presented by the PICP Secretariat to Police Chiefs).

Under Area 3: Representation and Cooperation:

- The PICP Secretariat notes that they have been mandated by the Chiefs of Police to represent them at a wide variety of regional and international fora.

Implementation Strategies

6. The Secretariat was established to service the needs of PICP members as described above. The PICP charter includes the promotion of efficiency, effectiveness, capability and integrity of all aspects of policing in the South Pacific Region.²² One area of interest to the Stocktake was the capacity development approach which the Secretariat, through support of the NZ Police, took. For

²¹ This position was set up as a fixed-term position by the PICP Secretariat to enable a review of internal staffing efficiencies to be undertaken due to overlaps in functions between the Executive Director, Secretariat Officer, Executive Support Officer, and the BPMO positions. The PICP-S was unable to complete its internal review, and the PICP-S requested the stocktake consider this.

²² Updated 20 December, 2003 for review at 33rd SPCPC.

example, in a July 2004 Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) between MFAT (then NZAID) and the NZ Police²³ key tasks and responsibilities of the NZ Police were described as:

- To provide effective Secretariat support to the SPCPC;
- To provide effective and appropriate support to SPCPC members according to priorities and interests identified at the SPCPC 2003;
- Furtherance of the SPCPC strategic plan and implementation plan for 2004-2007 through consultation with members and other key stakeholders; and
- Liaison with relevant regional and national level institutions and programmes on behalf of SPCPC to ensure police interests are represented at a regional level.

7. The Stocktake provided an opportunity to assess the degree to which the NZ Police, in hosting the PICP, and with support of the AFP, has provided PICP member representatives with capacity development opportunities, including opportunities to represent PICP at regional fora. Similarly, the processes for identification of projects, their delivery, monitoring and budget planning and expenditure will also be examined. For example, annual work planning processes and the degree to which PICP membership is consulted and involved in the identification and development of projects will be explored. Finally, the effectiveness of the PICP's delegation of a monitoring role to the PICP-S, which is also tasked to deliver projects, will also be explored.

8. On the back of the examination of the PICP-S structure and operations options for alignment of the PICP-S with regional organisational architecture will also be explored. In particular, exploration of whether housing the PICP-S regionally would provide increased cost efficiencies and the potential for increased involvement of and buy-in from other key regional partners, such as the AFP, will be balanced against the benefits which have accrued to PICP member representatives, particularly in terms of access to capacity development opportunities afforded through proximity to the NZ Police in Wellington where the PICP-S is hosted. This will require examination of whether such capacity development opportunities have been afforded and their uptake, together with the outcomes of this access.

PICP-S links with GoNZ development framework

9. The focus of New Zealand's approach to development since 2009 has been is on sustainable economic development and on the Pacific. This focus is a shift from the previous focus of the New Zealand government during 2003-2008 (i.e. elimination of poverty). The mission of the New Zealand Aid Programme (since 2009) is defined as:

“to support sustainable development in developing countries, in order to reduce poverty and to contribute to a more secure, equitable, an prosperous world.”²⁴

10. The New Zealand Aid Programme has four priority themes which are intended to guide it in stimulating sustainable development: (i) investing in economic development; (ii) promoting human development; (iii) improving resilience and responding to disasters; and (iv) building safe and secure communities. The Stocktake will explore the degree to which the MFAT support to the

²³ MoU between The New Zealand Agency for International Development and New Zealand Police regarding South Pacific Chiefs of Police Conference (SPCPC) Secretariat Support, dated July 2004, p5.

²⁴ International Development Policy Statement, p2.

PICP-S aligns with, and is a **priority** for, continued support in particular under the current and ongoing focus of the New Zealand Aid Programme²⁵.

Phasing of MFAT support to PICP-S and significant changes

11. The Stocktake will explore the phasing of MFAT support to the PICP-S since 2004/5, including annual approved budgets, any variances, and the expenditure rates and reporting on project expenditure. Strategic direction, annual planning and budget planning processes will be examined, as well as MFAT-NZ Police documentation, such as MoUs, which set out the anticipated expenditure. A comparison of administration costs against activity costs will be conducted to contribute to testing efficiency of the PICP-S' activities, and to feed into Value for Money analyses. Significant changes in funding will be assessed alongside PICP-S activities, for each year, and cross-checked against actual results for individual projects. Changes to PICP-S' mandate, as provided by the PICP members through annual conference processes will also be taken into account.

PICP-S key projects

12. The PICP-S has responsibility for the implementation of a number of projects on behalf of the PICP. Some projects involve the delivery of training or capacity development of PICP member services' police officers, for example the Women's Advisory Network (WAN) and the Pacific Patrol Boat (PPB). The Stocktake will view the WAN and the PPB as key PICP projects involving the delivery of training. Other types of projects involve the development of guidelines for instance, the Use of Force (UoF) project and Youth Strategies Project. Yet others involve a 'facilitation' role by the PICP-S, for example, the Armouries project. Results will be examined as against funding allotments. Circumstances underpinning the continuation of 'projects or activities' over one or more years by PICP-S (eg Youth Project) where they could not be completed for instance, due to competing priorities will also be explored with a view to exploring efficiency of PICP-S project management. Preliminary reading suggests that the PICP membership has reduced the role of the PICP-S in managing projects in comparison to the role identified in the mid-2000's. Exploration of the PICP-S structure and operations with respect to this project management role (albeit reduced) will also be conducted.

Scale of the MFAT support to PICP-S

13. Exploration of the number, type and outcomes of the various projects supported through the PICP-S will be conducted, taking into account the three identified Areas of PICP-S' mandate²⁶. This will provide a picture of the scale of MFAT support to the PICP-S since 2004/5, with a view to contributing to a Value for Money analysis of the MFAT investment in the PICP-S.

PICP-S resources

Financial Resources

²⁵ For instance, taking into account the relative priority of the regional initiative, whether support for the full operating costs of the Secretariat vs targeted support for specific project component (eg WAN) would better represent the priority and VFM for the NZ Aid Programme.

²⁶ Specific consideration would be given to the key activity areas (1-3 above) in relation to the extent to which they represent value-added services by PICP-S against use of taxpayer funds, and which activity types (e.g. provision of training vs development of guidelines) represent a genuine value added service by PICP-S for the PICP.

14. MFAT provided initial funding in 2004 in the amount of NZD100,000. It is understood that MFAT's total contribution in the 2009 calendar year was NZD1.075 million, in 2010 NZD0.966 million and in 2011 NZD0.768 million. Funding contributions to the PICP-S by NZ Police (as shown in harmonised PICP-S budget document) will be assessed. Funding contributions by AusAID/AFP since 2004/5 will also be assessed if available. It is recognised that GoNZ has provided the bulk of financial resources support to the PICP-S since 2004/5.

Human Resources

15. The hosting arrangement provided by the NZ Police will also be explored, both in terms of organisational support, as well as sourcing appropriately skilled staff to populate the PICP-S. Consideration of whether job descriptions adequately reflect key functions required to deliver PICP-S activities and whether the skills of the staff recruited against those positions meet requirements will also be explored. Any overlaps in functions in staffing positions (eg Executive Support Officer, Business Planning and Monitoring Officer, Executive Officer and Secretariat Officer) and the bandings they have been set at will also be explored for efficiency gains and identifying how value for money could be improved. Human Resources processes, including recruitment, staff management, performance appraisal, and contracting will also be considered with a view to how value for money and efficiency gains could be made, as well as how Pacific ownership of, and opportunities for their capacity development (including through the PICP-S structure) could be enhanced.

Pacific regional policing development context

16. Pacific Island policing has experienced an environment of social conflict, disparity with traditional law, resource constraints and difficulties in sustaining the gains secured from assistance and development projects. Many Pacific Island policing services struggle with capacity, resources, community acceptance and effective recruiting. As global effects of transnational crime emerge in the Pacific, rule of law issues remain relevant to PIC jurisdictions (as the table below indicates) and additional pressures are placed on national institutions, which are often small, and under-resourced. Poverty throughout the Pacific region continues to present significant development challenges, including booming youth unemployment levels, and the risk of transnational crime, such as people trafficking, terrorism, and drugs. Conventional approaches to policing housed within national jurisdictions, given resources available, do not appear to be sufficient to meet these challenges across a dispersed region. A key area of exploration will be to see whether MFAT resources are appropriately targeted to support the PICP to address key issues which are best dealt with through regional approaches and which are not otherwise receiving support through other regional or bilateral programs. The GoA, through AusAID and the AFP, has contributed to a number of bilateral and bilateral-multi-country law and justice and policing initiatives, including the former Pacific Regional Policing Initiative (PRPI) and the Pacific Policing Development Program (PPDP) initiatives. The relationship of the MFAT support to other support to regional law and justice, including regional policing will be taken into account.

ANNEX 6: PICP MEMBERS' QUESTIONNAIRE

PICP-S Stocktake PICP Members' Questionnaire (Chiefs of Police)

New Zealand's Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade (MFAT) has engaged an external consultant to conduct a stocktake of MFAT's support to the New Zealand Police (NZ Police) which hosts the Pacific Islands Chiefs of Police Secretariat (the Secretariat). MFAT has provided funding to the NZ Police for this purpose since 2004 and the current phase of funding expires on 31 December, 2011. MFAT wishes to assess the overall effectiveness and efficiency of the PICP-S in order to determine whether or not MFAT should continue to support the NZ Police's hosting of the PICP-S through the NZ Aid Programme beyond 31 December, 2011.

The PICP Vision statement is:

Safe and secure communities for all Pacific Island countries.

The PICP Mission Statement is:

To continuously improve standards within the policing profession and, through collaboration between members, to vigorously and effectively represent the policing interests of all Pacific Island Countries both within and beyond the Pacific Region.

The Secretariat has three identified Activity Areas (outputs):

Area 1: Support the PICP and Conference.

Area 2: Management of Projects;

Area 3: Effectively represent the PICP and its members' interests in the region and international environments.

The following survey asks a series of questions about the alignment, extent of contribution by PICP-S to the achievement of PICP outcomes (Impact), relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, extent to which current the Secretariat structure and PICP governance arrangements provide for Pacific ownership of and capacity development opportunities for Pacific Police services, gender equity, and value for money of the PICP Secretariat. While names are requested, all responses will be treated confidentially and respondents will not be identifiable. The majority of questions can be answered by circling a response on a scale from 1-6. The questionnaire is designed to take 30 minutes to answer. If you do not know the answer to a question or it does not apply to your circumstance, either skip that question or simply write "DK" for "do not know" or N/A for "not applicable".

Name of PICP Member: _____

Member police service: _____

Date: _____

Rating scale:

6 = very high / excellent;

Stocktake of the PICP Secretariat
Stocktake Report

5= good;
4= above average;
3=below average;
2=poor;
1 = very low / poor;

Kindly return completed questionnaires **by Friday, 10 June 2011**, directly to Mr. James Mc Govern at the following email: mcdevelopmentservices@gmail.com

Part 1: Alignment

1. Please describe the key aims of your police service's membership of the PICP?
2. Please describe the key benefits to your jurisdiction and to your police service of PICP membership?
3. Please describe the key aims of the PICP?
4. Please describe the key aims of the Secretariat?

Part 2: Extent of contribution by Secretariat to the achievement of PICP aims

5. Thinking about the period from 2004 to present, what were the key activities/projects that the Secretariat did which assisted your police service?

6. Please select one result which the PICP achieved, and describe how the Secretariat specifically contributed to its achievement?

7. How well do you think the Secretariat did in conducting these activities/projects?

1 2 3 4 5 6

8. Since you were appointed as Chief, where you were involved in a specific project, which was delivered by the Secretariat, how well do you think the Secretariat facilitated PICP and/or Pacific Police Services' ownership and buy-in during the conduct of activity planning and design?

1 2 3 4 5 6

9. Thinking about planning, how well do you think the PICP Secretariat facilitated the PICP to conduct planning over this period?

1 2 3 4 5 6

10. The Secretariat has three identified Activity Areas (outputs):

Area 1: Support the PICP and Conference.

Area 2: Management of Projects;

Area 3: Effectively represent the PICP and its members' interests in the region and international environments.

Under which of the three the Activity Areas listed above do you think the Secretariat makes the biggest contribution? **Why?**

Part 3: Relevance

11. How relevant do you think the Secretariat is to the success of the PICP in achieving its aims in each area?

Rating scale: 6 = very high / excellent; 5= good; 4= above average; 3=below average; 2=poor; 1 = very low / poor.						
Area 1: <i>Support the PICP and Conference.</i>	1	2	3	4	5	6
Area 2: <i>Management of Projects.</i>	1	2	3	4	5	6
Area 3: <i>Effectively represent the PICP and its members' interests in the region and international environments.</i>	1	2	3	4	5	6

12. Currently the PICP has a chairperson who is supported by the Secretariat. How well do you think these arrangements meet the needs of PICP members for activities in each area?

Rating scale: 6 = very high / excellent; 5= good; 4= above average; 3=below average; 2=poor; 1 = very low / poor.						
Area 1: <i>Support the PICP and Conference.</i>	1	2	3	4	5	6
Area 2: <i>Management of Projects.</i>	1	2	3	4	5	6
Area 3: <i>Effectively represent the PICP and its members' interests in the region and international environments.</i>	1	2	3	4	5	6

13. As a PICP member, what are the key things you expect from the Secretariat?

Part 4: Effectiveness

14. In terms of oversight of the Secretariat's activities, how effective do you think the current oversight arrangements are for the Secretariat (Chairperson and annual reports to PICP at Annual Conference)?

1 2 3 4 5 6

15. How well does the Secretariat perform the following?

Rating scale: 6 = very high / excellent; 5= good; 4= above average; 3=below average; 2=poor; 1 = very low / poor.			
	<i>Area 1: Support the PICP and Conference.</i>	<i>Area 2: Management of Projects.</i>	<i>Area 3: Effectively represent the PICP and its members' interests in the region and international environments.</i>
Planning			
Budgeting			
Capacity development of Pacific police members in the activities of the Secretariat			
Project monitoring			
Project evaluation			
Reporting			

16. To what degree do you think the PICP has achieved its aims since 2004 in each area?

Rating scale: 6 = very high / excellent; 5= good; 4= above average; 3=below average; 2=poor; 1 = very low / poor.						
<i>Area 1: Support the PICP and Conference.</i>	1	2	3	4	5	6
<i>Area 2: Management of Projects.</i>	1	2	3	4	5	6
<i>Area 3: Effectively represent the PICP and its members' interests in the region and international environments.</i>	1	2	3	4	5	6

17. What were the main challenges that affected the PICP achieving its aims?

18. Achievement of PICP's aims could be characterised as being due to a combination of factors and actors, including:

- a) Individual Pacific members' own contributions;
- b) other activities and programs which AFP or NZ Police provides, such as the former Pacific Regional Policing Initiative (PRPI), Pacific Policing Development Program (PPDP) etc.; and
- c) The contribution of the Secretariat.

Thinking in percentage terms what percentage would you give to Secretariat's contribution to the achievement of the PICP's results, as opposed to other factors and actors?

<i>Area 1: Support the PICP and Conference.</i>	Contribution of other factors and actors: ____/100%. Contribution of the Secretariat: ____/100%.
<i>Area 2: Management of Projects.</i>	Contribution of other factors and actors: ____/100%. Contribution of the Secretariat: ____/100%.
<i>Area 3: Effectively represent the PICP and its members' interests in the region and international environments.</i>	Contribution of other factors and actors: ____/100%. Contribution of the Secretariat: ____/100%.

19. Have there been any unintended consequences (positive or negative) of the Secretariat's approaches? If so, please describe.

20. Any other comment regarding the Secretariat's effectiveness:

Part 5: Efficiency

21. How efficiently did the Secretariat make use of time and resources to achieve the PICP aims in each area?

Rating scale: 6 = very high / excellent; 5= good; 4= above average; 3=below average; 2=poor; 1 = very low / poor.						
Area 1: Support the PICP and Conference.	1	2	3	4	5	6
Area 2: Management of Projects.	1	2	3	4	5	6
Area 3: Effectively represent the PICP and its members' interests in the region and international environments.	1	2	3	4	5	6

22. Please rate the Secretariat's performance in the following areas?

Rating scale: 6 = very high / excellent; 5= good; 4= above average; 3=below average; 2=poor; 1 = very low / poor.			
	Area 1: Support the PICP and Conference.	Area 2: Management of Projects.	Area 3: Effectively represent the PICP and its members' interests in the region and international environments.
How responsive and adaptive is management of the Secretariat to changing needs?			
To what degree does the Secretariat deliver what it promised on time?			
To what degree does the Secretariat deliver what it promised within budget?			
How well is the Secretariat resourced in			

terms of funds and appropriate staffing?			
How well are risks associated with the Secretariat's work managed?			

23. Any other comment regarding the Secretariat's efficiency:

Part 6: Extent to which current Secretariat structure and PICP governance arrangements provide for Pacific ownership of and capacity development opportunities for Pacific Police services

24. To what degree does the Secretariat contribute to improvement of PICP's activities from year to year?

Rating scale: 6 = very high / excellent; 5= good; 4= above average; 3=below average; 2=poor; 1 = very low / poor.						
<i>Area 1: Support the PICP and Conference.</i>	1	2	3	4	5	6
<i>Area 2: Management of Projects.</i>	1	2	3	4	5	6
<i>Area 3: Effectively represent the PICP and its members' interests in the region and international environments.</i>	1	2	3	4	5	6

25. Since 2004, have members of your organisation benefited from capacity development opportunities/training supported by projects managed by the Secretariat? If so, please list the key ones and what the benefits have been?

26. Please describe how you are consulted regarding development of initiatives/projects by the Secretariat?

27. Are there other ways that the Secretariat could promote capacity development within your organisation? If so, how?

28. How well do you think the current Secretariat structure and primary staffing by NZ Police and the AFP (as anticipated in the 2004-2007 Strategic Plan/design) enable capacity development and involvement of Pacific police members in the following areas?

Rating scale: 6 = very high / excellent; 5= good; 4= above average; 3=below average; 2=poor; 1 = very low / poor.						
<i>Area 1: Support the PICP and Conference.</i>	1	2	3	4	5	6
<i>Area 2: Management of Projects.</i>	1	2	3	4	5	6
<i>Area 3: Effectively represent the PICP and its members' interests in the region and international environments.</i>	1	2	3	4	5	6

29. What (if any) changes do you think need to be made to the Secretariat structure and the source of staffing for key positions to promote greater capacity development opportunities and Pacific involvement, and effectiveness, going forward?

30. Any other comment regarding the Secretariat's approach to capacity development:

Part 7: Project Monitoring and Project Evaluation

31. To what degree did the Secretariat facilitate the generation of data and documented results from its activities that were useful to your organisation in each area?

Rating scale: 6 = very high / excellent; 5= good; 4= above average; 3=below average; 2=poor; 1 = very low / poor.						
Area 1: Support the PICP and Conference.	1	2	3	4	5	6
Area 2: Management of Projects.	1	2	3	4	5	6
Area 3: Effectively represent the PICP and its members' interests in the region and international environments.	1	2	3	4	5	6

32. Any other comment regarding the Secretariat's project monitoring and project evaluation activities:

Part 8: Analysis and Learning

33. To what degree were the Secretariat's activities based on previous learning and analysis?

1 2 3 4 5 6

34. To what degree was learning from ongoing implementation and previous reviews (including both internal and external reviews) integrated into the work of Secretariat as it went along?

1 2 3 4 5 6

35. Any other comment regarding the Secretariat's analysis and learning approaches:

Part 9: Sustainability

36. If “sustainability” is defined as “having the ownership, capacity and resources to maintain an initiative following withdrawal of external support”, to what degree do you think the Secretariat takes a sustainable approach to its activities in each area?

Rating scale: 6 = very high / excellent; 5= good; 4= above average; 3=below average; 2=poor; 1 = very low / poor.						
Area 1: <i>Support the PICPs and Conference.</i>	1	2	3	4	5	6
Area 2: <i>Management of Projects.</i>	1	2	3	4	5	6
Area 3: <i>Effectively represent the PICP and its members' interests in the region and international environments.</i>	1	2	3	4	5	6

37. In your view, what are the least sustainable aspects of the Secretariat’s activities?

38. What were the top three factors which affected sustainability of the Secretariat’s work?

- 1.....
- ...
- 2.....
- ...
- 3.....
- ...

39. Should PICP members consider contributing to the costs of the Secretariat to promote better ownership by members and eventual sustainability? Please explain your reasons why/why not.

40. Currently the New Zealand Government (through funding from the NZ Police and the New Zealand MFAT) provides the majority of funding to the Secretariat’s work. What effect do you

think diversification of funding (i.e. seeking funding from UNDP, European Union) would have on financial viability, risk management, and ownership of the Secretariat?

41. Do you have any other comment regarding the Secretariat's sustainability? For example, what do you think PICP members or the Secretariat could do to improve sustainability of PICP Secretariat and its work?

Part 10: Gender Equity

42. To what extent has the work of the Secretariat advanced gender equity within your or other PICP member services, or at least not reinforced existing gender discrimination?

1 2 3 4 5 6

43. If applicable, please provide an example of how the Secretariat has advanced gender equity within your service?

44. To what degree did the Secretariat facilitate the provision of sex-disaggregated data to measure the results of the PICP's work on both men and women? i.e. were reports of training presented with results separated to show the effect of the training on men and women separately?

1 2 3 4 5 6

45. Any other comment regarding the Secretariat's approach to gender equity:

Part 11: Value for Money

46. Thinking about the PICP Secretariat's three Activity Areas, do you think the Secretariat adds value to the PICP's mandate? If so, which areas are the most value-added areas and how does the PICP Secretariat add value?

47. "Value for money" can be defined as:

*"Achieving the best possible development outcomes over the life of an activity relative to the total cost of managing and resourcing that activity and ensuring that resources are used effectively, economically, and without waste."*²⁷

Thinking about the funds which MFAT provides to the Secretariat, what activities that the Secretariat has already implemented do you think represented the best value for money and **why?**

48. Thinking about the Secretariat's Activity Area 2 (Project Management) and taking into account other regional, bi-lateral, and multicounty policing development programs to Pacific Police Services²⁸, in which area do you think the Secretariat adds most value:

- a) identification and research of projects;
- b) development of draft terms of reference for projects;
- c) resource mobilisation (finding funding for projects);

²⁷ Value for Money Guideline, MFAT IDG, last updated 27 October, 2010.

²⁸ provided by Australia (such as the AFP PPDP) and New Zealand (eg Bougainville Community Policing Project, Tonga Police Development Project, Pacific Prevention of Domestic Violence Programme, and the Partnerships for Pacific Policing (3P))

- d) delivering projects (implementing projects, such as delivering training etc.);
- e) monitoring projects (checking that projects are being delivered on time within their terms of reference etc.); and
- f) evaluation of results of projects?

49. Again, thinking about the Secretariat's Activity Area 2 (Project Management) and taking into account other regional, bi-lateral, and multicounty policing development programs to Pacific Police Services, which provider is best placed to develop capacity of Pacific Police services?

- a) Either Australian or NZ Police (bilateral programs/bilateral multi-country programs); or
- b) The Secretariat.

Why?

50. Thinking about future Secretariat activities, and considering that MFAT's financial resources are finite, what kind of activities do you think represents best value for money for the PICP and its members?

51. How well do you think the Secretariat manages financial and human resources to do its work?

Rating scale: 6 = very high / excellent; 5= good; 4= above average; 3=below average; 2=poor; 1 = very low / poor.						
<i>Area 1: Support the PICP and Conference.</i>	1	2	3	4	5	6
<i>Area 2: Management of Projects.</i>	1	2	3	4	5	6
<i>Area 3: Effectively represent the PICP and its members' interests in the region and international environments.</i>	1	2	3	4	5	6

52. Do you think that PICP members should make financial contributions to the Secretariat to help meet its costs?

Yes / No.

Please provide an explanation for your answer.

Part 12: Future Priorities for the Secretariat

53. In your view, what are the three key policing challenges which the Pacific Region is likely to face in the next 3-5 years?

- 1.....
- ...
- 2.....
- ...
- 3.....
- ...

54. Taking into account other regional, bi-lateral, multicounty policing development programs' support to domestic policing responsibilities within PICP member countries, (such as PPDP), as a regional body, what are the three key priorities that the PICP should pursue (through the Secretariat) in the next 3-5 years?

- 1.....
- ...
- 2.....
- ...
- 3.....
- ...

Part 13: Other comments

55. The Stocktake welcomes any additional comments/suggestions regarding the Secretariat for the future.

ANNEX 7: SUMMARY PICP QUESTIONNAIRE RESPONSES

Summary of Responses to PICP Members' Questionnaire²⁹

Part 1: Alignment	
1.	Please describe the key aims of your police service's membership of the PICP?
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Secretariat Maintain professional representation in the region through the PICP; Maintaining relevance in regional law enforcement initiatives through shared 'best practice'; Networking with regional police forces; Change management initiatives; Training opportunities; • Engage within Pacific Policing Partnership; Regional Co-operation opportunities; Contribute to safe/secure Pacific Community • The key aims would be to have support from a wider range of Policing services throughout the pacific. The PICP membership provides an excellent networking tool. Niue is by far the smallest and probably least resourced Police service in the pacific. Membership enables Niue's voice to be heard. • Ensure a network and dialogue between all Pacific Police Chiefs; Develop compatible Pacific approaches to areas such as Training, Operating process, and Sharing of Information. • The Guam Police Department's membership with the Pacific Islands Chief of Police (PICP) aims to embrace and network with other police services in the Pacific region to share and collaborate with one another in our goals to ensure a safer community for everyone involved. • Cooperation and exchanges. • a. (capacity building) - develop knowledge, skill and experience in policing from other PICP member countries; b. sharing of information among members in our fight against transnational crimes & other security threats nationally, regionally and internationally; c. working together with all policing agencies in the region for the safety & security of all communities; d. seeking assistance in terms of resources & capacity development from amongst members who have the capacity to improve and develop smaller agencies with scarce resources.
2.	Please describe the key benefits to your jurisdiction and to your police service of PICP membership?
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Engagement at Executive levels; Broader networking including key stakeholders; PPDVP – DV Unit capacity development; WAN capacity development; • Networking opportunity at executive level; Develop co-operation/operational links; Common issues resolution; Access to donor/partnership forum; • As above without membership to the PICP Niue would not be able to attend many of the conferences that PICP subsidises through the travel fund. Important meetings such as the WAN conference and Police Chiefs conference where Niue staff can meet pacific counterparts and share ideas. • Ensures a "One Pacific" approach to addressing crime impacting on us all; Sharing of new ideas. • One of the key benefits the Guam Police Department has gained as part of the PICP is the networking relationships gained with the other Pacific Islands in the areas of follow-up investigation and a possible future relationship within the forensic arena as our Crime Lab continues its goals to improve and renew its facilities and services. • Exchanges.

²⁹ 20 questionnaires were distributed, with 8 responses received. NZ Police advised it felt the questionnaire was more accurately targeting PICPs and sought agreement not to submit a response. Responses were received from Tuvalu, French Polynesia, Guam, FSM, Niue, Tonga and Nauru.

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • improve knowledge and skills of individuals within each jurisdictions to protect community safety and security; identify potential future leaders of the organisation, equip leaders of each organisation to make sound decisions and timely advice to government; smaller agencies could have access to better intelligence gatherings from other members; smaller agencies would get a share of the resources put into the PICP programs through projects; bigger and wealthy agencies could identify the problems faced by the least developed agencies where they could provide assistance financially or in other ways.
<p>3. Please describe the key aims of the PICP?</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reducing crime and building safer communities in the region; Creating safe and peaceful environment for the Pacific; Ethics & Integrity; Regional Capacity; Development; Regional Cooperation; • Support the Chiefs of Police; Provide a secure/stable regional community; Provide opportunity for training, development capacity and capability building; • I would have thought that was a question for the PICP to answer. But answering on their behalf I would expect that one of the key aims of the PICP is to foster communication from the various Police forces around the Pacific. • No response. • The key aims of the PICP are to: Enhance and improve policing and communication in the Pacific by promoting and providing a voice on law enforcement and social policy concerns; Provide a forum to share information and intelligence to counter transnational crime in the region. • To put the different police services in the Pacific in touch with each other. • working together for safer and secure communities for all pacific Island countries; continuously improve standards within the policing profession, and working closely together to effectively represent the interest of PICP members within and beyond the Pacific region; sharing of resources and knowledge between member countries.
<p>4. Please describe the key aims of the Secretariat?</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support the PICP Chair and members; Manage day to day activities; Provide focal point for communications; Responsible for completing various activities, reporting, networking with key stakeholders; Organising annual conference. • Support to PICP Group; Management of limited project development; Conference Co-ordination/research; PICP Representation; • To support the Chair who heads the PICP and the members; To have co-ordination of day to day activities; To facilitate communication between the various Chiefs and relevant stakeholders. • To support the Pacific Police services; To encourage positive development and ethical delivery of our mandated responsibilities. • The PICP Secretariat is to support the PICP members especially the Chairperson; Manage PICP related projects and activities; Represent the PICP and its members' interest in the region and at international environments. • To facilitate contact between Police services of Pacific countries. • a. provide assistance to all members through projects proposed by each jurisdictions; b represent PICP members' interest in the region and in the international community; c. support the PICP conference; d manage projects for each member country provided funding is available.
<p>Part 2: Extent of contribution by Secretariat to the achievement of PICP aims</p>
<p>5. Thinking about the period from 2004 to present, what were the key activities/projects that the Secretariat did which assisted your police service?</p>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Organising WAN Networking and ongoing capacity development of the WAN • Coordinated annual conferences; Supported WAN Advisory group; Prepared some general policy/procedure docs; Forum Representation; • The PICP has been active in supporting the domestic Violence programme through the PPDVP. The programme for the firearms safe and proper storage of Police firearms throughout a number of Pacific countries (Armoury project); Again as mentioned the assistance with the travel fund is crucial to Niue; Current project using Niue as a pilot for a Cyber Crime initiative. • Women Advisory Network for the advancement of women in policing; Provided armouries for weapons.; Training; A point of contact for advice; Annual conference • In 2009, The Guam Police Department hosted a Pacific Region Chief of Police Conference at the Civil Defense Center in Hagatna, Guam. • N/A. • a. training the trainers under PRPI program; b. series of classroom in-country trainings under PRPI program; c. Training materials provided by PRPI program for training of new recruits; d. Two new Police legislations facilitated under PRPI program; e. Police armoury safe provided under PICP project; f. WAN exchange program under PICP project; e. Use of Force in-country training provided by PICP to maritime personnel. 							
6. Please select one result which the PICP achieved, and describe how the Secretariat specifically contributed to its achievement?							
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No response. • Identified investigative issues for criminal behaviour on cruise ships as jurisdictional problem; Developed and formulated 'guidelines' & SOPS; • Guidelines as to the investigation of incidents on cruise liners. Secretariat did a lot of work facilitating discussion and drafting SOP(s) in conjunction with the Cruise Line industry regarding best practice and jurisdiction policy for these types of incidents. • They built Armouries for my Police Service, Pohnpei State Police and Yap State Police; Facilitated training for my staff. • The Secretariat was able to coordinate the communication for all the Chiefs of the Micronesia Region to come together and collaborate with one another on issues that affected their police departments. • N/A. • PICP Project Police armoury safe: The PICP armoury project provided three safe to the Tuvalu Police which arrived in good order. The safe were put in place and the arms were securely locked in the safe. The safe would of course prolong the life of the arms from the environment and more so could not be easily accessible by anyone unless the key holders to the armoury. The PICP Secretariat Project Officer, Xavier Mara was in the country following up the project. He presented a draft armoury and firearms policy and procedures for us to comment on and get back to them if the draft is ok with us. I thank him for the draft policy and procedure which was requested from this side to the PICP. This is the last part of the project and it seems that the project has finally met the need we asked for. 							
7. How well do you think the Secretariat did in conducting these	1 ³⁰	2	3	4	5	6	%

³⁰ **Rating scale:** 6 = very high / excellent; 5= good; 4= above average; 3=below average; 2=poor; 1 = very low / poor.

activities/projects?				√√√	√√√	√	91.2% ³¹ (5.4) ³²
8. Since you were appointed as Chief, where you were involved in a specific project, which was delivered by the Secretariat, how well do you think the Secretariat facilitated PICP and/or Pacific Police Services' ownership and buy-in during the conduct of activity planning and design?	1	2	3	4	5	6	%
				√	√√	√√	91.2% (5.4)
9. Thinking about planning, how well do you think the PICP Secretariat facilitated the PICP to conduct planning over this period?			√	√	√√	√	88.8% (4.9)
10. The Secretariat has three identified Activity Areas (outputs): Area 1: <i>Support the PICP and Conference</i> ; Area 2: <i>Management of Projects</i> ; and Area 3: <i>Effectively represent the PICP and its members' interests in the region and international environments</i> . Under which of the three the Activity Areas listed above do you think the Secretariat makes the biggest contribution? Why?							
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Area 3 – by being focal point and representation of PICP at appropriate level. • Area 1:-logistical exercise – easy to do; • Area 1: This from Niue perspective as previously mentioned if it were not for the Secretariat Niue Police service would be seriously isolated from the rest of the Pacific • Area 3, i choose this as the Secretariat is very hard working for the interests of the PICP and its members. For example, the FSM now have three armouries built. • The Guam Police Department has in the past assisted in facilitating trainings such as in the fields of Family Violence. This conference was held in Guam in 2009 and was facilitated with New Zealand Police and members of the Guam Police Department. In 2010, a member of the Guam Police Department and a member of the Non-profit group, Erica's House, presented at a Family Violence Conference facilitated by the PPDVP in Fiji on how our department works hand in hand with NGOs to ensure that victims' needs are met. The activity areas that the Secretariat has contributed the most are Area 2 and Area 3, where the Secretariat has utilized our resources to assist the other members of the PICP. In turn, these activities have also enhanced and expose members of our department to other cultural aspects and attitudes that may help in addressing possible similar issues on Guam. • Area 2. • All areas: Since I came into Office in July 2010 I attended the PICP conference in Brisbane. Travel arrangements for me were excellent. Two PICP Secretariat staff was at the airport and drove me to my hotel. During and after the conference Secretariat staff provided all courtesy protocols until my departure to Tuvalu. 							

³¹ This value represents the total score in percentage terms. It is calculated by adding the totals for each value and dividing by the total possible value for the question, and presented in percentage terms. i.e. for the first question under the Relevance category, the percentage value is calculated as follows: $4 \times 1 + 5 \times 7 + 6 \times 8 = 87$. The total possible value is 6×16 (there were 16 responses) = 96. Therefore $87/96 \times 100 = 90.6\%$.

³² This value represents the average score for the number of participants who responded to this question. It is calculated by dividing the percentage value by the number of responses. i.e. for the first question under the Relevance category, the percentage value of 90.6% divided by 17 respondents = 5.4.

<p>Management of projects which the former Commissioner has put forward such as the armoury and the WAN exchanged program were successful and thus provided benefits to this organisation. In regards to area 3, I had an opportunity to meet representatives from international policing agencies such as the International Association of Chiefs of Police where we discussed their links and connections to PICP and that they have recognised and take onboard the PICP interests. The PICP is also represented at their annual conference.</p>							
Part 3: Relevance							
11. How relevant do you think the Secretariat is to the success of the PICP in achieving its aims in each area?	1	2	3	4	5	6	%
<i>Area 1: Support the PICP and Conference.</i>				√√	√√	√√√	
<i>Area 2: Management of Projects.</i>			√	√√	√√	√√	
<i>Area 3: Effectively represent the PICP and its members' interests in the region and international environments.</i>			√	√√	√√√	√	
12. Currently the PICP has a chairperson who is supported by the Secretariat. How well do you think these arrangements meet the needs of PICP members for activities in each area?	1	2	3	4	5	6	%
<i>Area 1: Support the PICP and Conference.</i>				√√	√√√√	√	
<i>Area 2: Management of Projects.</i>			√√	√	√√√	√	
<i>Area 3: Effectively represent the PICP and its members' interests in the region and international environments.</i>			√	√	√√√√	√	
13. As a PICP member, what are the key things you expect from the Secretariat?							
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No response. • Co-ordination of region based activity such as annual conference; Advisory papers containing options in relation to policy development; Research activity; Training & development opportunities; Major incident support; • Effective Communication and realistic concepts that fit the pacific police model; Providing a steering arm for the various Chiefs in the pacific about projects that will benefit both the community and the local police service. • No response. • A few key things that, as a PICP member, I would expect from the Secretariat is communication possibly on what projects or activities that the Guam Police Department and its members may be able to utilize in achieving the goals of the PICP in our community. Also, in turn, we, as a police department, would be willing to network and collaborate with other countries who may have needs that we can provide for and vice versa. • Keep in contact. Collaboration. • To provide capacity development programs and suitable projects which small countries like Tuvalu could not afford to do due to financial constraints and unavailable resources. 							
Part 4: Effectiveness							

14. In terms of oversight of the Secretariat's activities, how effective do you think the current oversight arrangements are for the Secretariat (Chairperson and annual reports to PICP at Annual Conference)?	1	2	3	4	5	6	%
				√	√√√	√	79.6% (4.4)
15. How well does the Secretariat perform the following?							
Area 1: Support the PICP and Conference.							
Planning	1	2	3	4	5	6	%
				√	√√√	√	79.6% (4.4)
Budgeting				√√	√	√√	
Capacity development of Pacific police members in the activities of the Secretariat				√√√√	√		
Project monitoring				√√	√√	√	
Project evaluation				√	√√√	√	
Reporting				√	√√√	√	
Area 2: Management of Projects.							
Planning	1	2	3	4	5	6	%
			√	√	√√	√	79.6% (4.4)
Budgeting			√			√√√	
Capacity development of Pacific police members in the activities of the Secretariat			√√	√√√			
Project monitoring			√	√√	√	√	
Project evaluation			√		√√√	√	
Reporting			√		√√√√		
Area 3: Effectively represent the PICP and its members' interests in the region and international environments.							

Planning	1	2	3	4	5	6	%
			√	√	√√√		79.6% (4.4)
Budgeting			√√		√	√√	
Capacity development of Pacific police members in the activities of the Secretariat			√	√√√	√		
Project monitoring			√	√	√√	√	
Project evaluation			√	√	√√	√	
Reporting			√	√	√√√		
16. To what degree do you think the PICP has achieved its aims since 2004 in each area?	1	2	3	4	5	6	%
<i>Area 1: Support the PICP and Conference.</i>				√√	√	√	
<i>Area 2: Management of Projects.</i>			√	√√	√		
<i>Area 3: Effectively represent the PICP and its members' interests in the region and international environments.</i>			√	√√	√		
17. What were the main challenges that affected the PICP achieving its aims?							
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Personnel; Leadership; Co-ordination; • Geography is huge across the Pacific; at best the Chiefs are able to get together once a year to discuss relevant issues. When the culture equation is factored in then at best there may be 72 hours spent in productive dialogue about what the Chiefs are looking to focus on for the ensuing 12 months of the year. One of the challenges the PICP faces is ensuring the resolutions that the Chiefs have come up with at the PICP conference are followed through with. Having been on Niue for two years and having attended two Chiefs conferences the communication from the Secretariat to the PICP has been improved and is a valuable tool. • Funding, particularly with the aspect of International Engagement. • Don't know. • Don't know. • a. limited funding to execute projects; b. short staffing to provide trainings; c. relevant resources unavailable; d. depends on political will and major donor funding; e. Global financial crisis. 							
18. Achievement of PICP's aims could be characterised as being due to a combination of factors and actors, including: a) Individual Pacific members' own contributions;							

b) other activities and programs which AFP or NZ Police provides, such as the former Pacific Regional Policing Initiative (PRPI), Pacific Policing Development Program (PPDP) etc.; and c) The contribution of the Secretariat. Thinking in percentage terms what percentage would you give to Secretariat's contribution to the achievement of the PICP's results, as opposed to other factors and actors?							
<i>Area 1: Support the PICP and Conference.</i>	0-25	26-50	51-75	76-100			%
			√	√√√√			
<i>Area 2: Management of Projects.</i>			√√√	√√			
<i>Area 3: Effectively represent the PICP and its members' interests in the region and international environments.</i>			√√	√√√			
19. Have there been any unintended consequences (positive or negative) of the Secretariat's approaches? If so, please describe.							
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No Response. • Don't know. • No. • No. • None with the Guam Police Department. • Don't know. • N/A. 							
20. Any other comment regarding the Secretariat's effectiveness:							
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Needs strong leadership. • No. • No, I'm happy with what they do. • No. • Don't know. 							
Part 5: Efficiency							
21. How efficiently did the Secretariat make use of time and resources to achieve the PICP aims in each area?	1	2	3	4	5	6	%
<i>Area 1: Support the PICP and Conference.</i>				√	√	√√√	
<i>Area 2: Management of Projects.</i>			√	√	√√√		
<i>Area 3: Effectively represent the PICP and its members' interests in the region and international environments.</i>			√	√	√√√		

22. Please rate the Secretariat's performance in the following areas?							
Area 1: Support the PICP and Conference.	1	2	3	4	5	6	%
How responsive and adaptive is management of the Secretariat to changing needs?				√	√√	√√	79.6% (4.4)
To what degree does the Secretariat deliver what it promised on time?				√	√√√√		
To what degree does the Secretariat deliver what it promised within budget?				√	√√√	√	
How well is the Secretariat resourced in terms of funds and appropriate staffing?			√	√√√	√		
How well are risks associated with the Secretariat's work managed?				√	√√	√	
Area 2: Management of Projects.	1	2	3	4	5	6	%
How responsive and adaptive is management of the Secretariat to changing needs?			√		√√√	√√	
To what degree does the Secretariat deliver what it promised on time?			√	√√	√	√	
To what degree does the Secretariat deliver what it promised within budget?			√		√√√√		
How well is the Secretariat resourced in terms of funds and appropriate staffing?			√	√√	√√		
How well are risks associated with the Secretariat's work managed?			√		√√√		
Area 3: Effectively represent the PICP and its members' interests in the region and international environments.	1	2	3	4	5	6	%
How responsive and adaptive is management of the Secretariat to changing needs?			√		√√√	√	
To what degree does the Secretariat deliver what it promised on time?			√		√√√	√	
To what degree does the Secretariat deliver what it promised within budget?			√	√	√√√		
How well is the Secretariat resourced in terms of funds and appropriate staffing?			√√	√	√√		

How well are risks associated with the Secretariat's work managed?			√		√√√		
23. Any other comment regarding the Secretariat's efficiency?							
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Very welcoming – nice people. Are they effective? • No response. • No. • No. • No comments. 							
Part 6: Extent to which current Secretariat structure and PICP governance arrangements provide for Pacific ownership of and capacity development opportunities for Pacific Police services							
24. To what degree does the Secretariat contribute to improvement of PICP's activities from year to year?	1	2	3	4	5	6	%
<i>Area 1: Support the PICP and Conference.</i>				√	√√	√√	
<i>Area 2: Management of Projects.</i>			√		√√	√√	
<i>Area 3: Effectively represent the PICP and its members' interests in the region and international environments.</i>			√		√√	√√	
25. Since 2004, have members of your organisation benefited from capacity development opportunities/training supported by projects managed by the Secretariat? If so, please list the key ones and what the benefits have been?							
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Yes - Secondments to project development in PICP HQ; Report writing, analysis, networking skills enhancement; • Not in my term but one of my officers was seconded and worked at the Secretariat for a six month term; Niue Police as a whole directly benefited from the Armoury project. • Yes – WAN; Armouries; Transnational Crime Unit. • Yes – The Women's Advisory Network has positively benefited the female population of this department by allowing them the opportunity to attend the PICP-WAN Conferences and giving them insight in issues that are particular to them coming from likeminded individuals of the same region. In turn, this exposure has supported and helps address their concerns in a conducive environment. This conference has also inspired the women of the Guam Police Department in creating their version of the WAN with a female law enforcement organization they have named "Guam Women in Policing." This organization will be structured as a non-profit organization to help address issues that have in relation to this field and will be opened to the female civilian employees of this department and also other law enforcement agencies and their civilian counterparts. • No. • a. Training of our new selected recruits; b. provide training for the trainers – 2 qualified; c. provided opportunity for police personnel to undergo studies at tertiary level – 3 personnel graduated with BA in Pacific Policing and currently serving the Police Service; d. provided training materials for new recruits/supervisors level; e. assisted in drawing strategic plan for our Police Service; d. 2 new police legislation been passed by parliament since 2009. 							

26. Please describe how you are consulted regarding development of initiatives/projects by the Secretariat?							
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • During Conferences or as appropriate through email. • Email. Occasional paper. • Generally via email requesting feedback as to whether the project is applicable to the country. • Phone and Email and at the Annual Conference. • Contact with the Secretariat would usually be through email, which is a successful method and also through phone calls between the Chief's Office and his personnel. • By email. • a. Through emails and also sometimes visiting our country to discuss initiatives and projects; b. good opportunity was during the PICP Conference. 							
27. Are there other ways that the Secretariat could promote capacity development within your organisation? If so, how?							
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Through more linkages with donor countries/groups to maximise opportunities particularly for smaller countries/organisations. • Better research products; Better options delivery. • In terms of Niue no as we already have a close relationship with NZPOL through the International deployment Group. As a NZPOL officer my position is funded thru NZAID and NZPOL with the goal of capacity building a local into the C.O.P role. • No, the annual conference is the ideal forum. • The Secretariat can help in promoting the types of training and how some procedures are handled within each police organization for comparison. This will help in gaining an insight with what may work or address a present issue that may be a obstruction in a particular police department or agency. Other ways can be to avail each police department what services or training may be available by the PICP, other police departments, or organizations that may help benefit them. • Don't know. • a. provide refresher training for supervisors level; b. leadership skills; c. Investigation of serious crime (financial fraud, drug related cases, forensic experts etc..). 							
28. How well do you think the current Secretariat structure and primary staffing by NZ Police and the AFP (as anticipated in the 2004-2007 Strategic Plan/design) enable capacity development and involvement of Pacific police members in the following areas?	1	2	3	4	5	6	%
<i>Area 1: Support the PICP and Conference.</i>					√√√	√√	
<i>Area 2: Management of Projects.</i>			√	√	√	√√	
<i>Area 3: Effectively represent the PICP and its members' interests in the region and international environments.</i>			√	√	√	√√	
29. What (if any) changes do you think need to be made to the Secretariat structure and the source of staffing for key positions to promote greater capacity development opportunities and Pacific involvement, and effectiveness, going forward?							
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide more opportunities for smaller pacific countries senior management to engage in PICP Secretariat activities. 							

- Independent Executive Director; More flexibility to bring in short term consultants;
- None spring to mind.
- They are in a strong position as a voice and lobby group to engage with donors such as AFP-PPDP and NZPolice.
- Possibly allow more staffing with other pacific islands region within the Secretariat structure to help in promoting greater capacity development opportunities with Pacific involvement and effectiveness.
- Don't know.
- No comments.

30. Any other comment regarding the Secretariat's approach to capacity development:

- Secretariat may require to be more proactive especially for smaller pacific nations and organisations.
- No.
- No.
- No.
- None.
- Don't know.
- No comments.

Part 7: Project Monitoring and Project Evaluation

31. To what degree did the Secretariat facilitate the generation of data and documented results from its activities that were useful to your organisation in each area?	1	2	3	4	5	6	%
<i>Area 1: Support the PICP and Conference.</i>				√√√	√	√	
<i>Area 2: Management of Projects.</i>			√	√√	√	√	
<i>Area 3: Effectively represent the PICP and its members' interests in the region and international environments.</i>			√	√√√		√	

32. Any other comment regarding the Secretariat's project monitoring and project evaluation activities:

- No response;
- No;
- No response.
- No.
- None.
- No.
- No Comments.

Part 8: Analysis and Learning							
33. To what degree were the Secretariat's activities based on previous learning and analysis?	1	2	3	4	5	6	%
				√√	√√	√	
34. To what degree was learning from ongoing implementation and previous reviews (including both internal and external reviews) integrated into the work of Secretariat as it went along?				√√	√√	√	
35. Any other comment regarding the Secretariat's analysis and learning approaches:							
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No response. • No. • No response. • No. • Not at this time. • No comment. 							
Part 9: Sustainability							
36. To what degree did the Secretariat facilitate the generation of data and documented results from its activities that were useful to your organisation in each area?	1	2	3	4	5	6	%
<i>Area 1: Support the PICP and Conference.</i>		√	√		√√	√	
<i>Area 2: Management of Projects.</i>		√	√	√	√√		
<i>Area 3: Effectively represent the PICP and its members' interests in the region and international environments.</i>		√	√	√	√√		
37. In your view, what are the least sustainable aspects of the Secretariat's activities?							
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No response. • Project management. • Probably in Area 3. • Don't know. 							
38. What were the top three factors which affected sustainability of the Secretariat's work?							
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No response. • Inconsistent Project Management; Lack of accuracy in research; Leadership drive – words more than actions. • Geography; Turnover of staff both within Secretariat and amongst the senior staff of the various members of the PICP; Lack of commitment from some members 							

<p>of the PICP.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Nothing – their approach is supporting and not directive – they work with what we need and can sustain. • Consultation, listening, supportive. • 1 limited funding to support projects and to engaged staff; 2 no lead agency to facilitate and assist LDC member country; 3 limited information sharing in our fight against transnational crime/terrorism etc.
<p>39. Should PICP members consider contributing to the costs of the Secretariat to promote better ownership by members and eventual sustainability? Please explain your reasons why/why not.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Yes and refer to discussions at 38th & 39th PICP Conferences. Whilst the issue of economics is relevant an opportunity to contribute in funding provides for greater ownership by the participating countries/organisations. • Consider it but highly unlikely that members outside Aus/NZ could sustain it. • Good question, yes probably but significantly very few countries I would imagine would support this. Niue would not be able to financially support this nor would it have the political will to do so. • We do fund from our own resources many aspects of our annual conference as the hosting nation; Our current budget limitations would make this very difficult and something else would suffer. • Yes PICP members should contribute to the cost of the Secretariat to promote ownership and mostly importantly to maintain sustainability of the Secretariat in the long run.
<p>40. Currently the New Zealand Government (through funding from the NZ Police and the New Zealand MFAT) provides the majority of funding to the Secretariat's work. What effect do you think diversification of funding (i.e. seeking funding from UNDP, European Union) would have on financial viability, risk management, and ownership of the Secretariat?</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Unable to comment as I do not have visibility of opportunities. • Increase the number of donor partners requiring reporting; Possibly fragment the funding process too much. • Diversification of funding from the sources mentioned brings in differing lines of reporting. If the fear is that the Secretariat gets bogged down in justifying its existence then this would increase tenfold if various other funding streams had to be tapped into. Niue is looking at consolidating its funding approach as its easier to report on. • It would take ownership away from the Pacific Nation and we risk having unsuitable requirements imposed on us. • It would be a great concept but most of the members are already financially strapped within their organization and, though the PICP can and may be able to make a positive effects on its members, to require them to contribute financially may or may not limit their participation in these activities. • That would assist the Secretariat's works and also put additional projects to PICP members. The ownership does not affect if all PICP members contribute to the fund.
<p>41. Do you have any other comment regarding the Secretariat's sustainability? For example, what do you think PICP members or the Secretariat could do to improve sustainability of PICP Secretariat and its work?</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No comment

- Needs to be independent; Secondee's don't always bring right skills just policing background; Buddying system with consultant/PICP member.
- The model they have at present works well.
- It would take ownership away from the Pacific Nation and we risk having unsuitable requirements imposed on us.
- They could benefit by having an increased capacity to travel within the region.
- Funding from any other sources would help and enhance the Secretariat and its work with the PICP and hopefully be able to generate more projects to accomplish their goals and vision.
- It is suggested that we need other donors to assist the PICP fund to ensure sustainability of the Secretariat's works and add more projects to promote developments of policing agencies within the region.

Part 10: Gender Equity

42. To what extent has the work of the Secretariat advanced gender equity within your or other PICP member services, or at least not reinforced existing gender discrimination?	1	2	3	4	5	6	%
				√	√√	√√√	

43. If applicable, please provide an example of how the Secretariat has advanced gender equity within your service?

- Provide advice with WAN issues.
- Provided support to WAN development.
- My service was very gender equal in any event but the continued support from the Secretariat in relation to the WAN conference is a good example.
- WAN; Surveys.
- The PICP-WAN with the assistance and guidance of the Secretariat has helped gender equity by allowing female officers to address their concerns and issues in a male dominated organization. Though they do not seek preferential treatment over their male counterparts, they do wish to have an equal standing with them and hence the promotion of gender equity in the Guam Police Department.
- The good example is the WAN program.

44. To what degree did the Secretariat facilitate the provision of sex-disaggregated data to measure the results of the PICP's work on both men and women? i.e. were reports of training presented with results separated to show the effect of the training on men and women separately?	1	2	3	4	5	6	%
		√	√	√	√	√√	91.2% (5.4)

45. Any other comment regarding the Secretariat's approach to gender equity:

- No response.
- No.
- No.
- Recent HIV/AIDS survey was most useful.
- There should be more statistics to show how well gender equity has affected police departments by collecting statistics to show gender diversity or disparities

<p>within each organization. This would give the members of the PICP how each organization fairs with gender equity and assist in addressing it.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • WAN exchange program 		
<p>Part 11: Value for Money</p>		
<p>46. Thinking about the PICP Secretariat's three Activity Areas, do you think the Secretariat adds value to the PICP's mandate? If so, which areas are the most value-added areas and how does the PICP Secretariat add value?</p>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Yes. As previously mentioned providing the focus and coordination. • Yes it does add value but previous comments outline my views. • Yes, Answers previously discussed. • Without the Secretariat there would be no PICP; Sadly, we in the Pacific are not good at communication and the PICP gives us a way to improve this. • No comment. • No comments. 		
<p>47. "Value for money" can be defined as: "Achieving the best possible development outcomes over the life of an activity relative to the total cost of managing and resourcing that activity and ensuring that resources are used effectively, economically, and without waste."³³ Thinking about the funds which MFAT provides to the Secretariat, what activities that the Secretariat has already implemented do you think represented the best value for money and why?</p>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I am unaware of MFAT level of contribution – unable to comment. • WAN Support; Secondment Support. • No response. • Conference and Projects. • Unknown. • In my case the Armoury project because it has keep our arms safely from the deteriorating environment. This has prolong the life of our arms and thus save our budget in the next 10 or so years. 		
<p>48. Thinking about the Secretariat's Activity Area 2 (Project Management) and taking into account other regional, bi-lateral, and multicounty policing development programs to Pacific Police Services³⁴, in which area do you think the Secretariat adds most value:</p>		
		%
a) identification and research of projects;	√√√	
b) development of draft terms of reference for projects;	√	
c) resource mobilisation (finding funding for	√	

³³ Value for Money Guideline, MFAT IDG, last updated 27 October, 2010.

³⁴ Provided by Australia (such as the AFP PPDP) and New Zealand (e.g. Bougainville Community Policing Project, Tonga Police Development Project, Pacific Prevention of Domestic Violence Programme, and the Partnerships for Pacific Policing (3P)).

projects);							
d) delivering projects (implementing projects, such as delivering training etc.);	√						
e) monitoring projects (checking that projects are being delivered on time within their terms of reference etc.); and	√						
f) evaluation of results of projects?	√						
49. Again, thinking about the Secretariat's Activity Area 2 (Project Management) and taking into account other regional, bi-lateral, and multicounty policing development programs to Pacific Police Services, which provider is best placed to develop capacity of Pacific Police services?							
Provider							%
a) Either Australian or NZ Police (bilateral programs/bilateral multi-country programs); or	√√√						
b) The Secretariat.	√						
Why?							
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ensure focus for wider pacific representation • Bilateral or tripartite programs provide best option for success. i.e. Aus/NZ – Secretariat should provide support to those bilateral programmes. • Again from a Niue view point we already enjoy a close working relationship with NZPOL in terms of capacity building of the staff that will lead to a local successor. Other projects are more suited to the work of the secretariat such as the Cruise liner initiative and the Armoury project. • <i>Don't know which provider is the best to develop capacity of Pacific Police Services.</i> 							
50. Thinking about future Secretariat activities, and considering that MFAT's financial resources are finite, what kind of activities do you think represents best value for money for the PICP and its members?							
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Unable to comment as no visibility of extent of MFAT financial resources or need for rationalisation of funding. • Develop leadership options; Ethics & Integrity; Regional Co-operation; Need to enter into "Change Management". • The facilitation of the yearly meetings WAN and PICP chiefs conference alone are incredibly important. The Secretariat is guided by the PICP through the input of the chiefs as to what projects they should focus on to the betterment of the pacific. • Conference; Surveys; Coordination of activities; Transnational Crime Unit Management. • Projects and capacity development. 							
51. How well do you think the Secretariat manages financial and human resources to do its work?	1	2	3	4	5	6	%
<i>Area 1: Support the PICP and Conference.</i>					√√√√	√	
<i>Area 2: Management of Projects.</i>			√	√	√√	√	

Area 3: Effectively represent the PICP and its members' interests in the region and international environments.			√	√√	√	√	
52. Do you think that PICP members should make financial contributions to the Secretariat to help meet its costs? Yes / No. Please provide an explanation for your answer.							
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Yes. Previous response but it has to be relative to the size and economic status of the country/organisation. • No. Only NZ/AUS other countries can't sustain it. • Yes. And we do through the travel fund subscription. • No. We simply do not have the budget capacity to do at this time. • Yes. Everyone should contribute. • PICP Secretariat is an agency that represented the interest of its members regionally and internationally so PICP members should contribute a fair share depending of what it can offer to the Head office that is doing all the works for the benefit of individual member countries. 							
Part 12: Future Priorities for the Secretariat							
53. In your view, what are the three key policing challenges which the Pacific Region is likely to face in the next 3-5 years?							
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Refer PICP Strategic Direction 2009-2014. • Leadership Development – Sustainable Capacity Dev; Ethics and Integrity – Change Management; Regional Cooperation – Business Continuity Secretariat Support. • Disaster Management, through increasing adverse weather events; Population diversity and the further involvement of transitional crime figures; Population displacement throughout the Pacific. • Increased youth population and associated crime; Environmental changes and impact; Impact of Cyber Crime. • Drugs; domestic violence. • 1 Financial and resources constraints; 2 Transnational crimes is growing wider in the region; 3 modern technologies have pose threats and is also ahead of police capability. 							
54. Taking into account other regional, bi-lateral, multicounty policing development programs' support to domestic policing responsibilities within PICP member countries, (such as PPDP), as a regional body, what are the three key priorities that the PICP should pursue (through the Secretariat) in the next 3-5 years?							
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Refer PICP Strategic Direction 2009-2014. • Technical development of staff; Ethical behaviours; and Regional Cooperation. • Transnational Crime; 2Disaster Risk Assessment and evaluation; Youth Welfare initiatives. • Education development of Police members; Ethics Training; Effective communications portal between all pacific agencies. • 1 assists member country to put in place relevant domestic legislations, 2 provide training and equipment to police agencies in that area; 3 assist policing agencies to promote domestic awareness program to the population 							
Part 13: Other comments							

55. The Stocktake welcomes any additional comments/suggestions regarding the Secretariat for the future.

- The Secretariat may consider be more proactive in area of police training particularly in providing leadership with Recruit/Investigation programs as there appears to be a gap in bi-lateral programs.
- No.
- No response.
- No response.
- No further comments and thank you for your time.

ANNEX 8: WAN QUESTIONNAIRE

PICP-S Stocktake WAN Questionnaire

New Zealand's Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade (MFAT) has engaged an external consultant to conduct a stocktake of MFAT's support to the New Zealand Police (NZ Police) which hosts the Pacific Islands Chiefs of Police Secretariat (the Secretariat). MFAT has provided funding to the NZ Police for this purpose since 2004 and the current phase of funding expires on 31 December, 2011. MFAT wishes to assess the overall effectiveness and efficiency of the Secretariat in order to determine whether or not MFAT should continue to support the NZ Police's hosting of the Secretariat through the NZ Aid Programme beyond 31 December, 2011.

The PICP Vision statement is:

Safe and secure communities for all Pacific Island countries.

The PICP Mission Statement is:

To continuously improve standards within the policing profession and, through collaboration between members, to vigorously and effectively represent the policing interests of all Pacific Island Countries both within and beyond the Pacific Region.

The Secretariat has three identified Activity Areas (outputs):

Area 1: Support the PICP and Conference.

Area 2: Management of Projects;

Area 3: Effectively represent the PICP and its members' interests in the region and international environments.

The attached survey asks questions about the WAN and its activities. While names are requested, all responses will be treated confidentially and respondents will not be identifiable. The questionnaire is designed to take 15 minutes to answer. If you do not know the answer to a question or it does not apply to your circumstance, either skip that question or simply write "DK" for "do not know" or N/A for "not applicable".

Name: _____

Country: _____

Date: _____

Kindly return completed questionnaires **by Friday, 10 June 2011**, directly to Mr. James Mc Govern at the following email: mcdevelopmentsservices@gmail.com

Thank you for your cooperation with this Stocktake process.

ETAT DES LIEUX DU PICP-S QUESTIONNAIRE POUR LES MEMBRES DU WAN

Le Ministère des Affaires Étrangères et du Commerce Néo-zélandais (MFAT) a engagé un consultant extérieur afin d'effectuer un « état des lieux » sur le soutien offert par le MFAT à la Police Néo-Zélandaise, qui héberge le Secrétariat des Chefs de Police des Iles du Pacifiques (le Secrétariat). Le MFAT a contribué au financement du Secrétariat à cet effet depuis 2004 et ce financement expirera le 31.12.2011. Le MFAT souhaite évaluer globalement l'efficacité et le rendement du Secrétariat afin de décider si le MFAT continuera de contribuer à financer le Secrétariat, via le fond d'aide du programme néozélandais, après le 31.12.2011.

La déclaration de vision du PICP est :

Saines et stables communautés pour tous les pays des Iles du Pacifiques.

La déclaration de mission du PICP est:

De constamment améliorer les standards relatifs à la profession policière et, à travers la collaboration de ses membres, de représenter vigoureusement et efficacement les intérêts de la police dans tous les pays des Iles du Pacifique autant à l'intérieur qu'à l'extérieur de la région pacifique.

Le Secrétariat a identifié trois secteurs d'activité (rendement):

Secteur1: *Soutien du PICP et son conférence.*

Secteur 2: *Gestion des projets.*

Secteur 3: *Représentation efficace du PICP et des intérêts de ses membres dans la région et dans des environnements internationaux.*

Le sondage ci-dessous pose une série de questions au sujet du WAN et ses activités. Alors que vos noms sont requis, toutes les réponses seront traitées confidentiellement et les participants ne seront pas identifiés par la suite. Quinze minutes devraient suffire pour remplir le questionnaire. Si vous ne connaissez pas la réponse à une question ou si la question n'est pas applicable à votre situation, passez à la question suivante ou écrivez « SP » pour « ne sais pas » ou « NA » pour « non applicable ».

Nom : _____
Pays : _____
Date : _____

Échelle d'évaluation :

- 6 Très distingué, excellent
- 5 Bon
- 4 Au-dessus de la moyenne
- 3 En dessous de la moyenne
- 2 Pauvre
- 1 Très bas/pauvre

Veuillez compléter et renvoyer le questionnaire directement à M. James Mc Govern à l'adresse suivante au plus tard le vendredi 10 Juin 2011: mcdevelopmentservices@gmail.com

Merci pour la compréhension.

1. Please describe the key aims of the WAN?

Veillez décrire les objectifs principaux du WAN ?

2. Please explain why you participate in the WAN?

Veillez expliquer pourquoi vous participez au WAN ?

3. What is the most significant/important element of the WAN's activities?

Quel est élément le plus significatif/le plus important des activités du WAN ?

4. In addition to the opportunity to participate in the WAN annual conference what other opportunities does the WAN provide to you or your police service?

En plus de l'occasion de participer à la conférence annuelle de WAN quelles sont les autres occasions que le WAN fournisse à vous ou à votre organisation policière ?

5. If you have received training through the WAN please indicate what the training was about and how the training assisted you?
Si vous avez reçu la formation par le WAN indiquez svp ce qu'était la formation et comment la formation vous a aidé ?
6. What are the biggest challenges faced by women in your police service?
Quels sont les plus grands défis relevés par des femmes dans votre organisation policière ?
7. How well has the WAN assisted to address issues faced by women in the police in your country?
À quel point le WAN a-t-il aidé pour aborder des issues faites face par des femmes dans la police dans votre pays ?
8. Are you involved in other women-focussed activities supported by other donors (i.e. through the New Zealand Aid Programme, AusAID, the AFP, EU)? If so how?
Êtes-vous impliqué dans d'autres activités focalisées sur les femmes soutenues par d'autres donateurs (c.-à-d. par le programme de développement de la Nouvelle Zélande, AusAID, AFP, UE) ? Si oui, comment?

9. How do you rate the quality of the PICP Secretariat's work in supporting the WAN?

Comment évaluez-vous la qualité du travail du secrétariat de PICP en soutenant le WAN ?

(Rating scale:

6 = very high / excellent; 5= good; 4= above average; 3=below average; 2=poor; 1 = very low / very poor.)

Échelle d'évaluation :

6=Très distingué, excellent; 5 = Bon; 4 = Au-dessus de la moyenne; 3 = En dessous de la moyenne; 2 = Pauvre; 1 = Très bas/très pauvre.)

1 2 3 4 5 6

10. Do you have any suggestions about what the Secretariat could do to improve the WAN and its effectiveness?

Avez-vous des suggestions au sujet de ce que le secrétariat pourrait faire pour améliorer le WAN et son efficacité ?

ANNEX 9: WAN QUESTIONNAIRE RESULTS SUMMARY

The table below sets out the responses received to the WAN questionnaire. A total of five responses was received:

<p>1. Please describe the key aims of the WAN?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No response. • The PICP-WAN solely existed as an advisory group to the chiefs on matters relating to women in pacific policing including promoting gender equity, enhancing working conditions for women and introducing programs that upgrade skills and knowledge. A strategic plan for the PICP-WAN had embraced these issues and tabulated activities and tasks as a solution to the given matters, as follows: The PICP-WAN has three key aims. Pacific police agencies support women in policing through improved policies and procedures and better ethical standards. Greater levels of regional cooperation between women in policing. An expanded and strengthened women's network throughout Pacific policing. • To receive requests from women's delegations and liaise with police hierarchy to respond. Support and improve the working conditions of women in Pacific Island Countries. Find equality in terms of materials and human resources between different Pacific Island countries. Facilitate exchanges between countries. • Establishing a local WAN in all jurisdictions. • WAN aims to address issues pertaining women in law enforcement; to help women in law enforcement understand and strive for better work ethics. To maintain professionalism in the work place and learn from other female officers.
<p>2. Please explain why you participate in the WAN?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To enhance my knowledge on the roles of women police officers in the Pacific countries and to represent my country in the WAN. • I participated in WAN because fighting for the betterment of working conditions for women in pacific policing needed a corporate force. It required a body of women to come together to voice their needs and also able to generate some solution to solve their problems. • To meet others and compare working conditions in other countries. Gaining knowledge and experience due to exchanges. • I participated with the PICP-WAN as part of an assignment but continue on because I believe in their vision of gender equality and the networking necessary for women to be able to survive in a male dominated career. • I participate because I feel we need WAN to understand and learn from one another. Women Advisory Network has given us that opportunity to get to know each other and address issues that affect us women in law enforcement and how to address these issues.
<p>3. What is the most significant/important element of the WAN's activities?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Open forum discussion where we came together to share each other's grievances and be part of it. • The most significant element of WAN activities is the conducting of annual conferences where its members come together annually and report on progress on their activities and their achievements they achieved as a group. It is also a good opportunity for women in policing to discuss issues of concern and able to have the elected chairperson to present these concerns to the Chiefs of Police conference (PICP). • Support for women delegations to different countries with a view to reaching equality of conditions for women in the police and facilitating exchanges to try to meet these objectives. • Providing the PICP-WAN conference and the networking and activities associated with it. It helps develop and support the members. • The most important element of WAN is the togetherness we share after each conference. The role of women in law enforcement that can be discussed and shared

with others so that we can learn and benefit from them.
4. In addition to the opportunity to participate in the WAN annual conference what other opportunities does the WAN provide to you or your police service?
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Relationship – we have built our relationship throughout the Pacific countries and have come to understand some of their rituals, cultures and traditions during the short meet. • Other opportunities that the WAN provide is the chance of having the exchange program where women are able to travel and study in a foreign country on a subject of interest to upgrade skills/knowledge and or based on need of the police agency in a specific field. • Don't know. • The PICP-WAN was able to provided support to the female officers in our police department and helped support our issues by being a bridge to our Chiefs. Being that our department had gone through a few in a couple of month's time, Mr. Potaka was able to continue our mission and have it addressed with our Chiefs whenever it was difficult for our members to do so. • Getting to know other delegates from other countries and being able to discuss these issues with fellow WAN members and collaborate on them.
5. If you have received training through the WAN please indicate what the training was about and how the training assisted you?
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No. Haven't received any. • I have participated in the first six exchanges to study Gender Equity. This opportunity gave me insights that GE is a regional phenomenon and that it required collective support to push for equality in the workplace. It also indicated that women needed to be passionate about it in order to stay in track of this fight to equality in terms of opportunities and benefits. Having such knowledge had strengthened me to keep on pushing for what is good all women in my workplace and at the same time keeping in track with our organisation vision "Be a leader in policing" in every facets of policing. • N/A. • WAN provided me training with writing a Police Executive Summary, especially when required after attending a conference. • Haven't had the pleasure but hopefully sometime in the near future.
6. What are the biggest challenges faced by women in your police service?
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Culture - Fiji is a multi-cultural society and we have to respect each other's culture, protocols, norms of doing things. • The biggest challenges faced by women in my police service is the attitude/mentality of our male counterparts that our abilities are limited to domestic roles (administration support). As a result they failed to see the potential of women. Currently, big changes happened and more women are now engaged and investigations and other filed police work e.g., attending calls, police raids, crime scenes, police operations just to name a few. • Heading more than 100 police officers by a Commander; heading night time patrols by a Lieutenant and integration of women into the Anti-Crime Brigade. • The biggest challenges that are faced by the women in our department would still be having to individually address gender inequality, even in small forms or doses of it. Overall and on the surface, gender equality is present but we still have to deal with individual male attitudes that still occur. • We have been fortunate to come from a small island with leaders who understand that women do have the right to achieve and maintain higher positions in our work place but our most challenges is to achieve these goals with determination and efforts.
7. How well has the WAN assisted to address issues faced by women in the police in your country?
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We have formed a women's area network unit whereby we meet and discuss issues pertaining women officers every 3-6 months. • The WAN is a strong body in my police service as it also has the support of the PICP Secretariat. Its activities are supported by the Commissioner and the Executive. Activities such as establishing of a Family friendly room for all members of the Samoa Police. This project will be implemented in July 2011.

- N/A.
- One way the WAN has assisted was to ensure that we addressed the needs of having a local WAN on our island. This is still our biggest challenge considering we would like to motivate more participation and hopefully are doing so by finalizing the WAN Organization we have started establishing late last year.
- It has been improving since a female took over Deputy Director position and our new leaders in the police force are open to all discussions to help each and every one of us achieve our goals.

8. Are you involved in other women-focussed activities supported by other donors (i.e. through the New Zealand Aid Programme, AusAID, the AFP, EU)? If so how?

- No I am really looking forward for one. We are the future leaders of the Fiji Police Force and will be assets later if we attend and broaden our knowledge through this initiative.
- No.
- N/A.
- Not at this time.
- Yes. (No further information provided.)

9. How do you rate the quality of the PICP Secretariat's work in supporting the WAN? (Rating scale: 6 = very high / excellent; 5= good; 4= above average; 3=below average; 2=poor; 1 = very low / very poor.)	1	2	3	4	5	6
					√√	√√√

10. Do you have any suggestions about what the Secretariat could do to improve the WAN and its effectiveness?

- Maybe if we could have forums every 6 months; Regular contacts with the participants would be much appreciated; Visitations to countries that are deeply distressed; Lastly I would like to thank the PICP WAN for giving me an opportunity to be part of the forum last year; I look forward for it again in years to come.
- Yes, I do have some suggestions that the Secretariat should be able to visit country's that has problems with their local networks and conduct at least one day workshop to discuss problems. Secondly, last year the conference was hosted by Samoa Police and we arranged for keynote speakers locally as requested by the Secretariat and after each speaker, the PICP-WAN did not present a small gift as a token of appreciation for the local speakers that accepted our invitation to deliver in our conference. From a pacific perspective, it is very rude not to give anything as a symbol of appreciation of something that was done. At least a plaque with the name of the organisation as a gift for all the important speakers. I guess that all i can think of now but hopefully there will be better ideas from other sisters in the uniform in the pacific.
- Employ and interpreter to facilitate exchanges between countries.
- More modern police training and others that the females in my region may participate in.
- At the moment, no! Dave Pakota has been great and very supportive. I know that each conference cost lots of money to arrange but (only a suggestion) since we travel far to these places, could it be possible to have a day of tour of these places, especially the police station where the conferences takes place.

ANNEX 10: LIST OF REFERENCE MATERIALS

PICP Secretariat – General

- Pacific Islands Chiefs of Police Constitution reprinted 2005 to incorporate resolutions of the 2005 Conference.
- Contact details for other Pacific Organisations (OCO, PIDC, PIFS, PILON).
- Pacific Islands Chiefs of Police Contact List as at 5 April, 2011.
- WAN Contact List.

PICP Secretariat Job Descriptions

- Executive Director, January 2011.
- Executive Support Officer – SPCPC (SPCPC-OoC), draft, undated.
- Secretariat Officer, PICP, 12 April, 2011.
- Business Planning and Monitoring Officer 2008.
- PICP Secretariat Organigramme, undated.

Strategic Plans

- Future Directions In Pacific Policing, Volume One (Beyond 2010) and Volume Two (Ethics & Integrity Reference Material), PICP Secretariat [date?].
- South Pacific Chiefs of Police Conference (SPCPC), Strategic Plan 2004-2007 – Safe and Secure Communities for the South Pacific, 20 December, 2003.
- Pacific Islands Chiefs of Police (PICP) Strategic Plan 2005-2008, Working Draft, January 2005 (version 17).
- Pacific Islands Chiefs of Police Strategic Direction 2009-2014.
- Business Plan for the Pacific Islands Chiefs of Police (PICP) Secretariat, 19 April, 2005 (Version 1).

Budgets

- 2005/6 Budget (Excel Spreadsheet), 01 July 2005 to 30 June 2006.
- Memorandum from Cam Ronald to Rebecca Spratt, SPSPC Funding through NZAID (NZAID Funding Proposal 2004-2006), [date?].
- NZAID Funding Proposal 2004-05 Jan 05 (Old).
- NZAID Funding Proposal Version 4 – SPSPC Funding Through NZAID By 05/01/05, dated 17 December, 2004.
- NZAID Invoice 21 June 2005.
- South Pacific Chiefs of Police (SPCPC) - Pacific Islands Chiefs of Police (PICP), Recovery of costs incurred in the delivery of Secretariat Support under the MoU between NZ Police and NZAID, dated 8th April 2005 (NZAID Invoice Details to 30 June 2005, version 2).

- Letter from Secretariat Officer P.M. Stevens to Supt Cam Ronald re Unpaid Invoice, dated 1 August, 2005.
- NZPOL-NZAID Combined 0607, version 28 September, 2006, 11 October, 2006.
- Pacific Islands Chiefs of Police 2005/2006 Budget (PICP 05-06 Budget Forecast).
- PICP 05-06 Funding Proposals, versions 1 and 2.
- PICP 05-06 Funding Proposal – Final (version 5).
- PICP Secretariat 2005/2006 Budget – Overall, versions 1 & 2, 5 August, 2005.
- PICP Secretariat 1 January to 31 December 2008 Budget (Overall funding matrix with WAN & Appraisal), version 1.
- PICP Budget Projection 2008 to 2009 - Summary.
- PICP Budget Projection 2008 to 2010 - Summary.
- Pacific Islands Chiefs of Police (PICP) Secretariat NZAID contributions only, Expenditure forecast to 30 June 2007 (budget recast April June 2007).
- 2007/2008 Business Plan for the Pacific Islands Chiefs of Police (PICP) Secretariat (PICP Business Plan 2007-2008 Final).
- Pacific Islands Chiefs of Police (PICP) - 2007/08 Budget (PICP Business Plan final).
- PICP Covering Letter to NZAID for 2008-2009 Letter of Variation, Pacific Islands Chiefs of Police (PICP) - application for continued funding for the Period 1 January – 31 December 2009, dated 16 October, 2008.
- PICP Covering Letter to NZAID for 2008 Letter of Variation, Pacific Islands Chiefs of Police (PICP) - application for continued funding for the Period 1 January – 31 December 2008, dated 19 November, 2007.
- Pacific Islands Chiefs of Police Statement of Financial Performance for period 29 July 2004 - 30 June 2005.
- PICP Reimbursement NZD387.45, undated.
- PICP Stakeholder 2011 (Excel Spreadsheet).

PICP Projects ToRs

2005

- Country Profiles, 22 December, 2004.
- Transnational Crime Statistics 2004, 5 January, 2005.
- Dot Points for Discussion at the PICP Secretariat Retreat 10 June 2005.
- Pacific Islands Firearms Safety Awareness Handbook, January 2005.
- SPCPC Newsletter and Web Page, January 2005.
- UN Peacekeeping - participation of SPCPC members, January 2005.
- Pacific Islands Police Peacekeeping Operations - A Cost Benefit Analysis, May 2005.

2006

- Founding and Empowering Legislation, 16 August, 2006.
- Terms and Conditions of Service, 16 August, 2006.

2007

- FFA Information Sharing, 25 October, 2007.
- Patrol Boat Project – Year 2, 25 October, 2007.
- PICP Newsletter and Brochures, 17 November, 2007.
- PKO Post-Mission Management, 25 October 2007.
- Police Armories Project, 25 October, 2007.
- Use of Force Project, 25 October, 2007.

2009

- Police Armories Project – Year 2, 10 October, 2008.
- Carnival Australia, Cruise Ships, 10 October, 2008.
- Information Management & Data Collections Scoping Visits, ToRs.
- Patrol Boat Project – Year 3, 10 October, 2008.
- Use of Force Project – Year 2, 10 October, 2008.

2010

- Police Armories Project – Year 3, 18 September, 2009.
- Strategic Utility of the Future Directions In Pacific Policing (FDIPP) Y2, September 2009.
- Carnival Australia, Cruise Ships, 18 September, 2009.
- Deportees, 18 September, 2009.
- Pacific Fingerprint Assessment and Accreditation, 15 September, 2009.
- Pacific Heads of Training, 25 September, 2009.
- Pacific Patrol Boat Project – Year 4, 16 September, 2009.
- Use of Force Project - Year 3, 18 September, 2009.

2011

- Pacific Police Armouries Project - Year 4, September, 2010.
- Disaster Management Plan Review, September, 2010.
- Pacific Regional Information Management Project, September, 2010.
- PICP Women's Advisory Network, September, 2010.
- Deportees' Project, September, 2010.
- Pacific Patrol Boat Project, 27 September, 2010.
- Youth Project, September, 2010.

- Project Reports 2002-2010, PICP Secretariat.³⁵

WAN

- WAN Constitution, 2005.
- WAN Constitution, adopted 2011.
- WAN Strategic Plan 2010-2013, undated.

³⁵ This was a comprehensive set of materials, covering proposals and conference reports from 2002 to 2010.

- PICP Women in Policing Survey Overall Report and Country Reports for:
 - American Samoa
 - Cook Islands
 - Kiribati
 - Naru
 - Palau
 - PNG
 - Samoa
 - Solomon Islands
 - Vanuatu.

Progress Reports

- PICP Secretariat Activities Report 1 July 2010 to 31 January 2011, including:
 - Appendix A – 6 Month Progress Report on the PICP Women’s Advisory Network Project;
 - Appendix B – M&E Report 2010 as at 31 December 2010.
- SPCPC Strategy – “Work in Progress” - Review at 16 August 2004. Action Plans for Obj#1 Integrity; Obj #2 Communication; Obj #3 Capacity Building; and Implementation Plans, 16 August, 2004.
- PICP Secretariat Memorandum, *PICP – Business Plans Mid-Year Review*, dated 12 January, 2006, (Six monthly review for DC Ops).

MFAT Documents – General

- International Development Policy Statement, MFAT, GoNZ, [date], 2011.
- DAC Stocktake Quality Standards Vs the DAC Stocktake Criteria, [date].
- Quality Standards for Development Stocktake, DAC Guidelines and Reference Series, 2010.
- NZAID Gender Analysis Guideline, 26 October, 2006.
- NZAID Human Rights Mainstreaming Guideline, 6 August, 2009.
- NZAID Pacific Leadership Development Strategy, undated.
- Achieving Gender Equality and Women’s Empowerment, NZAID, May 2007.
- Empowering Women Reduces Poverty, NZAID, undated.
- Human Rights Policy Statement, NZAID, undated.
- Preventing Conflict and Building Peace, undated.
- Pacific Programme for Strengthening Governance Strategic Framework 2006-2008,
- Guideline: Structure of Stocktake and Review Reports Effective from 3 September, 2009.
- Guideline: Value for Money, 27 October, 2010.

MFAT Documents – PICP

- Appraisal of Activity for Pacific Island Chiefs of Police (PICP) Secretariat: funding application for 2011, 6 December, 2010.
- South Pacific Chiefs of Police Conference (SPCPC) Proposal for funding of Establishment Costs of the Secretariat and Implementation of the SPCPC Strategy and Workplans for 2004 – 2005 (Cover Page).

- South Pacific Chiefs of Police Conference (SPCPC) Secretariat – NZAID Related Costs (SPCPC Secretariat Estimated Costs 2003-2004), Funding Matrix, January 2005.
- PICP Secretariat Organigramme, showing funding of posts, undated.
- Appraisal – PICP Project Proposal, SAEG, 22 February, 2007.
- Comments on PICP-WAN Proposal for 2006-2009, Maggie Paterson, Gender Advisor, SAEG, 19 October, 2006.
- Comments on PICP Business Plan 2008/09 and Associated PTAs, Cameron Cowan, SAEG, 23 October, 2008.
- Letter from MFAT Wellington to New Zealand High Commissioner Apia enclosing FDIPP strategy, 7 April, 2008.
- Interim Activities Report, September, 2008 to June 2009, 24 April, 2009.
- MFAT general correspondence on PICP including emails and letters in the period 2005-2011.

ANNEX 11: LIST OF PERSONS CONSULTED

- Ms. Lorraine Kershaw International Legal Adviser, Pacific Islands Forum Secretariat, Suva, Fiji.³⁶
- Superintendent John Van Der Heyden, Acting Executive Director, PICP Secretariat.
- Detective Inspector Dave Potaka, Secretariat Officer, PICP Secretariat.
- Ms. Chris Wilding, Executive Support Officer, PICP Secretariat.
- Mr. Harry Lund, Business Planning and Monitoring Officer, PICP Secretariat.
- Federal Agent Melissa Northam, AFP, Senior Project Officer, PICP Secretariat.
- Police Investigator 1 Mr. Xavier Maras (FSM Police), PICP Project Officer, PICP Secretariat.
- Ms. Ranmali Fernando, Development Manager, IDG, MFAT.
- Mr. Walter Simmen, Simmen & Anderson Consulting, former BPMO.
- Mr. Tony Annandale, former Executive Director, PICP Secretariat.
- Mr. Craig Hawke, Director, IDG, MFAT.
- Mr. Matt Dalzell, Deputy Director, IDG, formerly team leader for Regional Growth & Governance Team.
- Ms. Emma Aitken, former contracts advisor for IDG-PAC.
- Ms. Samantha Keech-Marx, Evaluation Manager, Office of Development Effectiveness, AusAID.
- Mr. Marcus Cox, Team Leader, ODE Evaluation.
- Mr. Mehaka Rountree, Senior Monitoring and Results Advisor.
- Mr. Cameron Cowan, Manager, New Zealand Aid Programme - Timor-Leste (formerly Senior Advisor, Institutional Development, MFAT).
- Ms. Janine Monahan, Senior Policy Advisor, NZ Police, Wellington.
- Mr. Alan Cassidy, Human Resources Manager: Organisational and Employee Development, NZ Police, Wellington.
- Ms. Tracey Ardos, Logistics Support, FSM
- Superintendent Stuart Wildon, Manager, International Service Group, NZ Police, Wellington.
- Ms Melinia Nawadra, Acting Senior Program Manager, AusAID, Fiji.
- Federal Agent Mr. Chris Barnes, AFP Liaison Officer to AusAID in the PNG and Pacific Capacity Development Area, AusAID, Canberra, Australia.
- Chief, Takasy Reim, FSM National Police, FSM Dept. of Justice, Palikir, Pohnpei
- Mr. Cam Ronald, Programme Manager, PPDVP, Wellington.
- Dr Tony Murney, Program Development Adviser, Asia Pacific Civil-Military Centre of Excellence, Canberra, Australia.
- Lieutenant Angelique Sutter, New Caledonia
- Ms. Tracey White, Secretariat Officer, PILON, Apia, Samoa.
- Ms. Lautoa Faletau, Acting Coordinator, PPDP, IDG, AFP, Canberra, Australia.
- Commissioner Tony Negus, AFP, Canberra, Australia.

³⁶ Permission was sought and granted by all participants for inclusion of their names in a list of persons interviewed.

- Assistant Commissioner Frank Prendergast, National Manager IDG (NMIDG), AFP, Canberra, Australia.
- Ms. Smriti Aryal, Regional Program Advisor, UNAIDS RST AP, Bangkok Thailand.
- NZ Police Commissioner Peter Marshall, Wellington.
- Maara Teteva, Chief of Cook Islands Police.
- Ms. Jacquelyn Shannon, Manager: International Strategy and Policy, ISG, NZ Police.
- Sergeant Aldora Mamaia, Samoa Police Service (WAN Exchangee).
- Mr. Tobias Nischalke, Development Manager, IDG, MFAT.