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1. **EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

1.1 **OBJECTIVE OF THE REVIEW**

This review will assess a range of issues involving a governance strengthening initiative. The project, the Pacific Parliamentary Retreat, seeks to address the causes and consequences of democratic weakness in the Pacific. According to the aims of the coordinating agency, the Centre for Democratic Institutions (CDI), the Retreat is designed to bring together Pacific Island parliamentarians to discuss issues of concern and experience the Australian system of governance. The review seeks to assess the impact and effectiveness of this project by analysing the management of the Retreat and the extent to which it has been able to promote mutual learning and encourage networking between Pacific parliamentarians.

First, this review will outline below both the main findings and possible enhancements for this project. Then it seeks to place the evaluation in a historical and academic context and illustrate why certain review methods have been undertaken. Subsequently, the review will explain its methodology and place the Pacific Parliamentary Retreat in its political context. Finally, the evaluation findings will be analysed in more detail and possible enhancements will be suggested.

1.2 **MAIN FINDINGS**

Overall, participants from all four Retreats have rated their experiences extremely positively (see Appendix E). There have been no major negative issues concerning Retreat management and the parliamentarians have rated the program of instruction as useful. In general, it is felt by participants that they have benefited greatly from the Pacific Parliamentary Retreat. However, there are a few areas that could be improved, as participants have consistently indicated. These observations have led to three possible enhancements. The central theme of these suggestions is to do with post-Retreat follow-up initiatives.

First, encouraging participants to reflect on their country specific situations through a one-page fact sheet would help keep the project focused on Pacific problems and would support the application of lessons learned by participants to specific regional dilemmas.

Second, the one-sided gender distribution of the Retreats (see Appendix D) may require further initiatives to focus on increasing female participation. While the issue of gender distribution is a difficult one for the Retreat to solve alone, more targeted learning for female participants during the Retreats may improve skills and their ability to retain their parliamentary seats.

Third, a simple and brief bi-annual or annual mail out of parliamentary updates may cement the lessons learned by participants during the Retreats. This could be supplemented by a simple ‘reading list’ of material that might encourage participants to look more closely at the issues raised in Retreats at a later date, if they so wished.

The above suggestions and the associated findings will be analysed in more depth in section three of this review. However, it is considered necessary to first examine the theoretical context of evaluation and place this process in a wider academic framework before the main findings can be fully analysed.
2. Evaluation as a Theoretical Construct: Its Historical and Academic Context

This first section seeks to place the concept of evaluation within its wider academic framework. First a brief historical survey will chart the origins of evaluation before examining the process in a development context. Then major debates and different forms of evaluation will be investigated to offer an overview of academic discourse on evaluation literature.

The ‘art and science of research paradigms’ has a long history (WKKF 1998:4; Cronbach et al 1981:23-35). However, evaluation first came to prominence in a professional context as a result of the ‘Great Society’ initiative in the USA during the late 1960s (Cronbach et al 1981:30). Large programs funded by the state were implemented to address difficult social problems and there was a gradual call for accountability when these programs did not achieve immediate visible successes. As Michael Patton explains, evaluation arose from the question, ‘[h]ow does one distinguish effective from ineffective programs?’ (1978:12).

With this early emphasis on examining the ‘effectiveness’ of programs, evaluation was used to see whether a program works through emphasis on quantitative data rather than how it can be improved through, for example, better designs. This, as the W. K. Kellogg Foundation (WKKF) argues, has led to, ‘an almost exclusive focus on accountability (prove it works), versus quality (work to improve)’ (1998:5). Organisations (both private and public) must demonstrate to stakeholders and potential funders that programs undertaken are effective and future investment is worthwhile. However, this previous overemphasis on accountability within evaluation has undergone revision in professional evaluation circles, especially when dealing with complex social or community based programs (see below). This can be seen with development evaluation.

Evaluation in the field of development has evolved over the last decade (Lefevre and Garcia 1997:1-20; Hubbard 2000:385; Wood et al 2001:1). Nicoletta Stame explains that while ever ‘the investment model was the developmental paradigm, the task of evaluation was to check the rate of return’ (1999:105). Hence, social cost benefit analysis (calculating net social benefit over cost of the capital required to run the project) became a dominant tool. Like evaluations in the social field the emphasis on evaluations in development as a tool to check donor accountability has shifted to also help improve project implementation. Thus, social cost benefit analysis is now strictly used for projects in stable environments, when it is easy to calculate capital benefits. With many development projects (such as governance strengthening) there are too many ‘intangible’ elements that cannot be easily measured, for example, the exact increase of local knowledge (see Stame 1999).

Subsequently, in the development context evaluation seeks to perform three main functions:

- To improve project or program performance
- To enhance accountability through external reporting
- To provide lessons which assist in the design of new projects

Therefore, evaluation, as defined by both UNDP and DAC is,

a time-bound assessment that systematically and objectively assesses the relevance, performance and success/effectiveness of ongoing and completed programs and projects. The main aim of evaluation is to provide lessons which are incorporated into the decision-making processes of governments and donors (in Cook and Ruiz-Avila 1997:15-16).

---

1 While there were certainly forms of evaluation prior to this, Patton argues that only after the federal expenditures of the 1960s, did evaluation emerge in the form it is today (1978:11-17).

2 see McCaster 1998:4; Cook and Ruiz-Avila 1997:10-11
As a result, evaluation (along with mechanisms to effectively disseminate results)\textsuperscript{3} can be a useful learning process for key personnel and institutions involved in project design, management and policy. Armed now with a better understanding of the origins and meaning of evaluation, both generally and in a development context, it is necessary to investigate evaluation in its wider academic framework.

2.1 Debates within the Evaluation Literature

Within the literature on evaluation a number of broad debates about the advantages and limitations of evaluation are discussed. In the 1970s, it became generally accepted that all evaluation techniques are based on different implicit assumptions that must be taken into consideration whenever a particular method is used (Cronbach et al 1981; Patton 1997; WKKF 1998). As Cronbach et al (1981:16) argue,

\begin{quote}
[s]ome work collect facts, giving hardly a thought to their possible relevance to action. Other collections of potentially significant facts lack the force of evaluation because the facts are not organised and interpreted for use. Still other would-be evaluations are strong on judgment but have no systematic investigation behind them.
\end{quote}

Linked to this is the extent to which the evaluation method used influences the results and data collected. Evaluation work must always take into consideration the political context in which the program or project operates (Cronbach et al 1981:35). As WKKF (1998) explains, ‘[e]valuators must … understand the implications of their actions during all phases of the evaluation’. Therefore, emphasis on statistical data alone will not give a complete picture and furthermore, the interests of the key players or stakeholders must always be considered. As a result of traditional evaluations (often value laden), the extent that evaluators should be an integral part of the program management cycle is an issue of much debate (see Julian et al 1995).

By the 1980s, the political restraints of evaluation were accepted and the aims shifted from laying out the scientific truth behind programs under review to clarification and improvement of programs along with the creation of a ‘synthesis’ of evaluation views (Cronbach et al 1981:52-3). Therefore, evaluation restrictions illustrated that often certain issues remain unanswered if only one approach or method was used. Subsequently, complex social projects that aim to benefit in intangible ways are often too intricate to enable evaluators to establish simple cause and effect relationships. This requires the addressing of ‘impact’ questions (Julian et al 1995:334) as well as a variety of diverse evaluation methods (Connell et al 1995).

In conjunction with the formation of an ‘evaluation community’\textsuperscript{4} in the latter decades of the 20\textsuperscript{th} Century, different approaches to the art of evaluation have developed and offer a variety of ways to analyse and inform project efficiency.

2.2 Different Evaluation Methods

As WKKF explains, ‘[w]hen most people think about program evaluation, they think of complex experimental designs with treatment and control groups where evaluators measure the impact of programs based on statistically significant changes in certain outcomes’ (WKKF 1998:5). An example of such approaches would be cost-benefit analysis.

\textsuperscript{3} For an in-depth analysis of utilization focused evaluations, that effectively disseminate findings see Patton 1978.

\textsuperscript{4} According to Wood \textit{et al} (2001:2) this community consists of methodologists (who develop evaluation methods), evaluation practitioners (who implement these methods) and evaluation managers (who oversee the evaluation process)
However, there are a variety of different approaches to evaluation that can be employed and generally evaluators prefer either qualitative or quantitative methods (Cockerill et al 2000:353). For complex social programs, it is often necessary to use a number of different methods to develop a complete evaluation picture. Furthermore, the purposes of an evaluation can be diverse and therefore affect the method used.\(^5\)

It is therefore necessary to analyse the major approaches to evaluation undertaken by practitioners. These different evaluation methods form the basis of the evaluation literature and often academic discourse attempts to contrast various approaches (Hubbard 2000; Julian et al 1995)

### 2.2.1 Scientific Methods

Scientific evaluation techniques, which originated in medical and science related research, use statistical methods to test hypotheses regarding the programs under evaluation. As Carol Weiss explains,

> [t]here was much hoopla about the rationality that social science would bring to the untidy world of government. It would provide hard data for planning, evidence of need and of resources. It would give cause-and-effect theories for policy making, so that statesmen would know which variables to alter to effect the desired outcomes. (Weiss cited in Patton 1978: 17-18).

Such methods were effective at ascertaining whether programs worked under control conditions by demonstrating causal relationships between outcomes and the mechanisms that produce them. However, in complex social projects these techniques were less effective (Weiss 1995).

### 2.2.2 Interpretivism/ Constructivism

Due to the inability of scientific methods to deal with complex social projects, other techniques have been developed. Interpretivism (or constructivism) is an anthropological model designed to understand rather than explain what is being studied. Hence, its techniques are anthropological in origin, including interviewing and field observations to better describe the processes influencing the target under evaluation. Such methods are linked to feminist models of evaluation that focus on not only gender but also ethnic and minority aspects of cultural groups, chiefly through participant observation and individual interviews. These approaches originate from the insights derived from target values, dynamics and internal relationships.

However, while the participant observer who carries out this methodology attempts complete immersion to understand and document how the program works, it can become a very subjective form of analysis. This approach relies completely on the integrity and ability of the researcher (Rennie and Singh 1996). Furthermore, when the project under evaluation involves time constraints then this technique is not suited to outsiders, usually unfamiliar with the program, being able to quickly review its achievements.

### 2.2.3 Participatory and Community-Based Evaluation

Heavily linked with the approaches revolving around participant observation mentioned above, are a series of techniques that make up participatory research methods. Many of these methods primarily concerned with process design have been adopted for evaluation purposes as well (Webber and Ison 1995; Kapoor 2002), especially for evaluation of community-based projects.

---

\(^5\) Evaluation can be a lessons learned exercise, aid the handing over of project control, be part of the accountability process to stakeholders or simply an exercise in public relations (Kilby 2002)
These approaches encompass a wide range of methods including Rapid Rural Appraisal (RRA) and Participatory Rural Appraisal (PRA).

Cockerill et al define such community-based evaluation as, ‘a philosophy of inquiry that encourages active participation in the evaluation process from all involved communities’ (2000:351). As far as RRA is concerned, it consists of techniques that are designed to give a rough overview of a project under investigation in a short amount of time, hence broad methods are used to collate data from different sources. These methods, developed in the 1970s and 1980s proved a cost-effective way of reviewing a program without the in-depth analysis or time-consuming immersion techniques of participant observation. As Rennie and Singh (1996) argue, these methods ‘ drew on many of the insights of field social anthropology …, emphasised the importance and relevance of situational local knowledge, and the importance of getting the big things broadly right rather than achieving spurious statistical accuracy’.

Nevertheless, while these techniques allow a broad overview they remain based on the opinions of outsiders to the program under review. Such critics of RRA led to a more participatory approach with a stronger activist and empowerment standpoint. While PRA techniques certainly aim to localise programs firmly within the community, there are strong critics of its oversimplification and weak theoretical base considering the complex social change it attempts to affect (Kapoor 2002).

2.2.4 Evaluation as a Management Tool

The final evaluation approach to be analysed in this section is linked to the concept of theory-based evaluation and used primarily as a management tool. Theory-based evaluations (see WKKF 1998:7) aim to compile lesson’s learned through combining an understanding of project processes and project outcome data. Therefore, by emphasising the theory or logic model behind the project the evaluation seeks to understand how the program works.

Such management evaluation tools include the ‘open system evaluation’, which is designed to aid strategic outcomes in social or community-based programs (Julian et al 1995:333). These evaluation techniques rest on the premise that one program will not achieve a measurable community improvement and therefore should not be evaluated as such. Instead, programs should be placed in a wider framework of project goals and strategy to solve community problems, so as Julian et al explain, ‘a number of programs in concert, might produce a change or impact that is measurable at the community level’ (1995:334-5; see also Hubbard 2000). A similar system described by Hubbard (2000) entails comparison of potential and actual impacts on projects. A negative evaluation of project design and implementation ensues if it is found that actual benefits of the project are less than potential benefits.

Evaluation as a tool for management is related to the debate over the relationship between monitoring and evaluation (M&E). Monitoring is a form of ongoing evaluation designed to demonstrate whether or not an initiative is on course. The British NGO Christian Aid defines monitoring as the ‘systematic and continuous assessment of the progress of a project over time’ (cited in Kilby 2002). This allows agency staff to modify programs and ultimately to demonstrate understanding and effectiveness of the program by the managing staff to the multiple stakeholders. M&E is often linked together as one concept by today’s aid agencies such as the UNDP or AusAID (Cook and Ruiz-Avila 1997:8). In the case of benefit monitoring, this is particularly pertinent as here the ‘outputs of the monitoring program are a direct input to post-evaluation’ (Cook and Ruiz-Avila 1997:8).

---

6 Chief amongst them has been ‘triangulation’, which uses multiple tools and techniques to lessen the risk of particular bias affecting findings. Further techniques include direct observation, interviews and questionnaires (CRS 2002).

7 This is linked to ‘benefit monitoring’, which attempts to ascertain whether project outputs are achieving expected benefits on a regular or intermittent basis (see Cook and Ruiz-Avila 1997:14).
2.3 SUMMARY AND REVIEW METHODOLOGY

As has been demonstrated, there are a variety of methods for evaluation that can be employed. As WKKF explains, it is essential during any evaluation to be aware of alternative techniques and to employ various methods where possible and appropriate (WKKF 1998:5-7; CRS 2002). Jeffrey Pinto (2000) goes on to argue that an open environment during evaluation is also required to give these various evaluation perspectives a voice and to allow discussion of the politics, imported values and biases inherent in any review.

As a result, this review of the Pacific Parliamentary Retreats has implemented many of the concepts outlined above and employs a number of methods to achieve an effective evaluation. Documents and Reports of previous Retreats have been assessed as well as the feedback forms of past-participants. In conjunction with this, a questionnaire (see Appendix B) was sent out to all former Retreat parliamentarians in September 2002 asking for their impressions of the Retreat.8 Thus, the initial phase of the review was to assemble as much information as possible about the performance of the project from documentary sources (see Appendix A), questionnaires (see Appendix B), and talking to CDI staff while in Canberra. The second phase of the evaluation spanned one week in November at the 2002 Pacific Parliamentary Retreat in Brisbane (see Appendix C). Here the author based evaluation on personal interviews with Retreat participants and observation of the Retreat management and program at work.

3. THE REVIEW

3.1 INTRODUCTION

As has been described above, the aim of the Retreats is to facilitate a forum for Pacific parliamentarians to discuss issues of common interest while having the opportunity to look at aspects of Australian parliamentary practice. This review endeavours to see whether previous participants of the Retreats found the experience useful and practical. Consequently, it is hoped the data collected for this review may help to improve future Retreats.

The following section seeks to place the Retreats in their political context and further describes the project evolution. The second part explains the main review findings and addresses two questions. First, how well were the Retreats managed and, second, how effective have the Retreats been at meeting their major aims? The final part suggests three possible enhancements based on the data collected from evaluation and past feedback questionnaires, as well as personal observation of the 2002 Pacific Parliamentary Retreat in Brisbane.

3.2 PROJECT CONTEXT

The Pacific Parliamentary Retreat project reviewed below has been implemented against a backdrop of parliamentary crises in the Pacific during the last few years (Fry 2000). The Fiji coup in 2000 and the democratic problems in the Solomon Islands of the same year along with recent

---

8 There was only a medium response to this September 2002 questionnaire.
turmoil in Vanuatu in 2002 have all combined to lead many to question the legitimacy of parliamentary democracy in this region. Furthermore, there has been debate within Melanesia and the wider Pacific as to the validity of the Westminster system and initial investigation into indigenous Pacific models of governance (Larmour 2002).

This political situation outlined above links into a recent emphasis in the development field on the issue of public sector governance in developing countries. The development assistance sector, both government institutions and donors, has focused growing attention on governance strengthening initiatives. This can be seen, for example, in World Bank and ADB governance promotion programs (WB 2001; ADB 2002). Governance strengthening is defined by Kaufmann et al (2000:2) as supporting ‘the traditions and institutions that determine how authority is exercised in a particular country’ and has become synonymous with capacity building. Governance strengthening and capacity building can range from purely technical inputs to a target institution, such as supplying a new financial system to a government agency, through to organisational-level capacity building with its focus on structured programs of governmental change (Green and Battcock 2001:32). Therefore, such projects like the Pacific Parliamentary Retreats, aim generally to bring together people (and organisations), either from the same country or region, to share information and provide more effective institutions. As Kaufman et al (2000) argue, there is a strong, positive casual relationship between governance components and economic development, which provides the justification for such projects.

Within this context, and in line with a major sectoral focus on the parliamentary process, it was decided that the Centre for Democratic Institutions (CDI) could contribute to the governance and parliamentary process strengthening initiatives of the region, by bringing together Pacific Island parliamentarians to discuss issues of concern and experience the Australian system of governance. The project was consistent with the stated CDI approach, ‘to work with present and future leaders and decision makers from developing countries’ (CDI 2002) and by so doing promote mutual learning and encourage networking between Pacific parliamentarians and their Australian counterparts.

Subsequently, the first Retreat was held in Canberra from 22-26 November 1999 and was hosted by CDI in conjunction with the Centre for the Contemporary Pacific at the Australian National University.9 This first Retreat focused on the ways in which systems of parliamentary democracy operate in the post-colonial Pacific (see Appendix C) and brought together 12 parliamentarians from Fiji, New Caledonia, Papua New Guinea (PNG), Samoa and the Solomon Islands.10 Due to the success of this first Retreat it was decided to repeat the exercise in Canberra the following year, again with the support of the Centre for the Contemporary Pacific (Rich, R. pers. comment 2002). The focusing theme of 2000 was the ‘fragility of Westminster Democracy in the Pacific’.

By the time of the third retreat, it was decided to hold the event in Brisbane with the Key Centre for Ethics, Law, Justice and Governance (Griffith University) as the partner organisation. This was particularly beneficial as the focus of the Retreat moved from parliamentary democracy in general to a narrower focus on accountability and integrity. Having the Retreat based in Queensland allowed the participants to see state institutions of accountability at first hand.

### 3.3 Review Findings

Bearing in mind this project context, the Pacific Parliamentary Retreat review took place in two phases. First, CDI documents were analysed and a questionnaire sent out to all past Retreat participants. Second, the author participated in the 2002 Pacific Parliamentary Retreat in Brisbane. Overall, both past participants and those of the 2002 Retreat rated their experiences

---

9 This, and all subsequent retreats, have been partly funded by AusAID.
10 Vanuatu was also invited to the first Retreat but budget discussions prevented the involvement of its participants. For a complete analysis of participant break down see Appendix D.
very positively. The author believes, based on observation and past feedback forms, that the participants themselves were able to learn many useful lessons from the Retreats.

As emphasised above, the participants of the 1999 and 2000 Retreats concluded that the experiences had been very useful for their careers. In 2001 and 2002, particular enthusiasm was noted for the study of Queensland institutions within an accountability framework. Participants especially valued the opportunity to meet with Australian government officials and appreciated the chance to share their experiences with other Pacific colleagues. In so doing, it was felt the accumulated knowledge was given a particular Melanesian and Pacific focus. This enabled simultaneous learning from both Australians and other Pacific islanders experiencing similar problems. As one participant in 2002 explained, ‘it is important that we recognise the fact that island states need to share their problems pertaining to governance’.

The 2000 Report on the Pacific Parliamentary Retreat explains that the Retreat enabled participants ‘to think over large issues in a way that was not possible in the hurly burly of everyday political life’ (CDI 2000:15). And as the 1999 Report concluded, ‘what emerged, as the discussions proceeded, was that the Pacific Island States shared many problems in common. They unanimously recommended that similar Retreats, on different themes, should be organised on a regular basis’ (CDI 1999:4).

This overall positive impression was strengthened by the results of a questionnaire sent to all former participants of the Retreats, evaluation forms from past Retreats and personal attendance of the 2002 Retreat by the author. As a result, two questions are paramount in assessing the success, or otherwise, of the Pacific Parliamentary Retreats. These include the effectiveness of the project management and its ability to impart information to participants. These two issues will be analysed in more detail below, followed by three possible enhancements that have emerged from discussions with, and feedback from, participants themselves.

3.3.1 Has the Retreat been well managed?

In all the evaluation forms and questionnaires, along with personal interviews with participants, all parliamentarians have indicated their satisfaction with the administrative management and logistics of the Pacific Retreats. Furthermore, most participants were also satisfied with the organisation and content of the Retreat programs. As one 2000 participant explained light-heartedly, from the ‘moment we were met at the airport we kept to Australian time’.

As a result of the successful management of the first two Retreats participants asked that the event be held annually and that consideration be given to holding it, at times, in a Pacific country. In 2001 and 2002 these sentiments were reinforced, as there was unanimous support to continue the Retreats. Furthermore, continued attendance has been recommended by almost all former participants to their colleagues, especially for newly appointed parliamentarians with limited political experience. A general perception amongst former participants is that such programs, like the Pacific Retreats, are useful, particularly for recently independent and developing countries where many parliamentarians are relatively new to the governance system.

---

11 This was based on the post-Retreat assessment sheets.
12 It is worth noting that some participants were dissatisfied with the amount of per diem allowance allocated. However, the allowances were, on the whole, adequate for the purposes of the Retreat, bearing in mind both lunch and dinner were usually provided.
13 The majority of participants, for the past three years, have recommended that the Retreat be held in a Pacific country. This was again reinforced during the 2002 Retreat. While a number of venues have been proposed, Apia in Samoa appears the most popular. As one ni-Vanuatu 2002 participant explained other Pacific islanders have a lot to learn from Samoa at the moment, which is a leading light in terms of Pacific parliamentary governance processes. However, it must be added that many participants have also opted for the Retreat to remain in Australia, simply because the relevant government institutions are well developed and are ideal for visiting and observation.
As mentioned above, the discussion sessions for the parliamentarians have been an extremely valuable element of the Retreats. Generally, participants in 1999 believed the balance between excursions or lectures and discussions was adequate. There were suggestions, however, that in the evening all participants could get together to ‘share and brainstorm’ informally and generally reflect on the day. Moreover, as one participant explained, ‘all day discussions would not maintain interest’. As can be seen, greater emphasis on discussion was adopted in later Retreats (see Appendix C). Furthermore, general discussion sessions were programmed into the 2002 Retreat and proved very informative for parliamentarians. However, despite these attempts to incorporate discussion sessions, in the three previous Retreats, participants in 2000 and 2001 still regretted that there was not more time for further discussion, particularly amongst Pacific parliamentarians themselves. That these discussions are an integral part of the Retreat was borne out by one participant in 1999 who commented, ‘these discussions have given me the inspiration to continue in parliament’ (emphasis in the original).

In general, as experienced by the author during the 2002 Retreat, this program had a good balance between debate and lecture.\textsuperscript{14} This was further borne out by the participant evaluation forms. During this latest Retreat, questions and interjections were always allowed and frequently taken up. Most of the Queensland MPs and bureaucrats who presented did so in an informal manner. However, forty minute blocks of lecturing are hard on any passive participant regardless of background, especially when dealing with historical or theoretical concepts. This often exhausts participants, which was certainly the response from many parliamentarians of past Retreats. Hence, this evaluation can only stress again the importance of maintaining the balance between discussion and lecture, which was achieved in the 2002 Retreat.

Linked with the need to keep a good balance between debate and lecture was an oft-mentioned request from participants that certain presenters slow down when speaking. It may be necessary to ask lecturers to bear in mind that many of the participants command of English is not perfect. This would also make the task of whispering translators easier.\textsuperscript{15}

In 2000, it was suggested that parliamentarians would benefit from exposure to modern information systems and how to retrieve information, as most participants are not able to access such IT training in their own countries. As a result, for the first time in 2002, an Internet session was added to the Retreat program as requested by previous participants. The session was greatly appreciated as an introduction to the Internet for many of the participants. However, for ease of delivery and due to the mixed abilities of participants, it was suggested that two different levels of Internet teaching be created for those who have and those who have not previously used the service.

As has been shown, the participants of the Pacific Parliamentary Retreats have been generally satisfied with the management of the project, from the conference programs to the organisation of flights and accommodation.

### 3.3.2 Has the Retreat achieved its aims?

According to the aims of CDI, the Retreat is designed to bring together Pacific Island parliamentarians to discuss issues of concern and experience the Australian system of governance. To what extent, however, has the project been able to promote mutual learning and encourage networking between Pacific parliamentarians and their Australian counterparts? This

\textsuperscript{14} Days were roughly divided equally between lectures and discussion. To give an example, on the first day of the 2002 Retreat there were around 2 hours 35 minutes of passive lecturing, compared to 2 hours 15 minutes of free-ranging discussion.

\textsuperscript{15} During Retreats, participants from New Caledonia have been provided with ‘whispering translation’ from personal interpreters. Roland Rich often aided translation of their interventions into English. While this may not be the most effective form of translation it is certainly the most convenient method considering few venues contain specially designed conference chambers with translation booths.
section will first analyse how effective the learning of parliamentarians has been and then assess the success of networking within the Retreats.

Several parliamentarians, when asked if they had made use of knowledge gained at a Pacific Retreat gave general answers, such as the Retreat had, ‘strengthened knowledge of the rule of law and democracy’, or the Retreat, ‘promoted the practice of good governance, accountability and transparency’. In other words the Pacific Retreats introduced parliamentarians to an example of ‘best practice’ and built awareness of the various issues involved in the politics of the region. As one New Caledonian participant explained, the Retreat should help parliamentarians to better tackle everyday tasks and parliamentary functions.

In reference to the Queensland experience for 2001 and 2002 participants, many noted the usefulness of having practical examples and benchmarks to follow, particularly Queensland’s relatively successful institutional attempts to eliminate corruption (see KCELJAG and TIA 2001). The opportunity to observe and gain practical information from experienced Queensland MPs was also greatly appreciated. It was argued such personal contact with Australian professionals added immensely to the Retreat experience. Furthermore, parliamentarians were made aware of the ethical approach to governance work. One 2001 Samoan participant noted the relevance of the Retreat given that the country is currently embracing transparency and accountability. It was further noted that the Retreat had given a better understanding of the role of the Ombudsman, which enabled the parliamentarian to return to Samoa and ‘ensure our people are aware and use his [the Ombudsman’s] services as much as possible’. A further example of useful lessons learnt from the retreat by parliamentarians can be seen from a Fijian participant, ‘in Fiji’s case, the need to apply the accountability machinery in the expenditure of public funds, and the need to follow up the Public Accounts Committee’s recommendations’. One 2002 ni-Vanuatu participant commented that the Retreat experience aided understanding of parliamentary processes. As a ni-Vanuatu MP there were few chances to learn about such processes while remaining within the Vanuatu system. It further helped identify that indigenous systems needed support and the framework within which support may arise. However, it was noted by a number of participants that having witnessed the Queensland situation, it was extremely beneficial to discuss their specific regional situation with each other. Furthermore, while the Queensland experience was very useful, most participants accepted that institutions and concepts had to be adapted to Pacific conditions.

It is worth pointing out here the difficulty in catering for the needs of all participants. The diverse nature of the Pacific Island nations leads to diverse needs of their parliamentary representatives. This can be seen in the feedback forms of the participants that highlight different aspects for change to better suit their national needs. For example, Fiji delegations were satisfied with the last two Retreats in Brisbane that focused on integrity and accountability systems. This was due to the integrity needs of Fiji post 2000. In contrast many of the Solomon Islands and Vanuatu delegates requested greater focus of the Retreat on more basic parliamentary practice such as economic and democratic relationships to governance. This may be the result of more basic concerns of parliamentary operation in these countries.

As discussed above, the second major aim of the Retreats is to facilitate networking of Pacific wide contacts amongst participants. All former Retreat participants accept that Pacific Island countries share similar problems and many noted the usefulness of experiencing the different approaches adopted and the different stages that various countries had achieved. As one 2002 participant explained, ‘it is good to know what is happening in other countries and to make comparisons’.

While there was much initial enthusiasm for the contacts made at the Retreats many had lost touch with fellow participants in the ensuing time. However, there were examples of
correspondence between former participants. A number mentioned that they were still in contact with CDI through Roland Rich, but most had lost contact with other Retreat participants. A simple reason for this appears to be the lack of communication facilities, such as email and Internet access, in many of the participant countries. However, a certain collegiality was created between the group members, particularly between the different Melanesian participants from the Solomon Islands, Vanuatu and Fiji as well as the French speaking participants of Vanuatu and New Caledonia. This is a great strength that should be supported after the participants leave. Naturally, it is not possible to provide Internet access to all parliamentarians but a list of participants’ addresses and telephone numbers could be compiled and handed out to participants before departure, which perhaps may encourage further correspondence after the Retreats.

Parliamentarians did have some contact with previous participants from their countries but such contact was not, for example, institutionalised pre-departure. Also the contact that does exist between past participants and future participants (once they have been nominated by the Speaker of the House) appears to be within parties and not necessarily bi-partisan. In Vanuatu and PNG such contact between past and future participants was virtually non-existent. In Vanuatu this is primarily due to infrequent participation by delegations in the Retreat, which inhibits the building of institutional knowledge between participants. In PNG, on the other hand, there is a high turnover of parliamentarians that prevents the formation of any core institutional memory of Retreat lessons.

As can be seen, measuring the ability of participants to implement knowledge gained from Retreats is extremely difficult. There is no doubt that parliamentarians take a large amount of knowledge away with them when they return, but lack of links back in their home countries inhibits this knowledge being passed on to others. Networking is relatively successful between participants during the Retreat but falls away when parliamentarians return. This may be due to limited communication links between countries. It may be possible to encourage continued contact between parliamentarians after the Retreat.

With these observations in mind, three themes have been drawn out of the available data that have constantly arisen, either in feedback forms or in conversation with participants. These will be discussed below.

### 3.4 Possible Enhancements

#### 3.4.1 A Fact Sheet

While almost all participants agreed that the lessons learned at the Retreat were useful, it was felt that parliamentarians did not appreciate the conditions in the other Pacific countries and that sometimes it was difficult to focus on small country issues. The first two Retreats (see Appendix C) incorporated formal presentations from participants on the various topics and brief descriptions of their ‘governance’ systems. However, this proved to be difficult to sustain, as the quality of presentations was variable both in terms of content and delivery. Furthermore, this process of asking participants to present their country situations was time consuming and added to the general passive ‘listening’ time of the parliamentarians. For future Retreats, it was decided to convert this presentation time into further discussion (Rich, R. pers. comment 2002).

However, the subsequent two Retreats focused on the Queensland experience and parliamentarians noted their desire to be better informed of Pacific wide practice. As a result, several participants believed it may be useful for CDI to distribute a brief one-page fact sheet at

---

16 One such example was between a Fijian participant who sent to a ni-Vanuatu participant a copy of a statement made in the Fiji Parliament concerning the interests of the minorities in Fiji that included Melanesians originally from Vanuatu and the Solomon Islands.
the start of the Retreat, that outlines the governance situation for each of the participating countries. If this were done at the beginning of the Retreat, it would allow participants to learn and reflect on the issues during the week and offer possible solutions at the end of the Retreat. Furthermore, such a fact sheet at the start of the Retreat would not impede on valuable question time and overcome any discrepancies in participant presentations by maintaining uniformity.

Linked to this issue, and also to the third suggestion below, is a frequent request from participants for brief post-Retreat updates on 'who was doing what in the Pacific region' in relation to parliamentary progress. Not only would this support learning from the Retreats but it may also help participants stay informed of Pacific parliamentary developments while possibly sustaining contact between Retreat parliamentarians.

Encouraging participants to reflect on their country specific situations through a one-page fact sheet would help keep the project focused on Pacific problems and would support the application of lessons learned by participants to specific regional dilemmas. Furthermore, this process could be expanded to a brief regular post-Retreat mail out of major regional parliamentary developments to continue the parallel learning of parliamentarians.

3.4.2 Gender Distribution

As can be seen by Appendix D, balanced gender representation is a problem for the Retreat and the Pacific region in general. While CDI always requests female participation for the Retreats from the national parliaments, the low number of woman parliamentarians means the Retreat gender ratios are frequently unbalanced. For example, in the new Vanuatu government elected in May 2002, there is only one woman out of 52 members. Given the gender situation in Pacific parliaments, the Retreats clearly try and focus on women, with ten female participants (or around 18 percent) out of 56 Retreat parliamentarians being a much higher ratio than female membership of parliament in the Pacific generally. Nevertheless, the September 2002 questionnaire sent out to former participants of the Retreat focused a section on how the Retreat could improve female participation. Responses received suggested that female participation could be improved if the contact details of women parliamentarians Pacific wide were distributed to female participants during the Retreat. Furthermore, and this is linked to the first suggestion above, past female participants felt they would benefit from a brief post-Retreat update on women’s issues in the Pacific. This again could improve region wide networking of women parliamentarians.

It was also suggested that if a number of female participants were involved in a Retreat, then the program could be supplemented with additional training for female parliamentarians, improving skills and knowledge. For example, at the first two Retreats in 1999 and 2000, Senator Margaret Reid (the then Senate President) took a special interest in the female participants and their role in the Pacific. In 2001 and 2002, oman parliamentarians were able to see a parliament with the highest level of female membership in Australia. At all future Retreats, this current practice of discussing women in parliament should be further institutionalised. This may improve women parliamentarian chances of re-election.

While the Pacific Parliamentary Retreat alone cannot improve the distribution of women in Pacific parliaments, it may aid this transition by providing parallel links to female members across the region. Again a post-Retreat update for female parliamentarians may help. Moreover, a half-day special training for female participants of the Retreat may help focus on some of the particular challenges facing women parliamentarians in the region.

3.4.3 Follow-up Initiatives and Fostering Contacts

As has been discussed in the previous two suggestions, some form of follow-up initiatives for participants has been a constant request in one form or another. The issue of brief post-Retreat updates sent to past participants for both general parliamentary developments in the region and
more specific gender related issues have been discussed above. In addition to such updates, participants could be provided with a selected reading list of readily available books or articles on the issues being discussed during the Retreat. This would not only enhance the program but also allow participants to do some follow-up reading during or after Retreats. Moreover, one participant suggested that to strengthen learning between parliamentarians it would be useful to take minutes during group discussions and pass these notes on to the participants.

Linked to the issue of Retreat follow-up is the issue of fostering post-Retreat participant contacts. As mentioned above, networking during the Retreat is relatively successful but falters once participants return to their respective countries. As Roland Rich commented, 'the south-south learning process is also difficult to maintain'. Networking could be fostered post-Retreat by giving all parliamentarians a contact address list of participants during the Retreat. This may encourage follow up discussion after the Retreat when parliamentarians have returned.

As well as post-Retreat updates, participants have requested access to information to allow them to improve their knowledge on their return. To support this, the Retreat could supply both minutes of the Retreat discussions and further reading lists. This could be combined with a comprehensive list of contacts that may encourage post-Retreat interaction between participants.

3.5 Conclusion

Overall, participants from all four Retreats have rated their experiences extremely positively (see Appendix E). There have been no major negative issues in connection with Retreat management and the program of instruction has been very useful for parliamentarians. Generally, it is felt by former participants that they have benefited greatly from the Pacific Parliamentary Retreat.

The only two areas where participants have consistently pointed out improvements are to do firstly with post-Retreat follow-up initiatives. A simple and brief bi-annual or annual mail out of parliamentary updates may cement the lessons learned by participants during the Retreats. This could be supplemented by a simple ‘reading list’ of material that might encourage participants to look more closely at the issues raised in Retreats at a later date, if they so wished.

While the issue of gender distribution is a difficult one for the Retreat to solve single-handedly, more targeted learning for female participants during the Retreats may improve their skill levels and aid them to retain their positions. Furthermore, this may also encourage and enable women parliamentarians to support more effectively female colleagues moving up through the ranks.
APPENDIX A: DOCUMENTS AND INTERVIEWS

The Centre for Democratic Institutions (CDI), 2002. ‘About CDI’,
http://www.cdi.anu.edu.au/about_CDI/aboutcdi.htm (06/12/02)


http://www.cdi.anu.edu.au/asia_pacific/asia_downloads/PacRet.rtf (13/10/02)


In addition to these CDI documents available online the Review has drawn heavily on the feedback forms from the past four Pacific Parliamentary Retreats and the 2002 Evaluation Questionnaire sent out to all past participants of a Pacific Parliamentary Retreat. For examples of all these questionnaires see Appendix B.

These primary documents were supplemented by numerous personal discussions with CDI staff, most notably Mr. Roland Rich. In addition, while attending the 2002 Pacific Parliamentary Retreat in Brisbane, there was an opportunity for several personal discussions with most of the participants. These included:

Vanuatu: Fiji:
Hon. Thomas Nithitawai Hon. Joeli Nabuka
Hon. Ham Lini Hon. Senator Adi Nailatikau
Hon. Lekh Ram Vayeshnoi

New Caledonia:
Madame Bianca Henin

Solomon Islands:
Hon. Edmond Rukale

PNG:
Hon. Fred Iro Fono
Hon. Nick Kuman

Hon. Joses W. Sanga

Samoa:
Hon. TALIAOA Pita

Hon. PATEA Satini
APPENDIX B: QUESTIONNAIRES

1999 Pacific Retreat - Feedback Forms

How do you assess the arrangements for the Retreat with regard to travel, accommodation, meals and transport?

Were the discussion sessions valuable? Which did you find the most useful?

Were the excursions useful? Which did you find the most and least helpful?

Was the balance between discussions and excursions appropriate?

What would you recommend would improve the Retreat in future?

Would you recommend attendance at future Retreats to your parliamentary colleagues?
How would you rate the Retreat overall? (please circle one)
Excellent, Good, Average, Poor

Retreat Content and Structure
Did you think that the program was relevant and will be useful to your work? Which sessions were most useful, least useful?

Were you happy with how the sessions were presented? E.g. Clarity of information and documentation provided?

Was the balance between discussions and excursions appropriate?

Given the length of the program, are there any topics you would have included that were not covered? Any topics that were not useful?

Were you happy with the Centre for Democratic Institutions’ management of the Retreat?

Future Activities
Would you recommend attendance at future Retreats to your parliamentary colleagues?

Can you suggest any useful themes or topics for inclusion in future Retreats?

Travel and Accommodation
Was your accommodation adequate?

Were you happy with your travel arrangements?

Other Issues
Are there any other issues you would like to mention that might help us in the management of our next Retreat?
1. How would you rate the Retreat overall? (Please circle one number)

Excellent  Good  Average  Poor

Parliamentary Retreat Content and Structure

2. In what way will the program be relevant or useful to your work?

3. How happy were you with the way the sessions were presented? (For example, clarity of information and documentation provided)

4. Given the length of the program, are there any topics you would have included that were not covered? Any topics that were less useful?

5. How useful was the study of the Queensland experience?

6. How useful were the information and experience exchanges between participants in the Retreat?

7. Are there any specific examples of accountability devices/ideas discussed at the Retreat that could be applied in your own situations?

Future Activities

8. Would you recommend attendance at future Parliamentary Retreats to your parliamentary colleagues?

9. Can you suggest any useful themes or topics for inclusion in future Retreats?

10. Where should the 2002 Pacific Parliamentary Retreat be held?

Travel and Accommodation

11. Was your accommodation adequate?

12. Were you happy with your travel arrangements?

Other Issues

13. Are there any other issues you would like to mention that might help us in the management of our next Retreat?
2002 CDI Pacific Parliamentary Retreats
Evaluation Survey

1. How would you rate the Pacific Parliamentary Retreat you attended overall?


2. Have you implemented or made use of something you learnt at a Pacific Retreat?

3. Do you think the Parliamentary Pacific Retreat was relevant and useful to your work? Please give examples?

4. Are you still in touch with people you met at a Retreat from other Pacific countries?

5. What more can we do to support women parliamentarians?

6. Would you recommend attendance at future Pacific Parliamentary Retreats to your parliamentary colleges?

7. Are there any other issues you would like to mention that might help us in the management of our next Parliamentary Retreat?
APPENDIX C: PROGRAMS OF PAST PARLIAMENTARY RETREATS

Canberra Retreat on Parliamentary Democracy in the Pacific Islands
Canberra, 22-26 November 1999

Formal Discussions around the following themes:

- Political Parties and Parliamentary Democracy
- The Individual Parliamentarian and Parliamentary Democracy
- The Role of the Opposition in Parliamentary Democracy
- Ethics and Responsibility in Parliamentary Democracy
- Managing the Economy and Natural Resources

As the 1999 Report explains,

In addition to formal discussions, the participants availed themselves of the opportunity of visiting Canberra to meet with officials of the Australian Electoral Commission, tour the Australian War Memorial, attend Question Time in the Federal Parliament, meeting with presiding officers, had Afternoon Tea at the ACT Legislative Assembly with Speaker Greg Cornwell, met Foreign Minister Alexander Downer and visit their respective High Commissions. The PNG participants also attended the PNG Update hosted by the National Centre for Development Studies at The Australian National University.

(CDI 1999:2)
Pacific Island States Parliamentary Retreat
Canberra, 4-8 December 2000
PROGRAM

Monday 4 December
10.30 am Opening Ceremony
   Master of Ceremonies: Roland Rich, Director, CDI
   Welcome from Ngunnawal People: Agnes Shea
   Welcome to the ANU: Professor John Richards, Deputy Vice-Chancellor, ANU,
   Opening Address: Senator Kay Patterson, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister
   for Foreign Affairs
   Welcome to the Retreat: Professor Brij Lal, Director, CCP
   Response on behalf of participants: Ms Akanisi Koroitamana
12.00 Welcome lunch
2.00 – 5.00 pm Representing the People – Mr Roland Rich (Presenter)
   Discussants: Ms Akanisi Koroitamana, Mr Patauave Etuale; Mr Guy George
6.00 – 8.00 pm Cocktail reception, Michigan Room, Rydges Lakeside

Tuesday 5 December
9.00 – 12.00 Does Governance Matter? – Professor Ron Duncan (Presenter)
   Discussants: The Hon. Leo B. Smith, The Hon. Mr Iarris Naunun, Mr Ulu Vaomalo Ulu Kini MP
1.30 pm Coach travel from Rydges to Parliament House
2.00 – 3.00 pm Observe Question Time in House of Representatives

Wednesday 6 December
9.00 – 12.00 Political Parties – Professor Brij Lal (Presenter)
   Discussants: Mr Krishna Datt, The Hon. Mr Joe Natuman, The Hon. Daniel Kwanairara
1.30 pm Coach travel from Rydges to Parliament House
2.00 – 3.00 pm Observe Question Time in the Senate
3.15 – 4.15 pm Tour of Parliament House
4.15 pm Meeting with Mr Downer
5.00 pm Meeting with Presiding Officers

Thursday 7 December
9.00 – 12.00 Dealing with Extra Constitutional forces – Dr Sinclair Dinnen (Presenter)
Discussants: Mr Leilua Punivalu MP, The Hon. Alfred Sasako, Mr Germain Padome

2.30 – 5.30 pm Visit National Aquarium
7.30 pm Coach transfer to Novotel, Northbourne Ave, Canberra City
8.00 pm Farewell dinner - Novotel (together with members of the CDI Consultative Group)

**Friday 8 December**

9.00 – 12.00 How Appropriate is Westminster in the Pacific? - Dr Peter Larmour (Presenter), Dr Sharon Bessell (Rapporteur)
   Discussants: The Hon. Job Tausienga, Mr Robert Paouta Naxué
Afternoon Free
Pacific Parliamentary Retreat
Brisbane, 3-7 December 2001
Program

Monday 3 December
9.00  Key Centre for Ethics, Law, Justice and Governance (KCELJG)
   Griffith University
9.30  Overview - General discussion of accountability
The Four Waves of Accountability and Integrity in Anglo-American countries
Magna Carta and Parliament: Written and Institutional Constraints on Royal Power
Separation of Powers and Judicial Review - acting lawfully
The Westminster System and Parliamentary Government
accountability to Parliament
accountability to the people The Fourth Wave
Discussion leader: Professor Charles Sampford
11.00  Morning Tea
11.30  The Queensland Experience
Queensland before Fitzgerald - the limits of one dimensional accountability
The Queensland Fitzgerald Inquiry and EARC: a case study in political, legal and
administrative reform
Discussion leader: Prof Charles Sampford
13.00  Lunch
13.00  Bus to Lone Pine Koala Sanctuary
19.00  Dinner at the Queensland Club

Tuesday 4 December
8.55  Walk to Parliament House
9.00  Executive Agencies (in Parliament)
   Department of Premier and Cabinet
Queensland Integrity Commissioner - Katherine Navin, Executive Officer to the
Commissioner
Office of Public Service Merit and Equity and Whistleblower Legislation - Susan
Allard, Jeff Loof
Queensland Treasury
Office of Government Owned Corporation – Peter Dann
Department of Public Work (and its role in government purchasing)
Discussion leaders: Ms Susan Allard and Prof Charles Sampford

12.50  Walk to Gardens Café
13.00  Lunch (at the City Botanical Gardens Café)
15.00  Discussions at KCELJG
17.30  Finish

Wednesday 5 December
9.15  Parliamentary Committee System
      Mr Neil Laurie, Deputy Clerk and Clerk of Committees
9.45  Privilege/ Ethics and Disclosure
      MEPPC - Mrs Julie Atwood, Chair, Mrs Joan Sheldon, Deputy Chair, Mr Bill Flynn, Ms Anita Phillips, Mrs P Croft
10.15  Morning Tea
10.40  Question Time in Queensland Parliament
11.25  Accountability
      LCARD - Ms Karen Struthers, Chair, Mrs Liz Cunningham, Ms Rachel Nolan
      PAC - Hon Ken Hayward, Chair, Mr Tim Mulherin, Ms Jan Jarrett, Mr Ray Hooper
      SLC - Mr Warren Pitt, Chair
12.30  Tour of Parliament
13.00  Lunch – Hosted by Speaker of the Queensland Parliament
      Attended by Members of Parliament
14.30  Office of the Queensland Parliamentary Counsel
      Mr Peter Drew, Deputy Parliamentary Counsel
15.15  Afternoon Tea
15.45  General Discussion
      Discussion leaders: Dr John Uhr and Mr Roland Rich

Thursday 6 December
9.00  Criminal Justice Commission
      Parliamentary Commissioner for Administrative Investigations (Ombudsman) - Mr Frank King
      Criminal Justice Commission and its relationship with Parliament
      Queensland Audit Office - Mr John Findlay, Director of Audit Policy and Reporting
      Office of the Information Commissioner (Qld) - Mr Greg Sorensen
      Chair: Mr Roland Rich
13.00  Return to apartments
Friday 7 December

10.30  The Judiciary (Supreme Court of Queensland)
   Rule of law and constitutionalism
   Role of administrative law
11.30  Morning Tea
11.45  General discussion
   Discussion leaders: Justice Bob Douglas, Prof Charles Sampford
13.20  Lunch
14.40  The Role of civil society and the media in accountability
   Media as a watchdog
   Civil society as a whole
   Discussion leaders: Mr Roland Rich, Prof Charles Sampford
16.30  Concluding Drinks with KCELG
### Fourth Pacific Parliamentary Retreat 2002
#### Accountability and National Integrity Systems
**Monday 25- Friday 29 November 2002**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Venue</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>DAY 1</strong></td>
<td>25TH November, 2002</td>
<td>Overview: Accountability and National Integrity Systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Key Centre for Ethics, Law, Justice and Governance, Griffith University, Nathan Campus, Brisbane. 4111.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DAY 2</strong></td>
<td>26th November, 2002</td>
<td>Queensland’s Legislative Process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Speaker’s Dining Room, Level 5, Queensland Parliamentary Annexe, Cnr George and Alice Street, Brisbane. 4000.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DAY 3</strong></td>
<td>27th November, 2002</td>
<td>Queensland’s Executive Agencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Speaker’s Dining Room, Level 5, Queensland Parliamentary Annexe, Cnr George and Alice Street, Brisbane. 4000.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DAY 4</strong></td>
<td>28th November, 2002</td>
<td>Special Investigative Agencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Speaker’s Dining Room, Level 5, Queensland Parliamentary Annexe, Cnr George and Alice Street, Brisbane. 4000.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DAY 5</strong></td>
<td>29th November, 2002</td>
<td>Civil Society &amp; the Media The Rule of Law and Constitutionalism Forum on Leadership Code for Pacific States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Key Centre for Ethics, Law, Justice and Governance, Griffith University, Nathan Campus, Brisbane. 4111.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Upper House Chamber, Parliament House, Cnr George and Alice Street, Brisbane. 4000.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Daily Program

#### Day 1 25th November

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Topic(s)</th>
<th>Presenter(s)</th>
<th>Venue</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9.15-10.45</td>
<td>Overview: General discussion of accountability and national integrity systems What is Integrity? Integrity and Public Office The Four Waves of Accountability and Integrity in Anglo-American countries Magna Carta and Parliament: Written and Institutional Constraints on Power Separation of Powers and Judicial Review Role of Administrative Law The Westminster System and Parliamentary Government The Fourth Wave of Accountability Measures</td>
<td>Prof Charles Sampford, Director; Key Centre for Ethics, Law, Justice and Governance Dr Tom Round Research Fellow; Key Centre for Ethics, Law, Justice and Governance</td>
<td>Meeting Room 1.22 Macrossan Building (N16)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Topic(s)</td>
<td>Presenter(s)</td>
<td>Venue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.45-11.15</td>
<td>Morning Tea</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.15-12.45</td>
<td>The Queensland Experience</td>
<td>Prof Charles Sampford</td>
<td>Meeting Room 1.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Queensland before Fitzgerald – the limits of one dimensional accountability</td>
<td></td>
<td>Macrossan Building (N16)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Queensland Fitzgerald Inquiry and EARC: A Case Study in Political,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Legal and Administrative Reform</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.45-13.30</td>
<td>Lunch</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.30-15.30</td>
<td>The Role of the Judiciary</td>
<td>Prof Charles Sampford</td>
<td>Meeting Room 1.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Judicial Integrity System</td>
<td>Dr Tom Round</td>
<td>Macrossan Building (N16)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Judicial Independence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Appeal System</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Appointments Processes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Judicial Discipline and Removals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Judicial Ethics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Continuing Judicial Training and Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Role of Parliament</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Parliamentary Privilege</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Committees System</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Roles of Parliament</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Legislative role</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Scrutinising role</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Investigative role</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Executive Government - Australia’s Three-Tiered System</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Contribution of the Executive to an Integrity System</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Financial Monitoring</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Administration of Law and Order Mechanisms</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Self-Monitoring within the Executive Arm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Dynamics of an Integrity System</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.30-16.00</td>
<td>Afternoon Tea</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.00-17.30</td>
<td>Internet Session</td>
<td>Ms Penny Baker and Mr Paul Stock, IT trainers, Information Literacy Service</td>
<td>Library</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.30</td>
<td>Dinner</td>
<td></td>
<td>The Queensland Club</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dress code: Jacket and tie</td>
<td></td>
<td>19 George St, Brisbane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day 2</td>
<td>26th November</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Topic(s)</td>
<td>Presenter(s)</td>
<td>Venue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.15-9.45</td>
<td>Queensland’s Parliamentary Committee System</td>
<td>Mr Stephen Finnimore, Research Director, Parliamentary Crime and Misconduct</td>
<td>Speaker’s Dining Room, Level 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Committee System</td>
<td>Committee (PCMC)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.45-10.15</td>
<td>Members’ Ethics and Parliamentary Privileges Committee</td>
<td>Mrs Julie Attwood MP, Chair</td>
<td>Speaker’s Dining Room,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Committee</td>
<td>Mr Lawrence Springborg MP, member</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.15-10.45</td>
<td>Morning Tea</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.45-11.30</td>
<td>Question Time in Queensland</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Topic(s)</td>
<td>Presenter(s)</td>
<td>Venue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.30-12.30</td>
<td>Accountability: The Legal, Constitutional and Administrative Review Committee (LCARC) The Public Accounts Committee (PAC) The Scrutiny of Legislation Committee (SLC)</td>
<td>LCARC: Ms Karen Struthers MP, Chair PAC: Hon. Ken Hayward MP Chair Dr David Watson MP, Deputy Chair SLC: Mr Warren Pitt MP, Chair</td>
<td>Speaker’s Dining Room</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.30-13.00</td>
<td>Tour of Parliament</td>
<td></td>
<td>Speaker’s Courtyard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.00-14.30</td>
<td>Lunch – Hosted by Speaker of the Queensland Parliament</td>
<td></td>
<td>Speaker’s Dining Room</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.30-14.50</td>
<td>Parliamentary Crime and Misconduct Committee</td>
<td>Mr Geoff Wilson MP, Chair of PCMC</td>
<td>Speaker’s Dining Room</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.50-15.20</td>
<td>Parliamentary Library</td>
<td>Ms Mary Seefried, Director, Research &amp; Publications</td>
<td>Parliamentary Library</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.20-16.30</td>
<td>General Discussion</td>
<td>Discussion leaders: Mr Roland Rich, Director of The Centre for Democratic Institutions Mr Clem Campbell, Former MP and Chair of Ethics and Privileges Committee</td>
<td>Speaker’s Dining Room</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Day 3 27th November

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Topic(s)</th>
<th>Presenter(s)</th>
<th>Venue</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9.15– 10.00</td>
<td>Department of Premier and Cabinet: The Queensland Integrity Commissioner</td>
<td>Ms Katherine Navin, Executive Coordinator to the Integrity Commissioner, and Ms Zandra Ushay, Executive Coordinator to the Executive Director, The Office of Public Service Merit &amp; Equity (OPSME), Department of Premier and Cabinet</td>
<td>Speaker’s Dining Room</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.00-10.45</td>
<td>Public Sector Ethics Act and Whistleblowers Protection Act</td>
<td>Ms Rhyl Hurley, Principal Policy Officer, Policy and Learning, The Office of Public Service Merit &amp; Equity (OPSME), Department of Premier and Cabinet</td>
<td>Speaker’s Dining Room</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.45-11.15</td>
<td>Morning Tea</td>
<td></td>
<td>Speaker’s Dining Room</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.15-12.00</td>
<td>Queensland Treasury The Office of Government Owned Corporations</td>
<td>Mr Renny Phipps, Director, The Office of Government Owned Corporations, Queensland Treasury</td>
<td>Speaker’s Dining Room</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.00-12.45</td>
<td>The function of internal audit in ensuring probity and accountability within the Department of Public Works</td>
<td>Ms Robyn Turbit, Director of Internal Audit, Department of Public Works</td>
<td>Speaker’s Dining Room</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.45-13.45</td>
<td>Lunch</td>
<td></td>
<td>Poolside BBQ Area, Level 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.45-14.30</td>
<td>The Structure and Function of the Ethical Standards Command</td>
<td>Superintendent Steve Kummerow, Ethical Practice</td>
<td>Speaker’s Dining Room</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Topic(s)</td>
<td>Presenter(s)</td>
<td>Venue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.30-16.00</td>
<td>General Discussions</td>
<td>Discussion leader: Mr Roland Rich, Prof Charles Sampford</td>
<td>Speaker's Dining Room</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Day 4</strong></td>
<td><strong>28th November</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Time</strong></td>
<td><strong>Topic(s)</strong></td>
<td><strong>Presenter(s)</strong></td>
<td><strong>Venue</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.00-10.45</td>
<td>The Crime and Misconduct Commission</td>
<td>Mr John Boyd, Manager Prevention, The Crime and Misconduct Commission</td>
<td>Speaker's Dining Room</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.45-11.15</td>
<td>Morning Tea</td>
<td></td>
<td>Speaker's Dining Room</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.15-11.50</td>
<td>The Queensland Audit Office</td>
<td>Ms Kaylene Cossart, Executive Officer to the Auditor-General, Mr John Findlay, Director - Audit, Policy and Reporting, The Queensland Audit Office</td>
<td>Speaker's Dining Room</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.50-12.25</td>
<td>The Parliamentary Commissioner for Administrative Investigation (the Ombudsman)</td>
<td>Mr Frank King, Deputy Ombudsman, The Ombudsman’s Office</td>
<td>Speaker’s Dining Room</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.25-13.00</td>
<td>The Queensland Information Commissioner</td>
<td>Ms Sue Barker, Senior Administrative Review Officer, The office of the Information Commissioner</td>
<td>Speaker’s Dining Room</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.00-16.00</td>
<td>Lone Pine Koala Sanctuary</td>
<td>• Including BBQ lunch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Day 5</strong></td>
<td><strong>29th November</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Time</strong></td>
<td><strong>Topic(s)</strong></td>
<td><strong>Presenter(s)</strong></td>
<td><strong>Venue</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.00-10.30</td>
<td>The role of the media in accountability</td>
<td>Mr Roland Rich, Prof Charles Sampford</td>
<td>Meeting Room 1.22, Macrossan Building (N16)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.30-11.00</td>
<td>Morning Tea</td>
<td></td>
<td>Meeting Room 1.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.00-12.00</td>
<td>The Rule of Law &amp; Constitutionalism</td>
<td>Prof Charles Sampford, Dr Tom Round</td>
<td>Meeting Room 1.22, Macrossan Building (N16)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.00-12.40</td>
<td>Lunch</td>
<td></td>
<td>Meeting Room 1.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.40-15.00</td>
<td>Leadership Code</td>
<td>Prof Charles Sampford, Dr Tom Round</td>
<td>Meeting Room 1.22, Macrossan Building (N16)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.00-15.20</td>
<td>Afternoon Tea</td>
<td></td>
<td>Meeting Room 1.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.20-16.45</td>
<td>Summary: what might be used in small scale integrity systems</td>
<td>Discussion leaders: Mr. Roland Rich, Prof Charles Sampford</td>
<td>Meeting Room 1.22, Macrossan Building (N16)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.45-17.00</td>
<td>Presentation of Certificates</td>
<td></td>
<td>Meeting Room 1.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.30-19.00</td>
<td>Book Launch and Xmas Drinks</td>
<td>The Hon Bill Hayden AC, The Hon Peter Beattie, Premier of Queensland</td>
<td>Upper House Chamber Parliament House</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX D: PARTICIPANT BREAKDOWN

A) By Nationality

- The Solomon Islands: 9
- Fiji: 13
- Samoa: 13
- Papua New Guinea: 8
B) By Gender:

- Number of Male Participants: 46
- Number of Female Participants: 10
C) By Year:
As of 2000, Retreat feedback forms requested participants to give the Retreat an overall rating, either Excellent, Good, Average or Poor.
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