The Centre for Democratic Institutions

LEADERSHIP & MANAGEMENT TRAINING COURSE FOR PNG NGOs
MARCH-APRIL 2001

INTERIM REPORT

funded by
AusAID & The Centre for Democratic Institutions

managed by
Australian Council for Overseas Aid
## Contents

1. Introduction .................................................................................................................................................3
2. Objectives of the Course .........................................................................................................................3
3. The Lead-up to the Course and Selection of Participants ......................................................................3
4. Phase One: The Coursework in Canberra ............................................................................................4
5. Phase Two: The Placements in Melbourne and Sydney ......................................................................5
6. Phase Three: Course Wind-up and Evaluation in Canberra ..............................................................5
7. Planning for Phase Four .........................................................................................................................6
8. Logistics during the Course ....................................................................................................................6
9. Administration of the Course ................................................................................................................7
10. Recommendations and Lessons Learned ...........................................................................................8
11. Evaluation of Performance Against Objectives ..................................................................................9
Appendix 1 - The Participants ..................................................................................................................10
Appendix 2 - Phase One Schedule ...........................................................................................................11
Appendix 3 - Phase Three Schedule .........................................................................................................12
Appendix 4 - Presenters .............................................................................................................................13
Appendix 5 - Placement Agency Contact Persons ..................................................................................14
Appendix 6 - Evaluation by Participants ..................................................................................................15
1. Introduction

The Australian Council for Overseas Aid (ACFOA) is the peak council for ninety community based development organizations working in international development, advocacy and development education.

The Centre for Democratic Institutions is Australia’s foremost democracy promotion center receiving its core funding from AusAID. Civil society is one of four sectors on which CDI concentrates and PNG is one of CDI’s primary geographic points of focus.

ACFOA is currently managing a Leadership and Management Training Course for PNG NGOs and this is the interim report, reporting on Phases 1 to 3 of the course, held in Australia in March and April 2001.

The training had its genesis, primarily in the mandate of the CDI, and in discussions that took place in mid-2000 between CDI and ACFOA. ACFOA was once again granted the management of the training course on a basis of ‘sole provider’, given that it is the peak organization for Australian NGOs and part of the agenda of the training was to link PNG NGOs with Australian NGOs. This training was the first that came with the distinct possibility of a fourth follow-up phase to be undertaken in-country a short period following the Australian end of the training.

2. Objectives of the Course

The broad objectives of the course, as outlined in the proposal, were:

1. To develop a stronger understanding of the organization structure, policy environment, accountability requirements and ethical principles for NGOs.
2. To establish and/or strengthen networks between Australia and PNG NGOs.
3. To strengthen coordination among PNG NGOs by assisting them to develop skills in the management of a peak body.

3. The Lead-up to the Course and Selection of Participants.

Initially this training was to have taken place in November/December 2000, however as the time approached it was clear that this would not allow enough time for planning, and there was also a major NGO/Government summit timed for this same period in Port Moresby, which would have clashed with the course. The new timing was for March/April 2001, and whilst this gave a generous planning period, it meant that much planning had to take place over the Christmas holiday break period, a time of low activities in Australia agencies.

The nominations were called for and received in mid-2000, prior to the annual ACFOA Council meeting in early September. At that meeting a sub-group of the ACFOA Pacific Working Group was formed to select the final 15 participants to be invited. Fifteen people were chosen from a list of 32 nominations. This list was chosen to achieve a reasonable gender balance, representation from around the country as well as Port Moresby-based National organisations, a range of sectors and areas of interest, concentrating largely on organizational leaders and senior management.

Most nominations were from Australian NGOs, with one from CDI and initially two from ACFOA itself. As time went by and more participants dropped out, ACFOA nominated replacements. In the beginning all fifteen people invited either accepted the invitation or expressed strong interest in attending. Then after a few months it became apparent that not all had fully committed themselves to definitely attending the course. It is unfortunate that several candidates pulled out of the course in the New Year just weeks before the commencement of the course, making it impractical to try and replace them.

The final group consisted of eleven persons, five women and six men. Eight of these individuals were either the head or acting head of their organisations with the other three holding senior management...
positions. The positive aspect of being able to attract such senior people is reasonably obvious in a course designed around management and leadership. The downside was that many of these people had to continue to 'run' their organisations from Australia during the course, and in fact two went home before the final phase, due to work demands. See Appendix 2 for a list of final participants.

4. Phase One: The Coursework in Canberra

Previous training courses have had the theme of policy and advocacy work, however the funding organisations felt that there was a greater need in PNG, to strengthen skills in the area of management, leadership and organisational development. Therefore the course had to be substantially re-designed to suit this purpose. It was decided to go with fewer presenters, giving them a longer time to develop their ideas and concepts with the group. In briefing the presenters about their sessions it was stressed that a strong participatory approach should be used, given the level of experience in the group and the seniority of those involved. This calls for highly experienced trainers who are able to gauge the levels of involvement in the group and change tack instantly if either group interest flags, or if the group wish to take the session off at a tangent that they feel is more appropriate.

Phase 1 commenced on Sunday the 18th March and finished on Saturday 24th March - see Appendix 3 for a summary program of the week.

The formal sessions began on Sunday 18th March, with some introduction sessions to introduce both the participants to one another, as well as outline the course to the group. This was followed by a session on globalization and its effects, particularly on PNG. The session, facilitated by Jim Redden of ACFOA, went well and raised a number of key issues that were to be picked up over the following week.

On Monday 19th, George Collett led the group through a day of work looking at the concepts and skills that relate to Strategic Planning at an agency level. It was difficult to know whether it was more suitable to place this session at the beginning or the end of the course, it was decided to start with larger, 'big picture' issues and work towards the more specific. As it turns out this approach worked quite well with the group well engaged by the end of the week on specific matters around management and organisational development.

On Tuesday 20th, the group visited Parliament House where they were given an excellent presentation on the Australian Parliamentary Committee systems and how it works, especially how civil society groups such as NGOs are able to make submissions to enquires held by these committees. Following this the group were taken on a tour of the House of Representatives and the Senate, where the way in which they operate and relate to one another was very clearly explained. The group then traveled to ACFOA House for lunch, following which Ellen Shipley, the director of the NGO Section within AusAID, and Graham Tupper, the Executive Director of ACFOA, gave presentations and talked about how the relationship between government and NGOs is handled in the Australian context. Following afternoon tea, Graham went into greater depth about the role of ACFOA, the development of the ACFOA Code of Conduct, and issues around the challenges and opportunities that face ACFOA as a peak body for development NGOs. This long and tiring day was rounded off with an enjoyable barbecue back at Rydges Eagle Hawk hotel.

On Wednesday 21st, Dr. Pat Ranald of the Public Interest & Advocacy Centre in Sydney presented a day's work on the analysis of policy, the framing of alternative policy options, the writing up of policy and finally the methods whereby policy may be taken out to decision-makers and how this advocacy work is undertaken. On the Wednesday evening CDI hosted a reception for the participants at the Australian National University, where representatives of the University, AusAID and the PNG High Commissioner attended.

On Thursday 22nd, the group had a morning session with Paul Nichols of International Development Support Services (IDSS), who undertook an excellent participatory analysis session on the nature of PNG NGOs and seeking out what some of their key issues may be with management systems. The group then had the afternoon off to go sightseeing, shopping, or to catch up with friends in Canberra. The results of the morning session were analyzed and the session for Friday 23rd was based on that analysis. A full day
on Friday looked at key management areas requiring strengthening, and concentrated on three out of six areas identified by the group. These sessions were seen by the group as the most stimulating and useful of the course, and the comment was made that it is a shame that more PNG NGO people have not been exposed to the ideas contained in them.

The Saturday was a day of logistics and preparation for the week of placement in Melbourne and Sydney. The group also recapped on the week and through a small group process generated a long list of issues that they might raise with Australian NGOs when they visited them. Most took advantage of a free afternoon, before being hosted by Jim Redden at his house for dinner. Unfortunately this evening was rather short as the group going to Melbourne (six of the participants) was catching an overnight bus to Melbourne, in order to be able to attend the Australian Conservation Foundation board meeting, and to possibly participate in the Community Aid Abroad/Oxfam Australia “Walk Against Want”.

A big difference between this and previous courses has to do with language. The whole group had an excellent command of English (many had studied at Australian universities or other institutions). The time that was saved by not needing translation, and the fact that sessions were able to flow more freely, dramatically changed the dynamic of the course and the interactions between participants, facilitators and trainers. This is not an argument for conducting training entirely in English, but it may be a sound argument for seeking trainers who have no need of translation!

Unfortunately during this first week three of the participants succumbed to malaria, probably brought on by climate change, especially the dramatic change in temperature. Ruby Mirinka became extremely ill with cerebral malaria and was hospitalized for several days.

5. Phase Two: The Placements in Melbourne and Sydney

Five members of the group went to Sydney to visit four agencies: World Wide Fund for Nature [WWF]; National Council of Churches of Australia [NCCA]; APACE; and two to the Australian Foundation for Peoples of Asia and the Pacific [AFAP]. In this case these people were hosted by the agencies concerned who undertook the logistics and programming for their visits. The other six participants went to Melbourne where a different approach was taken, based on the very positive experience and example set by APHEDA in the previous course with Indonesian participants. A coordinator for their visit was hired, Rosie Wheen, who made contact with a number of interested agencies and helped to coordinate a program. However none of the agencies concerned was responsible for actually hosting the participants or organizing logistics. There is absolutely no doubt that this latter way of handling exposure is superior, and dramatically reduces the likelihood of participants having a negative or uninteresting experience.

6. Phase Three: Course Wind-up and Evaluation in Canberra

This phase had three full days for follow-up as opposed to two on the previous courses. This was, on reflection, useful and made for a less crowded follow-up than previous courses. It also meant that some themes where there was not time to cover in the first week [Monitoring and Evaluation in NGOs] could be covered during this period. There was the opportunity to meet with staff of the PNG desk in AusAID, which was a very useful meeting for both participants and AusAID. The evaluation of the course was both formal and informal, with informal feedback actually producing much more interesting information.

A highlight of Phase 3 was having the Minister for Foreign Affairs present participants with their certificates of participation. The Minister met with the participants for over the allotted half-hour period, and demonstrated his in-depth knowledge of PNG. This sort of exposure gave the course participants the opportunity to gain confidence in dealing with very high officials which, as senior representatives of key PNG NGOs is a valuable experience for them to have gained from the course. It also strengthens the openness and access that ordinary Australians have to parliament, parliamentarians and parliamentary processes.
7. Planning for Phase Four

For the first time the funding agencies have made it clear that there is a strong possibility for funding a follow-up phase, in PNG, to this course. There has been a tentative budget allocation of AUD$70,000 put aside for this. The planning for this phase was kept deliberately vague in the early stages, with the designers of the course believing that the actual plans for such a follow-up should involve the PNG NGOs intimately and that they should be the ones to identify the key areas that such a follow-up should tackle.

Discussions were held regarding this follow-up phase, at the end of week one in Canberra (to simply gauge interest and brainstorm possible ideas), and then again during phase three back in Canberra after placement. Two keys issues or areas kept coming back into the conversation, and whilst they are quite different they are very much related, and built strongly on the capacity building focus of stages one to three of the course. These issues are:

- The issue of PNG NGOs needing a peak organization that has arisen from their own deliberations and concerns, to represent them on a number of key issues common to PNG NGOs;
- The need for practical skills training in dealing with the managerial information required increasingly by both funding bodies and Australian partner NGOs.

ACFOA and the Course Manager agreed that this was a positive and constructive plan for Phase 4. A final plan was not put in place, but a process to produce a final plan was established.

The components that were agreed upon are:

- That Phase 4 will most likely have these two key areas identified by the participants in Phase 3 (see above) as the main focus.
- Mike Crooke - the Course Manager for Phases 1 - 3, will be contracted again by ACFOA to be the Course Manager for Phase 4.
- A small working group consisting of four Moresby-based participants (Vince Manukayasi, Sophia Gegeyo, Sabi Pati and Regina Piam) was formed. They will consult other NGO people about the most suitable way forward and will liaise with the Course Manager and ACFOA by email.
- In asking the group as to whether any follow-up ‘event’ would be best centralized or spread throughout the provinces, there was reasonably strong opinion that, whilst getting out to the regions was generally a good thing (one idea suggested), isolated NGOs get few chances to come together and that it would be better to have a centralized event, thus giving NGOs the opportunity to all come together to discuss common issues and possible ways of collaborating and working more closely together.
- Mike will be advised by a small working group of Australian-based experts with significant experience operating in PNG.
- A planning trip will be made to Port Moresby by the Course Manager in mid to late May to meet with the P.Moresby working group and establish the final planning and logistical arrangements for Phase 4.
- It is envisaged that the actual training and meetings will take place in mid to late June, pending availability of the trainer identified by the working group and the timing of a key government meeting in PNG.
- See Appendix 1 for the Amended Budget for Phase 4, which assumes the structure will be as recommended by the participants in Phase 3.

8. Logistics during the Course

Corporate Traveler once again proved to be an effective and efficient travel agent for the course. There were an inordinate number of changes to ticketing required, as participants kept changing their minds about their travel arrangements, and in one instance lost their ticket altogether. These were handled efficiently and with good humor given that the people concerned would have been well within their rights to be a little annoyed at the constant changes.
The move to hold the course at Rydges Eagle Hawk Hotel was overall successful. Whilst the costs were slightly higher than Hotel Heritage, the service was very much better and the staff more professional and efficient. The positive aspects to Eagle Hawk as a venue are:

- Friendly and professional staff, relaxed but efficient;
- Cheap use of the hotel bus (okay for groups of 11 or less);
- Charming natural surroundings and comfortable rooms;
- Good conference facilities when you can get the right rooms (see below);

The less positive aspects to Eagle Hawk as a venue are:

- When they fill up they may shift you to a smaller training room, which may or may not be adequate;
- Many school groups visiting, extremely noisy;
- Very isolated removing other choices for food, telephones, entertainment;
- Food is not very good and it is expensive, as is anything not covered by the tariff.

For future courses, it has been suggested that course organizers investigate whether accommodation and facilities at ANU are available at competitive prices during the summer semester break. This would be within walking distance from the city center, may be comparable on price, and would provide a quieter and more reflective atmosphere for study and course sessions.

9. Administration of the Course

As mentioned in previous reports, the amount of administrative work that these courses require can very easily be underestimated as each task on its own can seem insignificant and unimportant, but there are so many tasks that must be done, that it only takes a few hitches for the workload to blow out dramatically. On this course there were a few unforeseen hitches that resulted in considerably extra work required to be undertaken by the ACFOA manager responsible for the course, the course manager and other administrative support staff at ACFOA. While some of this was due to personnel resignations and availability at ACFOA, some was also due to the timing and some was an underestimation of time required in the initial proposal and budget. Last minute changes of travel arrangements by participants created an enormous workload for ACFOA administrative staff, and reflects the importance of ensuring that for future courses, a PNG based coordinator/organization is essential in order to alleviate these sorts of problems.

The hiring of Rosie Wheen (an administrator on previous courses) to assist with general course administration as well as the placements coordinator in Melbourne greatly alleviated these problems. ACFOA is greatly appreciative of her willingness to accept the contract on short notice and acknowledges her contribution to the success of the course.

As the Project Coordinator, Mike Crooke has again provided an invaluable service, and all involved benefited greatly from his previous experience in managing the previous two courses, as well as his many years of experience as a community development worker and trainer with a commitment to genuine participation.

As the Project Manager for ACFOA, Rhonda Chapman actively participated in Phase One in Canberra, contributing her experience as a community development worker and trainer as well as her senior management role at ACFOA.

Administrative staff at ACFOA also contributed greatly to the success of the course. A significant contribution was made by Stephanie Stockdill in assisting the Project Manager and Coordinator with the frequent last minute changes to travel and the often difficult task of communicating with all participants in the lead up to the course.
10. Recommendations and Lessons Learned

Having run three of these courses now, ACFOA is beginning to develop a reasonably sophisticated view of what works well, what is of value to participants, and what the likely downsides are to any training event. These recommendations build on this experience and on the evaluation sessions with participants as well as conversations with individual participants about what works and what does not work.

1. The lead-in period of at least five months to fully facilitate communications between course organizers and participants and to fully facilitate preparations in Australia is essential.

2. Whilst the nomination process for such courses will always be tricky, it seems to be working quite well as it is at present, the added step of having an ACFOA working group do the final choosing of participants was positive and acts as a buffer against any doubts regarding the transparency of the process.

3. It is very clear that visiting NGO personnel see the placement with Australian agencies as a key element of the course. In the past this has been patchy depending on the host agency but the move to managing these placement through a coordinator should reduce the risk of negative experiences in this area.

4. The management of placement or exposure to Australian NGOs should be done through a coordinator in both Melbourne and Sydney, this has been so much more effective than placement with individual agencies that it should become standard practice.

5. In managing this placement process, coordinators should be identified early enough that they have enough time to build effective and useful programs with interested Australian NGOs.

6. In all elements of the course, it is important that in initial orientation sessions it is made very clear that the course is exposing participants to the way in which Australian NGOs tackle certain issues and that participants will be expected to bring a critical mind to bear, adopting, adapting and possibly rejecting approaches and methods as they feel appropriate.

7. For coursework aspects of the course, it has become apparent that fewer presenters are better than more, and that these presenters be capable of presenting ideas, materials, information and skills in an appropriate participatory fashion. They should be mature, confident and capable of great flexibility in their approach.

8. It is important to find presenters who will challenge participants and present ideas that are new and fresh, rather than presenters with whom there will be a great deal of common analysis, world view, and approach. The latter may be comforting, but it does not necessarily stimulate new learning or thinking.

9. Having said this however, sessions should build, as far as possible, on the existing experience within the group of participants, it is possible to do this as well as challenge and stimulate.

10. In dealing with service providers for such a training (travel agents, hotel, venue managers, etc) it is important that one person is designated as the key contact person (from both the service provider and from ACFOA), in order to reduce miscommunications to a minimum. This may require ACFOA to recruit an administrative support staff member for the duration of the course.

11. With regard per diems, food allowances etc. participants should be given the full amount due to them at the beginning of their stay for which they should sign a receipt/agreement which spells out exactly what they will be responsible for from those allowances. This avoids the seemingly paternalistic practice of handing food money out on a daily basis.

12. Budgets for future courses need to be constructed with previous budgets in mind. On both courses run by ACFOA there have been a number of budget oversights which need to be included in future budgets.
13. It is important that realistic staff time is made available for administration, especially in the period 2 – 3 months prior to the course, and that one or two persons be designated to undertake this work rather than anyone who may have time available.

14. Where translation is required, it is better to find a National from the same country as the participants who has a good command of English, rather than an Australian with a good command of the foreign language.

15. Timing of courses, especially for participants from tropical areas, should try to avoid the coldest months of May to August (inclusive). It may be worth trying to time the Australian-based residential aspects of any future courses in such a way that they occur during the summer semester break at university. In this way it may be possible to base the training at the university and do so during warm weather.

11. **Evaluation of Performance Against Objectives**

   Since only Phases One to Three have been completed at the time of writing this is an interim evaluation of the performance of the project in achieving its objectives.

   **Objective 1**
   It is clear that that many issues have been covered during Phases One to Three. Participants were clearly exposed to an array of information and experience about the operations of NGOs in Australia including: organizational structure, policy environment, accountability requirements and ethical principles. What use will be made of this experience once the participants return to PNG is difficult to determine at this stage.

   **Objective 2**
   The process and design of the project has clearly facilitated linkages between PNG and Australian NGOs and between the different PNG NGOs. Importantly the links forged in the work placements in Australia (Phase Two) were based on shared interests which should enhance their sustainability.

   **Objective 3**
   The close involvement of ACFOA will be invaluable to the participants not only because it gives them familiarity with the structure and workings of Australia’s peak NGO body in the development assistance field, but also because it gives them a reference point for cooperating and interacting with all Australian NGOs.
Appendix 1 - The Participants

The 11 final participants who were selected from 32 nominations were as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cosmas Makamet</th>
<th>Daina Exon</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Diocese of Aitape</td>
<td>ECO SEEDS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regina Piam</th>
<th>Kilyali Kalit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PNG YWCA</td>
<td>WWF PNG</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>John Kawowo</th>
<th>Linda Passingan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Deboin People’s Foundation Inc.</td>
<td>ENBSEK - East New Britain Social Action Committee</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ruby Mirinka</th>
<th>Sabi Pati</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BO CBIHP - Honiara</td>
<td>National Volunteer Service</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yati Bun</th>
<th>Sophie Gegeyo</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Foundation for People &amp; Community</td>
<td>PNG National Council of Churches</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vincent Manukayasi</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Partners with Melanesians</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix 2 - Phase One Schedule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sunday 18th</th>
<th>Monday 19th</th>
<th>Tuesday 20th</th>
<th>Wednesday 21st</th>
<th>Thursday 22nd</th>
<th>Friday 23rd</th>
<th>Saturday 24th</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Free Time</td>
<td>Strategic Planning</td>
<td>Leave Eaglehawk at 9.00am</td>
<td>Management and Implementation of Advocacy Programs</td>
<td>Management and Administration Systems</td>
<td>Planning and Information relating to the Placement Phase</td>
<td>Mike Crooke</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morning Tea</td>
<td>Morning Tea</td>
<td>Morning Tea at Parliament House</td>
<td>Morning Tea</td>
<td>Morning Tea</td>
<td>Morning Tea</td>
<td>Morning Tea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lunch at Hotel</td>
<td>Lunch at Hotel</td>
<td>Lunch at ACFOA</td>
<td>Lunch at Hotel</td>
<td>Lunch at Hotel</td>
<td>Lunch at Hotel</td>
<td>Afternoon Free!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Session</td>
<td>Strategic Planning Cont.</td>
<td>Presentation at ACFOA by AusAID NGO Section &amp; ACFOA Staff</td>
<td>Management and Implementation of Advocacy Programs</td>
<td>Afternoon and Evening Free Bus will collect participants for a pre-arranged place in Civic at a time agreed to by the group to return to Eaglehawk.</td>
<td>Management and Administration Systems Cont.</td>
<td>Afternoon Tea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Afternoon Tea</td>
<td>Afternoon Tea</td>
<td>Afternoon Tea</td>
<td>Afternoon Tea</td>
<td>Afternoon Tea</td>
<td>Afternoon Tea</td>
<td>Afternoon Tea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second Session</td>
<td>Strategic Planning Cont.</td>
<td>Discussion with ACFOA staff on the Nature of Aust. NGOs and the pressures on them Finish 5.30pm</td>
<td>Management and Implementation of Advocacy Programs 3.45pm-5.15pm Bus leaves at 6.00pm sharp for Reception</td>
<td>Management and Administration Systems Cont. Finish 5.30pm</td>
<td>Management and Administration Systems Cont.</td>
<td>Afternoon Tea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dinner</td>
<td>Dinner Group dropped in Civic at 7.00pm and picked up at 9.30pm to return to Eaglehawk</td>
<td>Dinner Barbeque at Eaglehawk</td>
<td>Reception @ ANU CDI hosted reception from 6.30pm-8.30pm Followed by dinner in Civic. Bus goes back to Eaglehawk</td>
<td>Dinner In Civic to be Collected and driven back</td>
<td>Dinner At Jim Redden’s House</td>
<td>Free Evening</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Free Evening</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Melb. group depart for the Bus Depot at 8.30pm</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 3 - Phase Three Schedule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sunday April 1st</th>
<th>Monday April 2nd</th>
<th>Tuesday April 3rd</th>
<th>Wednesday April 4th</th>
<th>Thursday April 5th</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mike Crooke arrives back in Canberra</td>
<td>Debriefing from placement sessions.</td>
<td>Monitoring and Evaluation for NGOs Mike Crooke</td>
<td>Complete evaluation session for the course</td>
<td>Participants leave for PNG – 6.00am</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morning Tea</td>
<td>Morning Tea</td>
<td>Morning Tea</td>
<td>Morning Tea</td>
<td>Morning Tea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debriefing from placement sessions cont.</td>
<td>Monitoring and Evaluation for NGOs cont.</td>
<td>Discussion around planning for Phase 4. Travel to PH for presentation of certificates by Minister for Foreign Affairs, Mr. Alexander Downer</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mike Crooke and Rosie Wheen debriefing with Rhonda Chapman.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lunch</td>
<td>Lunch</td>
<td>Lunch</td>
<td>Lunch – Last meal together as a Group</td>
<td>Lunch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sydney bus in @ 2.30pm</td>
<td>1.30pm - begin to focus on the discussion to be had with AusAID.</td>
<td>Evaluation session for the course</td>
<td>Complete discussions on planning for Phase 4 Last chance at shopping</td>
<td>Mike Crooke and Rosie Wheen leave for Melbourne.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melbourne bus in @ 2.45pm</td>
<td>2.30pm - AusAID PNG desk people visiting to meet with the group to discuss CDS and the PNG Incentive Fund.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mike to collect and transfer to Eagle Hawk</td>
<td>Afternoon Tea 3.45pm</td>
<td>Afternoon Tea 4.00pm</td>
<td>Afternoon Tea</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Settling-in time again</td>
<td>Evaluation of the Course cont.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dinner</td>
<td>Dinner</td>
<td>Dinner</td>
<td>Dinner</td>
<td>Dinner</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 4 - Presenters

Jim Redden  Globalisation and PNG NGOs
George Collett  Strategic Planning for NGOs
Margaret Swieringa  The Australian Parliamentary Committee System
Ellen Shipley  The Management of AusAID and NGO Relationships
Graham Tupper  The Role of ACFOA, Issues for Peak Organisations
Pat Ranald  Policy Analysis & Development, Approaches to Advocacy
Paul Nichols  Management & Administrative Systems for NGOs
Mike Crooke  Monitoring & Evaluation Systems in NGOs
Appendix 5 - Placement Agency Contact Persons

Australian Volunteers International [AVI] Pat Jessen
International Women’s Development Agency [IWDA] Annie Goldflam
Community Aid Abroad/Oxfam Australia [CAA] Damien O’Keefe & Julie Eagles
World Wide Fund for Nature [WWF] Marguerite Young
Australian Foundation for Peoples of Asia and the Pacific [AFAP] Ruth Nichols
Australian Conservation Foundation Lee Tan
National Council of Churches of Australia Jamie Isbister
APACE Donella Bryce
Appendix 6 - Evaluation by Participants

I have included the evaluation feedback in its entirety, unaltered. As is usually the case, some of the statements are hard to fathom and a few (not as many as last time) are contradictory. I did get a chance to talk to a number of people informally in the last few days of the training, and from those discussions and the results of the evaluation I would make the following comments, which I feel reflect the majority of the participants’ thoughts and feeling about the training.

Logistics and Administration

- **Transport:** There was a fairly high degree of satisfaction with the arrangements that had been made for people, especially given the complexity of air travel both to and from Australia. Some people mentioned that the coach trip to Melbourne was tiring, night trips by coach should be avoided in future where possible.

- **Accommodation:** In Canberra most people were reasonably happy with the accommodation, although they said that the atmosphere at the hotel was not conducive to the nature of the course? They also felt that the hotel was rather isolated and that this had both a good and a bad aspect to it.

- **Food:** Most people were unhappy about the food at the hotel. It was for this reason that we decided to give them dinner allowances more often and allow them to go outside to eat, though this meant a lot of driving.

- **Administration:** I think people were generally pretty happy the way the course was administered, which was informal but efficient. They did mention that they felt that it would be more appropriate (especially with such senior and experienced people) if all allowances and per diems were simply given to them up front at the beginning of the course.

Coursework in Canberra

- **Sessions that Worked:** Most sessions worked quite well and were valued by participants. The sessions that people seemed to particularly like were: Globalisation [Jim Redden]; Management and Administrative Systems [Paul Nichols]; The visit to Parliament [presentation by Margaret Swieringa]; Monitoring and Evaluation [Mike Crooke] and the session at ACFOA [Ellen Shipley and Graham Tupper].

- **Sessions of Questionable Value:** The group was fairly positive about the content of all sessions, they felt that both George Collett and Pat Ranald needed to make their sessions more participatory, drawing more from the experience and skills that exist within the group.

- **Focus:** The feedback was generally that the components were well conceived and put together and that the focus and content were about right given the time available.

The Placement Week [by placement agency]

- **Australian Volunteers International:** AVI set a new high watermark for effectiveness in terms of facilitating a positive placement experience. They committed a fair number of staff and resources to the effort and obviously took it very seriously and this was reflected in the glowing comments from participants on their return to Canberra.

- **International Women’s Development Agency:** Participants visiting IWDA felt that the agency had not really understood the nature of the course and had not provided the type of experience that they had been looking for, although some aspects of the exchange had been useful.
• **Community Aid Abroad/Oxfam Australia:** Comments were much the same as for IWDA, although those participants who have joint projects with CAA found the time useful in terms of discussions around project details, requirements, reporting, etc.

• **Australian Conservation Foundation:** ACF played a fairly minor role this time around, although the participants were grateful for the opportunity to attend the ACF board meeting and to meet the members of the board including Peter Garratt.

• **World Wide Fund for Nature:** WWF came in for the most negative comments from Sydney-based participants. They felt that WWF had not understood the nature of the course, was not really committed to giving them any time, and were upset with the condescending way they perceived WWF to have dealt with its PNG partner, Kilyali Kalit. [Kilyali returned to PNG early, some participants said because of this treatment, therefore it was not possible to check these perceptions with him]

• **Australian Foundation for Peoples of Asia and the Pacific:** The two participants who visited AFAP seem to have had a positive experience, although they did not provide much by way of information [Yati Bun who works with AFAP as an implementing partner returned to PNG early making it impossible to debrief with him properly]

• **APACE:** John Kawowo has been an implementing partner with APACE, and it is a little unclear given that APACE is winding down activities in its current form, just what any future relationship will be. The visit seems to have been useful although John was very sparse on detail as to exactly what he did, and does seem to have had a lot of ‘free time’ during the visit.

• **National Council of Churches Australia:** This seems to have been a very fruitful visit, clearing up a number of misconceptions from both agency and participant perspectives. Although it was organized very late in the planning for placements, it seems to have worked well.

**Some General Thoughts on Placement**

- It is very clear from the feedback that participants see this as being a very important part of the course, especially those that had a productive and stimulating experience during their exposure. Those that are unfortunate enough not to have such a positive experience, tend to question the value of placement more.

- It is also clear that the quality of the placement experience depends to a large extent on the attitude of those who will play the role of hosts. This attitude was able to be monitored and to a large extent potential negative experiences avoided in Melbourne this time by using a coordinator who was committed to the group having a positive experience, and was sensitive enough to work with the agencies in such a way that this came about [having to dramatically reduce the role of one agency who clearly had not understood the nature of the placement].

- This idea of using a coordinator grew out of recommendations from previous courses and is clearly the best way to manage these exposures and to ensure that they are a productive and positive as possible.

Whilst the results of group evaluations can be confusing and at times contradictory, they are reproduced in full below. The value of these exercises is to stimulate discussion and debate and in that way very often the real feelings about what was positive and negative is brought out into the light.