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Dear Mr Rennie

Submission on the Service Priority Review – Interim Report

Thank you for the opportunity to make submissions in relation to the Service Priority Review - Interim Report (August 2017) (Interim Report). I have read the Interim Report with interest, and I agree with the observations and general recommendations made by the Panel.

By way of background, I am a former senior public servant with over 15 years experience within Western Australia’s public sector. I was previously a senior lawyer with the State Solicitor’s Office. Most recently, I was the Director of Strategy and Reform at the former Department of Environment Regulation (2015 to 2017), responsible for agency-wide reform and reporting directly to the Director General. I resigned from my position in leading reform in environmental regulation in April 2017. As a former senior officer with recent and direct responsibilities with implementing reform, I hope my submission is of some assistance to the Panel.

1. Implementation of Reform

The Interim Report notes that too often, the public sector has been unable to move from problem identification to action, and then to sustained and effective solution (page 10). My own experiences support this observation.

Sustained and effective solution of major reforms in the public sector are not implemented for a range of reasons. These reasons depend on the agency involved. I have observed the following specific reasons for failure –

- The inability of the agency to design genuinely effective solutions. Often this arises as the staff involved in solution design are the same line agency staff who are responsible for the service delivery. Staff who have been career, long term or senior public servants in the agency are often unable to conceptualise and support new approaches to how things can be done.

- It is a burden on staff to require them to undertake change and also continue to provide essential services at the same time. This dual role leads to –
  - decline in staff morale, and increase in anxiety and stress, due to increase workloads or perceptions of increase workloads;
  - confusion and lack of confidence in new processes due to lack of familiarity and experience; and
opposition due to entrenched support for the “old way” of doing things when the “new way” is seen to be more complex or more work for staff. As a result, implementation of reform fails due to critical factors of solution design and staff engagement.

For these reasons, I would recommend that implementation of significant reforms within and across the public sector be led and driven by external agents of change (persons outside of the agencies in question) and by areas within the agency which are adjunct to existing functional areas.

Internal agents of change are vulnerable to personal and professional relationships, internal-agency politics and organisational dynamics. External agents of change are more effective in the implementation of reforms as they have fresh eyes which identify new approaches, experiences outside of the agency which result in effective comparators, and overall a greater appetite for risk and doing things differently.

The creation of adjunct areas to implement reform is critical. Success breeds success and confidence. Allowing the workforce to continue with business as usual enables agencies to continue with service delivery. This is critical to ensure agencies maintain their service obligations to the Government and the public.

2. Data

I agree with the Interim Report’s observations on increasing data sharing among agencies. However, I note that my experience within the former Department of Environment Regulation (now Department of Water and Environmental Regulation), evidenced the following issues in relation to data sharing within a single agency –

- The agency has multiple data systems which are not interoperable and do not easily support data analysis to occur. These data systems are outdated, and cost a significant amount of recurrent expenditure to maintain. They contain out of date data and there are no processes for data cleansing to be frequently undertaken.
- Data systems are only as reliable as the users who input the data. The data systems were unreliable due to lack of protocols for entry of information (for example, inconsistency of naming conventions, nomenclature etc).
- Data systems are not analysed or utilised in decision making. Without formal processes and governance requiring the agency to analyse and utilise data in decision making, there was a high risk that the data would be ignored.

I wish to make the following points –

- The highest and best use of data by the public sector is to enable evidence-based targeting of agency resources, responses and activities and to ensure evidence-based decision making. Agencies often lack the appropriate human resources to undertake and analyse and interpret data appropriately and effectively. Investment in the appropriate capability is critical.
- Strong governance structures are needed in relation to data management and data system maintenance, as well as documented requirements as to how data will be used by agencies. Without documented requirements, agencies may not utilise data to make informed, evidence-based decision making.
3. **Good quality regulation**

In my former role as Director Strategy and Reform, I was responsible for the design and implementation of a new approach to environmental regulation. This approach was based on COAG principles of regulation, and was built on the foundation of risk-based regulation.

Risk-based regulation will achieve the objectives of good quality regulation identified in the Interim Report. Too often, government regulation utilises a cookie cutter “one size fits all” approach. This simplistic approach results in under-regulation in some cases, and over-regulation in most cases. Risk-based regulation strikes the balance of protecting the public interest and not creating undue burden on industry. Risk-based regulation will enable a more sophisticated, considered response to the ever-changing and increasingly complex challenges facing Western Australia. It will enable improved, efficient and effective regulation.

Risk-based regulation, in simple terms, means that a regulatory response correlates to the risk of the activity or action. The development of an effective risk-based framework requires an understanding of the legislative framework, the industries regulated, data analysis and trend identification. It will also require, in some areas, a complete review of the appropriateness of the regulatory capture under existing laws.

Legislative reform is urgently needed in a number of areas of regulation to reduce burden in some instances, increase regulation in others, and ensure competitive neutrality within and across industries. In summary, in some cases, the public sector can be perceived to be ineffective because the very laws they are tasked to implement are out of date and require amendment.

* I would welcome the opportunity to meet with you and the Panel to discuss my own experiences in implementing reform within the public sector. Whilst a whole of government culture is valuable and effective, each agency must also be competent at delivering its core essential service. Not all agencies are yet able to do so.

My thanks to the Panel for the invaluable work in undertaking this review. I sincerely hope that your work results in genuine, sustained, and lasting changes in the public sector in Western Australia.

Yours sincerely

Agnes Tay
10 September 2017
Eugenio Carroll

16 September 2017

The Panel
Service Priority Review
Department of Premier and Cabinet

Re: Feedback on issues raised in the interim report

Disclaimer

The feedback and comments provided are intended to contribute to making the WA Public Sector a truly effective and efficient service for the community of Western Australia. It represents a personal view based on observation over 20 years in the sector. It is not intended to be a criticism of past or existing leadership of public sector agencies or governments.

I am grateful for the opportunity to provide feedback to the Service Priority Review panel.

Introduction

I respect the Panel’s busy schedule and timeframe to produce the final report. The feedback will be brief and hopefully expressed adequately to provide a gist of the issues and potential solutions for consideration.

Having responsibility for workforce strategic planning and service delivery modelling but not being able to implement reforms and recommendations from previous reviews highlights a number systemic issues that impede performance and decision making at the executive and agency level. The Service Priority Review - Interim Report to the Western Australian Government, published 30 August echo’s the content of plans and justification for reforms that I have submitted in particularly that:

- the public sector must rethink design practice and service delivery to achieve better outcomes for the community
- the State cannot afford business as usual
- the public sector has been unable to move from problem identification to action and then to sustained and effective solution. The 2009 Economic Audit Committee review is a case in point as are other major reviews.

Trying to implement transformation and reform from the bottom up has been impossible. ‘Impossible’ is a word that I am not comfortable with as I believe there is a willingness and intelligence that recognises a need for transformation. However, we are addicted to way
of working that is reactionary and focused on immediate need and this approach needs rehabilitation.

The opportunity to provide feedback allows a top down approach to implement solutions that will raise the consciousness of the executive leadership and the ministers of whichever party that forms government for the State of Western Australia.

The four directions for reform referred to in the report are:

- Building a public sector focused on community needs
- Enabling the public sector to do its job better
- Reshaping and strengthening the public sector workforce
- Strengthening leadership across government

Feedback will be provided under three headings of:

- Effective and efficient public sector, which combines the first two directions
- Workforce
- Leadership

All three areas are interdependent and solutions need to be introduced simultaneously.

**Effective and efficient public sector**

As expressed in the Interim report ‘it is of serious concern that much good work done in previous reviews has not been implemented and thus failed to lead to lasting change”. Agency performance reviews have also resulted in the same fate. Once the urgency for compliance has passed and enough justification has been provided initiatives are shelved and we return once more to a reactive state of being. This is a common challenge where urgent issues of the day distract government and agency executive from following the ‘Plan’.

My observations suggest that machinery of government and the relationship with agencies must change as it is the primary cause for sustaining reactive cultures and leaders. The current mode of operation also attracts people with reactive tendencies and whose survival dependencies are mainly focused on serving the CEO or the Minister or the Government of the day, not the people of WA.

What I have noticed and this is generally known is that when Governments change there is a spill at the top end, usually the CEO and a number of executive leave. If the CEO of an agency is working to a strategic plan, the Minister can force the abandonment of the plan -intentionally or unintentionally - with pressures to meet election promises and government priorities. Failure to change course could mean a premature departure as the Minister replaces the CEO. This issue obviously cascades down chain of command.

I note that the Interim Report alludes to an awareness of this issue when it says “much of what appears in this report presupposes a recalibration of the relationship between the Premier, ministers and agency leaders. Noting the whole of government perspective taken by the Premier, the framework for appointment and performance management of agency heads needs to be clarified, and the support provided to agency heads strengthened”.

A solution is critical to success for the WA Public Sector and any Government responsible for the State. The public sector can only take reforms so far, especially if the political environment is one of short-termism. A new machinery of government model that allows agencies to develop strategic plans and pursue longer term outcomes for the State must be introduced. Western Australians deserve a public sector that delivers the best possible outcomes for the community. Agencies can’t be held responsible to only support the Minister’s and Government election promises. There needs to be a means by which incoming governments can work with agencies to adjust plans and priorities and seek feasibility studies before forcing to action promises that may not be the best use of resources. With the opportunities for the agency to adjust plans there can be a win for the government, the agency and more importantly the people we serve – the community.
The State Labour Government announced this review but will they support a solution that must transcends which party is in government, elections cycles and ministers reactive demands and decisions. It’s going to require a major shift from the way government currently works. And it’s going to need a lot of commitment from us to make it successful.

We must find and implement a solution that supports strategic planning that allows agencies to plan reforms to endure beyond electoral cycles. We have to get better at working with the political class to get across the benefits of pursuing broad outcomes, while helping them adjust the focus where necessary according to the specific policy mandates they have received from the public.

The review’s reference to an outcomes based approach is welcome and is release of fresh air. It will drive a need for a planning culture, strategic planning (including workforce planning, funding and resourcing considerations), incorporating governmental agreements, local businesses and community organisation’s needs. This will encourage a need to work together to devise the priorities that will get results we want. These measures will bring about substantial long-term change by improving the sector’s efficiency, effectiveness, accountability and affordability. We can expect that, over time, our public sector reforms will save taxpayers hundreds of millions of dollars.

Without fear, agency heads will be able to deliver on the agenda of the government of the day and also ensure the enduring, apolitical operation of the sector. There must be a strong trust relationship between agency heads and the government of the day. Purposeful, regular interaction between agency leadership and the political leadership can help foster this.

The use of blunt, short-term ‘efficiency dividends’ and staffing caps to support short-term deficit reduction have weakened the incentives for departments to develop sustainable financial management strategies. A strategic plan based on outcomes and service delivery intention will also support planning and budget cycles. Submissions for funding will be based on robust strategic plans, priorities and staffing models. Alignment with government funding decisions will also mean approvals can be given to support agency internal budget allocations, responsibility and accountability. Executive can be empowered to be effective stewards of State’s resources.

Ministers and government agencies can together identify cross-sector targets that tackle community priorities, with agencies working collaboratively to address them. An outcomes approach will provide clarity on key priorities, improve collaboration and enable the public sector to make more of a difference. Clarity of purpose is a key to workforce performance improvement.

**Workforce**

As a dedicated public servant, I know that our actions are overwhelmingly motivated by the desire to serve the public. We join the public service because we care. When we’re at our best, it’s because there’s a strong moral purpose to what we do, and good structures in place, motivating us to work for the common good.

As noted in the interim Report “public sector employees in general possess a strong spirit of public service, are ethical in practice and have a genuine desire to improve services for the benefit of the community”. There is also considerable diligence to understand that meeting community need does not mean making the community needy.

With such qualities in our workforce it is a shame that we are not utilised to our potential. This underutilisation only results in further disengagement, dissatisfaction and disease, which mean considerable amount of unproductive time and resources. Poor structures and leadership impacts on the wellbeing of the workforce which is costly.

We need to manage our workforce better. With a leadership culture that is reactive and does not value planning the workforce is also forced into providing reactive service, firefighting issues as and when they occur. How do we expect to achieve a high performing workforce when we don’t understand human need for growth and contribution?
A switch to an outcomes focus that mandates strategic planning and workforce planning will provide clarity about our purpose and objectives. It will provide clarity about how we can contribute to make the State an even better place for people to live in.

The workforce needs structures and leadership that empowers and supports innovation. The workforce needs leadership that can win hearts and minds and inspires high performance. The workforce needs a systematic and long-term workforce planning, capability development and effective workforce management.

A reactive approach has resulted in insufficient capability in strategic planning, strategic workforce planning and human resources management. The human resources function has also become reactive and is seen as provider of transactional services such as payroll, recruitment, industrial relations, staff grievances, workers compensation administration and general HR advice and services.

Attempts in the past to introduce workforce planning and strategic services within agencies and the Public Sector Commission have not been successful. The Australian Human Resources Institute has recognised that the function has become devalued and underutilised and is seeking to develop capability and capacity to service organisations at the strategic level through the Certification Program.

Public Sector has recognised the value of certification in the accounting function. That is, a Chief Financial Officer needs to have a CPA to perform at this role. However, the human resources function that should be responsible for the strategic and operational workforce services that can amount to over 50% of total operating expense does not require such credentials.

Workforce planning and management function needs to be elevated so that it can deliver effective and efficient HR services and also contribute to developing high performance workforce and leadership at all levels of the organisation.

Often we don't consider people as leaders unless they have been given some position of authority in an organization. We must invest in workforce development and develop leadership capability no matter what level or position people hold. Everyone needs to recognise that they have some responsibility for leadership and they are responsible to lead themselves and use their skills to its potential to serve not only their own interests, but also to the interests of others.

The HRM function must restore the word “human” in human resource management and support the organisation bring out the best performance in its people, its workforce. It must support agencies and take a lead role to implement effective stewardship, cultural change and networks to leverage resources to achieve public value outcomes across the public sector and beyond.

**Leadership**

Complex systems require effective leadership at all levels to ensure efficient operations and effective service delivery. Leadership shapes culture, sets the tone and encourages innovation and best practice service design. It fosters cohesion across disparate functions and looks to the long-term.

We have been attracting the reactive leader, the command and control type, the ‘my way or the high way’ leaders, some bordering on being psychopaths. What got these leaders here won’t get the public sector to where it needs to go. We need a new leadership approach, one that can rise above the reactive state to a higher level of consciousness.

A higher level of consciousness is necessary as the essence of leadership is broader than possessing certain skills and expertise. It's deeper than what any leadership assessment can reveal. And it's much more profound than being accountable to shareholders to impart vision and reap financial results.

Business consultant Peter Block suggests that leadership should be viewed more as stewardship. In a business setting, Peter Block defines stewardship as “the willingness to
be held accountable for the well-being of the larger organization by operating in service, rather than control, of those around us."

Most of us can grasp being a steward of money and tangible property. But when it comes
to taking responsibility for the intangible things, such as our abilities—and especially our
relationships—things start getting a little fuzzy.

We must develop new leaders that understand they are stewards of everything, including
time, money, abilities, information, wisdom, relationships, and authority. As stewards they
will be required to give account to the appropriate delegate as to how well they managed
all things entrusted to them.

As leaders with high consciousness - stewards – we will be required to help others use
their skills and abilities. This means our most important responsibility is to empower the
people under our authority to discover, develop, and use their abilities to potential and to
win the hearts and minds of the workforce.

Strategic plans and workforce plans must include funding estimates to develop the
leaders at all levels to the required 21st century standards and contain strategies to shift
those reactive leaders unable to adjust to new requirements.

Conclusion

The public sector is made up of people with a desire to serve and contribute to the
development and prosperity of the community, State and nation. Yet despite this desire a
significant portion of the workforce is dissatisfied, disengaged, disempowered and some
now diseased.

Observations of the past 20 years suggest that solutions to bring the public sector into the
21st century require reforms to the machinery of government practices, workforce culture
and leadership.

Agencies have been conditioned over the years and have developed a reactive approach
to service delivery. This reactive culture does not value strategic planning and workforce
planning and this has consequences on agency performance.

The public sector can only take reforms so far, especially as the political environment is
one of short-termism. We must find and implement a solution that supports strategic
planning that allows agencies to plan reforms to endure beyond electoral cycles. We have
to get better at working with the political class to get across the benefits of pursuing broad
outcomes, while helping them adjust the focus where necessary according to the specific
policy mandates they have received from the public.

A switch to an outcomes focus that mandates strategic planning and workforce planning
will provide clarity about our purpose and objectives. It will provide clarity about how we
can contribute make the State an even better place for people to live in. It can eliminate
the use of blunt, short-term 'efficiency dividends' and staffing caps to support short-term
deficit reduction that have weakened the incentives for departments to develop
sustainable financial management strategies.

The workforce needs structures and leadership that empowers and supports innovation.
The workforce needs leadership that can win hearts and minds and inspires high
performance. The workforce needs a systematic and long-term workforce planning,
capability development and effective workforce management.

Workforce planning and management function needs to be elevated so that it can deliver
effective and efficient HR services and also contribute to developing high performance
workforce and leadership at all levels of the organisation. To be elevated the function
needs certified professionals in these roles, similar to the Public Sector recognizing the
value of certification in the accounting function.

Given the elevation in function, HRM must restore the word "human" in human resource
management and support the organisation bring out the best performance in its people, its
workforce. It must support agencies and take a lead role to implement effective
stewardship, cultural change and networks to leverage resources to achieve public value outcomes across the public sector and beyond.

As leaders with high consciousness we will be required to help others use their skills and abilities. This means our most important responsibility is to empower the people under our authority to discover, develop, and use their abilities to potential and to win the hearts and minds of the workforce.

Strategic plans and workforce plans must include funding estimates to develop the leaders at all levels to the required 21st century standards and contain strategies to shift those reactive leaders unable to adjust to new requirements.

I thank you for the opportunity to provide feedback and hope that the contents have contributed in some to support the outcomes for the final report.

Yours Sincerely

Eugenio Carroll
(Slide 1)

The following is my unsolicited contribution to the Service Priority Review (SPR).

My 5 cents.
(Slide 2)

My contribution centres on the above nine questions from the SPR’s major themes.
Terms of Reference

The Service Priority Review is to review, report on and make recommendations with specific reference to:

1. Achieving cultural change within the public sector (e.g. promoting risk based decision making, promoting innovation and radical efficiency, improving accountability, and identifying incentives and disincentives to improved performance).

2. Promoting a culture of collaboration in the achievement of outcomes for the community.

3. Promoting public service innovation that delivers transformative public policy and service delivery that is different, better and lower cost.

4. Identifying opportunities to further consolidate public sector entities into departments or other entities aligned with Government’s strategic imperatives (or other means to better align and coordinate roles and responsibilities across public sector entities).

5. Identifying opportunities to deliver Government services, programs, projects and other initiatives more efficiently or effectively, including through a whole of Government digital strategy, or to no longer be delivered.

6. Developing and implementing whole of sector key performance indicators to ensure more effective delivery of services to the community and support for economic activity and job creation.

7. Attracting and retaining a skilled public sector workforce with the capacity to meet emerging economic, social, environmental and technological challenges.

8. Achieving greater economies and efficiencies in Western Australia’s public sector administration, including opportunities to reduce bureaucracy and red tape within Government, improve workforce management processes and facilitate workforce renewal in a fair and transparent manner.

(Slide 3)

My contribution also relates to the following words, as featured within the SPR's Terms of Reference.
| (Theme 1) What does the WA community require from the public sector? | 1. Organisational Project Management | Slides 5-9 |
| (Theme 1) What key outcomes should the public sector be trying to achieve? | 2. Information System | Slide 14 |
| (Theme 1) How can results be measured and shared with the community? | | |
| (Theme 2) How can senior officers be better supported to manage their teams more effectively? | | Slides 15-16 |
| (Theme 2) How can public sector agencies work together to better share and exchange workers’ knowledge and expertise? | | Slide 14 |
| (Theme 2) How could the performance management and accountability framework be strengthened to give incentives for collaboration? | | Slides 15-16 |
| (Theme 3) How can the public sector better collaborate – both between agencies, and with the private sector – to operate more efficiently? | | Slide 14 |
| (Theme 3) How can the public sector be more accountable for service delivery? | | Slides 15-16 |
| (Theme 3) How could the public sector be better organised to operate more efficiently? | | Slides 12-13 |

(Slide 4)

My contribution suggests three areas of immediate adoption, mandatory use, and continuous improvement across the entire public sector:

- Adoption of system thinking across the entire Western Australian public sector via an Organisational Project Management (OPM) strategy execution framework;
- Support the above execution framework with an information system; and
- Underpin the above framework and information system with championing a new culture based on transparency across the entire Western Australian public sector.
(Theme 1) What does the WA community require from the public sector?

Short answer:

To become more effective, efficient and to continuously improve.

Recommendations:

1. To achieve the above requires a unifying clarity across the public sector and State Government on: a) Why we work, b) How we work, and c) What we do. Note: Must be in this order, always starting with the Why.
2. Apply a systems thinking approach by creating and defining portfolios and sub-portfolios.
3. Immediately enforce across the public sector and State Government a single and unifying strategy execution framework, such as Organisational Project Management (OPM). This approach will strip-away the current ambiguity, duplication and complexity, making it simple for everyone to understand why, how and what we all do together as one team. By adopting a single and consistent framework will allow us to strategically align all projects, programs and operational components to their sub-portfolios and portfolios.

• https://startwithwhy.com/
(Slide 6)

**Theme 1: What does the WA community require from the public sector?**

**Background information:**

Well over a century we’ve been breaking things down to component parts. Reductionist thinking has lead to efficiency, for example, departments of specialists who focus on independent tasks, each understanding a small piece of the puzzle.

But this approach can, in isolation, lead to losing connection with the whole concerning how all the pieces fit together to create a dynamic living system of work. This is a critical failure, because without holistic understanding of any system, it becomes difficult, if not impossible, to improve it.

In the 20th century we took work apart. In the 21st century we need to put work back together again. We need to focus on connecting EVERYTHING, all the projects, programs, operational components, functional areas, departments, commissions, agencies, boards, sub-portfolios, stakeholders, so there is a shared understanding of why, how, and what we do.

* https://medium.com/the-xplane-collection/how-to-survive-the-disruption-ff862fc537af
Systems thinking has been defined as an approach to problem solving that attempts to balance reductionist thinking and holistic thinking. By taking the overall system as well as its parts into account systems thinking is designed to avoid potentially contributing to further development of unintended consequences.

Systems thinking is increasingly being used to tackle a wide variety of subjects in fields such as business analysis, business management, government, computing, engineering, epidemiology, information science, health, manufacture, sustainable development, and the environment. Organisational Project Management (a strategic execution framework) is an example of a systems framework and thinking.

Such systems are often described in terms of inputs, transformations, outputs, and feedback loops that operate to make an organisation healthy or unhealthy.

(Slide 7)

(Theme 1) What does the WA community require from the public sector?

Background information:

Stability and reductionist thinking can be an asset, but this limited thinking is becoming increasingly viewed as a liability.

It’s time to stop breaking down the public sector and start putting it together as one team.

The existing ‘stable and reductionist thinking’ status quo is becoming increasingly complex, problematic, ineffective, and costly.

(Slide 8)

(Theme 1) What does the WA community require from the public sector?

Background information:

Reductionist thinking is not bad: 6 million parts making up 100’s of tons of aircraft is way cool. Look at what individual projects and programs can achieve with the ongoing support of operational management.

However project, program and operational teams can have trouble collaborating. They can hoard information; they can be focused on different priorities; and they can blame each other when they stall or fail to deliver in a wider context. How is the public sector currently performing? Are we cooperating or collaborating?

Cooperating is working in parallel tracks completing a task and handing it to the next team in the next silo.

Collaborating is putting everyone to work in the same track and changing the way they work every day; it requires them to behave and interact in a new way. To collaborate we need to break down our silos and stop this reductionist thinking.

• http://xblog.xplane.com/breaking-down-silos-to-foster-collaboration?utm_source=XPLANE+Newsletter&utm_campaign=66f0e8bd3c-XPRESS_May_2017&utm_medium=email&utm_term=0_8dc57d6ae-66f0e8bd3c-370884805
(Slide 9)

**Theme 1** What does the WA community require from the public sector?

**Background information:**

Holistic thinking is the whole deal. Everything. The Portfolio of all components – projects, programs, and operational components. Collaboration is possible, look at the airline industry.

Everyone seems to agree that collaboration across functions is critical for successful projects/programs and operational success. The reality, however, is that meshing the skills and resources of different teams, departments, agencies, each focused on its own distinct targets, each having a different Why, What, and How to achieve a larger goal is much easier said than done.

In fact, it takes much more than people being willing to get together, share information, and cooperate. It more importantly involves making tough decisions and trade-offs about what and what not to do, in order to adjust resourcing and workloads across areas with different priorities and bosses. And despite all the well-meaning cooperative behaviours, this is often where interdepartmental and interagency collaboration breaks down.

(Slide 10)

**Theme 1: What key outcomes should the public sector be trying to achieve?**

**Short answer:**

It shouldn’t, because using the word ‘outcomes’ and trying to serve the people of Western Australia using ‘outcome theory’ is counterproductive and we should immediately cease using this outdated mindset/practice/measurement.

**Recommendations:**

1. This question and its use of the word ‘outcomes’ is so last century! It is now 2017! The public sector needs to completely drop the use and thinking surrounding this ‘outcome theory’ conceptual thinking. It’s outdated and not helpful.
2. Immediately shift to ‘customer experience’ thinking and ‘customer experience management’ practice and measurement.
3. Feed customer experience KPI’s and reporting into portfolio, program, project, and operational performance management to determine real-time public value and achievement against strategic goals.
4. Where on Maslow’s hierarchy of needs is the public sector positioning itself? Long term perfect solutions? Really! Let’s focus on the here and now.

* https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Maslow%27s_hierarchy_of_needs
* https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Outcomes_theory
* https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Customer_experience
* https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Nirvana_fallacy
(Slide 11)

(Theme 1) **What key outcomes should the public sector be trying to achieve?**

**Background information:**

- “Deal with the world as it is, not how you’d like it to be” (Jack Welch)
- The people that we serve just want us to help them with their basic needs straight away.
- Customer experience is all about real time connections, interactions, relationships, service, usability, design and advertising. Not the promise of the future but the reality of the now!
- People remember and value great experiences that demonstrate deep understanding and respect for their needs.
- When companies learn how to deliver and evolve differentiated experiences, they tend to build strong, enduring customer relationships and profitable businesses. Governments can learn from this approach.
- It’s all about the immediate interactions. Not the promise of a fantasy future!

- [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Maslow%27s_hierarchy_of_needs](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Maslow%27s_hierarchy_of_needs)
(Theme 3) How could the public sector be better organised to operate more efficiently?
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(Theme 3) How could the public sector be better organised to operate more efficiently?

Background information:

- We are all talking different languages and seeing things from different perspectives! We are not all on the same page because all our pages are slightly different.
- Teachers, doctors, lawyers, auditors, scientists, engineers, psychiatrists, investigators, social workers, nurses, commissioners, director generals, prison guards, police officers, administration assistants, directors, assistant directors, project managers, program managers, IT professionals, statisticians, procurement professionals, ministers, accountants, policy practitioners etc etc etc!!!!!!! Let’s face it, within the public sector, we are a very broad collection of people and we all have our own unique understanding of what projects, programs, sub-portfolios, and operational components are and how they should be described and managed.
- Therefore anyone involved in project/program/portfolio/operational management within the public sector should have access to a clear and concise single set of definitions to foster common understanding and consistent usage across the whole of government via a single strategic execution framework that accommodates the complexity of the public sector.
- Robust and consistent definitions and standards are valuable assets as they allow us to assess situations better, have more meaningful conversations and make better decisions together.
- In contrast, varied and ever changing, imprecise or poorly constructed definitions, standards and management styles can make it difficult to even agree on what we’re talking about and trying to achieve. This is why the public sector needs to adopt generic definitions, practices and standards that are recognised as world’s best practice rather than developing or tailoring multiple and bespoke sets of definitions, standards and management styles.
(Theme 1) How can results be measured and shared with the community?
(Theme 2) How can public sector agencies work together to better share and exchange workers’ knowledge and expertise?
(Theme 3) How can the public sector better collaborate – both between agencies, and with the private sector – to operate more efficiently?
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(Theme 1) How can results be measured and shared with the community?
(Theme 2) How can public sector agencies work together to better share and exchange workers’ knowledge and expertise?
(Theme 3) How can the public sector better collaborate – both between agencies, and with the private sector – to operate more efficiently?

Short answer:
Smartsheet.com

Recommendations:

1. To support the adoption and use of Organisational Project Management (OPM) across the public sector the Department of the Premier and Cabinet, on behalf of the Premier, creates a subscription with Smartsheet.com and instruct all agencies to update their information in real-time, concerning all the strategic planning and management of all projects, programs, and operations across all State Government portfolios.
2. Selected information via automated e-reports and e-dashboards are shared across the public sector, State Government and with the people of Western Australia via Smartsheet.com’s publishing functionality.
3. The public sector’s Organisational Project Management’s Information System (OPMIS), via Smartsheet.com, should be structured and aligned with the Project Management Institute’s Standards and Guides for consistency and clarity.

- https://www.smartsheet.com/videos/all
(Theme 2) How can senior officers be better supported to manage their teams more effectively?
(Theme 2) How could the performance management and accountability framework be strengthened to give incentives for collaboration?
(Theme 3) How can the public sector be more accountable for service delivery?
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(Theme 2) How can senior officers be better supported to manage their teams more effectively?
(Theme 2) How could the performance management and accountability framework be strengthened to give incentives for collaboration?
(Theme 3) How can the public sector be more accountable for service delivery?

Short answer:

It’s hard to collaborate, manage, and be accountable when there’s a lack of clarity and transparency. Creating an Organisational Project Management Information System with everything and thereby would create a panorama that is crystal clear.

Recommendations:

1. Establish and enforce an information system and supportive culture where clear information on everything is available and transparent.
IF YOU WANT SOMETHING NEW, YOU HAVE TO STOP DOING SOMETHING OLD.
(PETER DRUCKER)

(Theme 2) How can senior officers be better supported to manage their teams more effectively?
(Theme 2) How could the performance management and accountability framework be strengthened to give incentives for collaboration?
(Theme 3) How can the public sector be more accountable for service delivery?

Background information:

1. Everyone needs to see everything, the: why’s, how’s, what’s, who’s, when’s, and where’s should all be available in real-time. Exposing everything will quickly foster ownership and accountability allow for shared information, collaboration. A new revitalising culture that people will embrace.
2. Opaque projects, programs, and operational components go nowhere fast, therefore, change it.
3. Transparency isn’t just another buzzword. The word may be thrown around like it’s inherent in current workflow, but simply sharing dates and a perpetual “all systems go” mantra with all involved doesn’t qualify as transparency.
4. Transparency is top to bottom, bottom to top and across. This ensures that everyone is working toward common and understood goals.
5. Transparency is a constant state of accessibility to current state information, knowing and dialogue. It’s not just saying what people want to hear, but saying what people (the public of Western Australia) need to hear.
6. Transparency is ownership and accountability at all levels, on all activities.


The following is my written feedback on some of the issues in the interim report and the directions for reform.

But right-off-the-bat....well done, as the Interim Report was a good read.

So to all involved, be proud as a team. You’re all doing well and keep rolling towards delivering that final report. It’s important.

I know that this second submission of mine (9 Sep 2017), which relates to my first submission (15 Jun 2017), my initial email to the Premier (30 Apr 2017) and the Premier’s Reply (16 May 2017) are also all in the spirit of wanting the best for all Western Australians. The people we serve.

Sincerely.

Mark Weeks

PS: The pull of the status quo is strong but out-of-date attitudes and work practices must be challenged. (Not my words, someone else smarter than me said this).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interim Report Text</th>
<th>Interim Report Page</th>
<th>Topics &amp; Corresponding Slides</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>‘The report does not contain the ‘A to Z’ of public sector reform; it identifies the elements of reform that have the greatest capacity to catalyse change.’</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Maximise efficiency (Slides 3 to 16)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘These barriers call for a major cultural shift requiring transformative leadership and comprehensive up-skilling, including openness to using relevant skills from the private sector to implement the required changes.’</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Factors causing sub-optimal performance in the WA public sector: poor use of project planning, competition and innovation to maximise public value from the whole sector’</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>with a framework, standards and practices (Slides 17 to 22)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Factors causing sub-optimal performance in the WA public sector: modes of operating that maintain silos, with inconsistent approaches to – and no incentives for – cross-sector collaboration, no systematic learning from or dissemination of good practice across agencies for core functions.’</td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Urgency will be needed. So too will be priority setting, and effective sequencing of reform actions.’</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>that are already developed (Slides 23 to 26)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘APPENDIX D: List of meetings and submissions received, as at 4 August 2017.’</td>
<td>52-59</td>
<td>and used by professionals (Slides 27 to 33)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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My feedback focuses on the above highlighted text which features within the Interim Report and centres around the following four topics that I’ve made up for this submission:

1) Maximise efficiency 2) with a framework, standards and practices 3) that are already developed 4) and used by professionals.
Topic 1: Maximize efficiency with a framework, standards and practices that are already developed and used by professionals.

(Slide 3)

The first topic is all about maximizing efficiency by highlighting a single element of reform that I know would have the greatest capacity to catalyse change across the public sector.

It requires and would incorporate transformative leadership, comprehensive up-skilling and be based on using relevant skills from the private sector to implement the required changes across the Western Australian public sector.
But first... What can sometimes happen when you have people trying to play together without a set game to play? Or playing without clear rules, no framework of play, no standards of play, no practices of play? Some people may become frustrated, disinterested, start making up their own versions of games, argue about the best game option to play, split into groups and take sides, fight among themselves or even cheat!

Generally any good game has an established framework, standards and clearly set-out practices of play so everyone knows what to do and can even enjoy playing the game. Take the game Connect Four as an example.

Connect Four is a game with "perfect information". This term describes games where players have all the information about moves that have taken place, and all moves that can take place, for a given game state. One measure of complexity of the Connect Four game is the number of possible game board positions. For classic Connect Four played on 6 high, 7 wide framework/grid, there are 4,531,985,219,092 positions for all game boards populated with 0 to 42 pieces. That's a game that can be complex but yet is simple to play.

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Perfect_information
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Connect_Four
How about the game of financials? Very complex (especially for me, as accountancy is not one of my key strengths) but yet there are professionals in Australia and around the world who have taken leadership and created change that leads to maximising efficiency when dealing with lots and lots of money. Professional frameworks, standards and practices to maximise efficiency. Impressive. A clear way for everyone to understand and play by.

From 1966, the professional bodies jointly operated the Australian Accounting Research Foundation (AARF), which ultimately encompassed both the Accounting Standards Board (AcSB) and the Public Sector Accounting Standards Board (PSASB). These Boards worked closely together in preparing standards for private sector and public sector organisations. 1981 saw Australia starting to introduce these standards into Commonwealth and State/Territory Law. Making it clearer for everyone to be on the same page. To play well.

These accounting standards are technical pronouncements that set out the required accounting for particular types of transactions and events. The accounting requirements affect the preparation and presentation of an entity’s financial statements.

(Slide 6)

No matter if it’s Banking, Resources, Government, Health, Not-for-Profit, Defence, Manufacturing and so on..............the preparation and presentation of any entity’s financial statements is clear regardless of sector.

Image if there were no standards or different standards regarding financial frameworks, standards, reporting and practices? Wow, what a mess it would be.

Now what lead to this common understanding and clarity? Laws that set up the way we play.

How inefficient would it be if the Corporations Act wasn’t in place? How hard would it be to understand what was happening within corporations about their financials?
Dear Colleague

The Coalition Agreement makes clear our collective commitment to achieve better value for money for public spending. Francis Maude and Danny Alexander are jointly leading a programme of work to take it forward through the Efficiency and Reform Group within the Cabinet Office. Good progress has already been made. The Major Projects Review (MPR) report of August 2010, led by the Efficiency and Reform Group (ERG) with invaluable support from senior officials in departments, identified potential savings in the Spending Review period of at least £5.5 billion, with a realistic target of over £6 billion.

Moreover, there is much more to do. Government Departments, over the past few decades, have failed to establish an effective Major Projects process. We intent to do much better and I am now writing to request your cooperation and support.

There is currently no cross-governmental understanding of the size and cost of the Government’s Major Projects portfolio, nor of the cost and viability of the individual projects within it. This failure will hinder our ability to prioritise and manage them in a cost-effective manner. The MPR report found common issues and unacceptable delays in projects which we simply cannot accept. These include:

- Unacceptably high risks
- Lack of Business Case to establish absolute benefits
- Scope not finalised before project start
- Excepctable specification before government approval
- Amount of, or limited, options analysis

- No agreed budget or contingency planning
- No implementation or strategic risk management plan
- Weak commercial and contract management capability

There needs to be a more systematic approach by departments to prioritisation, to assessing viability before a project is initiated and to planning for continuous assurance on costs and benefits once a project is launched.

I have decided, on advice from Francis Maude and Danny Alexander, that a central authority is needed to work in collaboration with central government departments to help us get better control of our major projects both at the departmental and the portfolio level. The Authority will be a partnership between the Cabinet Office and Treasury (and will be known as the ‘Major Projects Authority’ (MPA)). The MPA will have the authority to:

- Coordinate a Government portfolio of Major Projects;
- Require, review and approve integrated assurance plans for each Major Project or Programme;
- Carry out Assurance Reviews where there is cause for concern;
- Intervene directly, where appropriate, in the delivery of major projects including the provision of commercial and operational support;
- Work with departments to build capability in projects and programme management;
- Publish an Annual Report on Major Projects.

I am asking all colleagues to support the MPA and, in particular, to ensure their departments take the following actions with immediate effect:

- Engage a Starting Gate review, or its equivalent, to assess the deliverability of all major new initiatives before project delivery gets underway. At this stage, the Treasury will need to assess affordability well before any call for tenders or contract awards are made;
- Develop, and comply with, an integrated assurance plan for each Major Project or Programme;
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Now when it comes to portfolios and sub-portfolios of operational, project and programme components there are no laws. Compared to accounting standards, it’s the wild west.

In the UK, Canadian, and Australian public sectors management of projects and programs are only covered by non-enforceable regulation at best, if that. Funny thing is..... the above UK government letter is from the home of the ‘Projects In Controlled Environments’ project management methodology! Wow! What’s that say?

NOTE: PRINCE/PRINCE2, is a UK government profit focused joint venture owned methodology. It commenced around 1989. In July 2013, 100% ownership rights to PRINCE2 were transferred from the UK Government (Cabinet Office) to Capita. So what was initially developed as a UK government standard has been transferred to the current owner, AXLLOS, and now has a joint venture by the Cabinet Office and Capita (AKA “Crapita”), with 49% and 51% stakes respectively.

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/PRINCE2
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/AXELOS
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Capita
Closer to home here in Western Australia.......how are things going within our public sector regarding portfolio and sub-portfolio management of its program, project and operational components across state government?

(Slide 9)

Now, there’s no shortage of frameworks, standards, and practices when it comes to project and program management. From Total Quality Management (TQM), Critical Path Method (CPM), Program Evaluation and Review Technique (PERT), US DoD, Agile, Waterfall, Scrum, RAD, Critical Chain Project Management (CCPM), PROMPT, NPI, PRINCE, PRINCE2, Kanban, Six Sigma, DMAIC, Extreme Project Management (XPM), Lean project management......and so on and so on....

However, with lots of ways to play, coupled with non-enforceable regulation at best, this can still lead to confusion, inefficiency and ineffectiveness. It is possible to accomplish great things but many organisations still struggle. Especially within the public sector. In addition, it’s not just about project and program management anymore. The key is solid portfolio management first!

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Organizational_project_management
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But what would happen if transformative leadership changed the current non-enforceable landscape and laid down the law across many government agencies to maximize efficiency?

Well check this out! It’s way cool.

http://www.quickbase.com/blog/obamas-legacy-is-project-management
20 Sep 2016 House Floor Debate on the Program Management Improvement and Accountability Act (9mins): https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Jloc3AlxpQQ
Program Management Improvement Accountability Act

(Sec. 2) This bill establishes as additional functions of the Deputy Director for Management of the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) requirements to:

- adopt and oversee implementation of government-wide standards, policies, and guidelines for program and project management for executive agencies;
- chair the Program Management Policy Council (established by this Act);
- establish standards and policies for executive agencies consistent with widely accepted standards for program and project management planning and delivery;
- engage with the private sector to identify best practices in program and project management that would improve federal program and project management;
- conduct portfolio reviews of agency programs at least annually to assess the quality and effectiveness of program management; and
- establish a five-year strategic plan for program and project management.
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The US Federal Government in 2017 is spending close to $4T on specific time limited projects and programs across US Government portfolios to add value and/or improve their existing operations.

The US Government are the first (that I’m aware of) to use law in support of the portfolio, program and project management.

The bill was unanimously approved by the US Senate with bi-partisan support and it cleared very quickly with minor modifications.

As with any law, the purposes and functions of law are to establish standards, maintaining order, resolving disputes, orders human activities and relations through systematic application.

Learn about the Program Management Improvement and Accountability Act PMIAA (2mins): https://youtu.be/UefhGb1ZAJs
(Slide 12)

Now when the US Government recognised that they needed change, who did they turn to?

The Project Management Institute (PMI) were approached by US State Government. Not the other way around. Now at this stage I need to declare I am NOT a PMI member and I have had nothing to do with them or any of their members. I’m just a fan of their work.

Founded in 1969, the Project Management Institute is the world’s leading not-for-profit professional membership association for the project, program and portfolio management profession.

The Program Management Improvement and Accountability Act of 2015 (PMIAA) was strongly endorsed by the not-for-profit Project Management Institute (PMI).

“This critical legislation will help maximize efficiency within the U.S. federal government, thereby generating more successful program outcomes and increasing the value that Americans receive for their tax dollars,” said PMI President and Chief Executive Officer Mark A. Langley.

2016 by the Numbers

- More than 10,000 volunteers from every region of the world and growing.
- Just over 740,000 Project Management Professional (PMP)®-certified professionals, more than half live outside the USA and 1 in 6 live in China.
- More than 470,000 members from 207 countries and territories, served by 283 chartered and 12 potential chapters.
- There are more than 5 million copies of all editions (including official translations into more than 10 languages) of A Guide to the Project Management Body of Knowledge (PMBOK® Guide) in circulation.
- Pulse of the Profession® research reports are available on PMI.org in multiple languages.
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What is this not-for-profit, professional body?

Why did the US Government turn to them?
### Global Executive Council Member Organizations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AB Volvo</th>
<th>ABB</th>
<th>Accenture</th>
<th>Airbus Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AstraZeneca</td>
<td>Australian Defence Material (ADMA)</td>
<td>BAE Systems</td>
<td>Barrick Gold Corporation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAE Systems</td>
<td>Boeing</td>
<td>Beazley Group</td>
<td>Bank of America</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bosch Group</td>
<td>BP</td>
<td>Burns &amp; McDonnell</td>
<td>CareFirst</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citigroup</td>
<td>CEP Engineering, Ltd.</td>
<td>Corporate Education Group</td>
<td>Deere &amp; Company</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dell EMC</td>
<td>Deloitte UK</td>
<td>Deloitte US</td>
<td>Deutsche Bank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>du Telecom</td>
<td>Dubai Road and Transportation Authority (RTA)</td>
<td>DuPont Pioneer</td>
<td>DXC Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ericsson</td>
<td>ExxonMobil</td>
<td>FedEx</td>
<td>Delta Technologies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fujitsu</td>
<td>GMR Group</td>
<td>Huawei Technologies</td>
<td>DHL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IBM Global Business Services</td>
<td>ICF International</td>
<td>IL</td>
<td>India</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infosys Ltd</td>
<td>JLL</td>
<td>KPMG International</td>
<td>Intel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lazard &amp; Truex Limited</td>
<td>Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory</td>
<td>Mayo Clinic</td>
<td>Micron</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Microsoft</td>
<td>NASA</td>
<td>NTT Data</td>
<td>NTT Data Corporation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netezza &amp; Co</td>
<td>Rio Tinto</td>
<td>SAP America, Inc.</td>
<td>TD Bank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Department of Veterans Affairs</td>
<td>Wells Fargo</td>
<td>Wolters Kluwer</td>
<td>ZTE China</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Why does the PMI’s Global Exec Council look like this and what are these guys and gals all about?

PMI and members of the influential Council believe that project, program and portfolio management deliver a strategic advantage that helps organizations do more with less, meet their strategic objectives and avoid those costly project failures. The elite organizations selected for the Council are well-positioned to direct the future of the project management profession, and ensure its continued growth and success. The Council member organisations:

- Are mature and credible in their organizational project management (OPM) practices.
- Can influence the project, portfolio and program management (PPPM) practices of other organizations.
- Assign appropriate internal resources to support the Council.
- Adhere to the Council’s code of conduct, as well as the PMI Code of Ethics and Professional Conduct.
- Align with PMI and support our programs, products and services.

Standards development follows six steps:

1. To develop a specific standard, we charter a committee including a chair, vice-chair and volunteers, and assign a PMI staff member to serve as a resource.

2. The committee meets over a period of several months to draft and refine the standard.

3. The PMI Standards Member Advisory Group (MAG) and subject matter experts review the draft and return it to the committee for revision.

4. The revised exposure draft is made available for public comment, which the committee considers and revises again.

5. The finished standard is sent for approval to the PMI consensus body, a group of independent volunteer members who validate the development process of each PMI standard.

6. Upon recommendation by the PMI standards manager, the new standard is approved by PMI’s president and CEO.
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How does the Project Management Institute develop its standards? Very much the same way that the Australian Accounting Standards Board sets its standards in conjunction with international professionals all around the world.

https://www.pmi.org/pmbok-guide-standards/about/development
International Standards Activities

To promote the project management profession, our volunteers and staff participate in a number of international standards activities.

ISO/TC 258 Technical Committee

The ISO/TC 258 Project, Programme and Portfolio Management Technical Committee TP develops standards related to project management and continues the work started by ISO PC219, which developed ISO 12207. TC258 has published a standard on portfolio management, ISO 21550, and is developing the following standards:

- Governance of PPP
- Program management
- Vocabulary for project management
- Work breakdown structure
- Earned value management
- Project and program manager competencies

(Slide 16)

Now that’s the end of the first topic and how the public sector could maximise efficiency by highlighting a single element of reform that would, in my opinion, have the greatest capacity to catalyse change across the public sector.

It would require transformative leadership but lead to comprehensive up-skilling and be based on using relevant skills from the private sector to implement the required changes.

Maybe if a similar law was passed in WA we’d also become only the 2nd public sector jurisdiction within the world after the federal US Government to sort out portfolio, program and program management. We could lead the way within Australia....that would be very cool.

https://www.pmi.org/pmbok-guide-standards/about/international
Topic 2: Maximize efficiency with a framework, standards and practices that are already developed and used by professionals.
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Ok, now for topic 2. What are the frameworks, standards and practices that the US Government turned to and made law to help them help themselves?

Because the US Government also realised that they needed to sort out the following issues:

- poor use of project planning
- modes of operating that maintain silos
- inconsistent approaches
- no systematic learning from or dissemination of good practice across agencies.

Sound familiar?
With the PMI’s Organisational Project Management’s (OPM) frameworks, standards and practices, which cover portfolio management, program management, and project management disciplines together, the WA public sector could easily sort everything out. I’m 100% confident of that.

I’ve been around for a while in both private and public sectors both here in Australia and overseas. I’ve also been around since Total Quality Management was the flavour (so I’m no spring chicken) and I’ve seen every new theory, fad, and practice come into vogue since then. This OPM via PMI is the best I’ve seen.
(Slide 19)

To fix up the current state, just list and strategically align all components from a full inventory across state government. Map all portfolios, sub-portfolios, programs, projects, and operational components into one big roadmap via a single organisational project management information system, and place it up on the Web for all to see and work from.

This is not rocket science and would be so quick and easy to do.

This current cartoon action within our public sector, as seen above, has got to stop! But like I wrote to the Premier on the 30 Apr 2017, it’ll take an initial autocratic leadership style to re-set and establish quickly. Without that autocratic leadership style from the get go, it won’t work as there’s just too many egos in play.
(Slide 20)

If I was the Premier I’d want everyone to see who’s doing what by when and everyone working together as a team, as per The Standard for Portfolio Management 3rd Edition. (PMI Global Standard)

The WA public sector doesn’t need to spend hundreds of thousands of dollars with fancy consultancy firms and wasting time, just buy the Premier, all Ministers, all shadow Ministers, all Agency CEOs and their senior management teams a copy each of the current PMI Global Standard for $38.70 AUD and tell them to have a day off and read all 189 pages, then everyone will be on the same page. It would be a light bulb moment.

(Slide 21)

Another view of a portfolio roadmap.

*The Standard for Portfolio Management 3rd Edition. (PMI Global Standard).*
Believe me, Organisational Project Management also perfectly aligns with how Dept. of Treasury see things.

Topic 3: Maximize efficiency with a framework, standards and practices that are already developed and used by professionals.
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One of the best things about the PMI’s OPM strategic execution framework is that it’s all there, ready and waiting to be adopted and exploited.

This is gold, especially if urgency is a requirement of government to maximise efficiency and effectiveness.

No having to make it up from scratch for ourselves.
The notion of opportunity cost plays a crucial part in ensuring that scarce resources are used efficiently.
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Since joining the WA public sector I'm constantly amazed at the way public servants want to continually create instead of blueprint. So much waste.

What gets me is that everything is so urgent but yet we'll go ahead and create and re-create the wheel. Over and over again.
Imagine how many frameworks, standards, and practices existed across US Federal Government in all those different agencies to do with the strategic management of portfolios, programs, project and operational management components leading up to the adoption of Program Management Improvement and Accountability Act PMIAA.

What about the WA public sector?

Too many cooks, that’s our trouble.
Look at what’s already developed and tested by professionals all over the world. Available right now to use.

When it comes to good portfolio, program and project management practice, it's not 'who' is right, but 'what' is right. No argument.

You get a collection of politicians and bureaucrats together trying to all add their own way of doing and reporting on things.....it’s always a battle of egos and what they think is best.

It’s got to stop. Very few politicians and public servants are OPM proffessionals.

The WA public sector needs a common, unified approach.
Topic 4: Maximize efficiency with a framework, standards and practices that are already developed and used by professionals.
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In this following topic I’ll refer to the term professionals. As described by Wikipedia: “A professional is a member of a profession or any person who earns their living from a specified professional activity.”

Portfolio, program and project management is a misunderstood profession. Unfortunately it’s one of those fields that’s full of confusion, misinformation, and ambiguity.

For example, politicians, IT professionals, health professionals, statisticians, procurement professionals or policy practitioners may all have their own unique understanding of what project/program/portfolio management is and what a project/program/portfolio manager does.

Therefore anyone involved in project/program/portfolio/operational management within the Government should reach out to professionals to help them be professional.

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Professional
(Slide 28)

When looking through Appendix D at the list of meetings, the following observations came to mind:

- Only Sam Walsh overtly stood out as a business professional that has spent significant time outside the government sector. (Excluding the consultants)
- Only a few people had an international flavour.
- The tally of meetings was very WA Government/Australian Government centric.
- If this report and its influence is going to last past the next change of government, make it bi-partisan and reach out to the Opposition/Shadows Ministers (at least give them the opportunity to provide their input). Some issues are bigger than politics, this being one of them. Take a leaf from the US passing of the Program Management Improvement and Accountability Act PMIAA. (Dec 2016)
- Finally, how many people featured in Appendix D are professionals of Portfolio, Program, and/or Project Management?
To wrap it up, professionalism can be found in many places.

Jimmy Woo runs a store that has been in his family for 5 generations.

However one of Jimmy’s grandchildren was becoming increasingly concerned with how the family ran the store. From her perspective, there were multiple opportunities for improvement both internally and how customers also perceived the store. She decided to go outside the family business and learn from other retailers about how other stores were run.
Planograms are visual representations of a store’s products or services.

(Slide 30)

One of her key discoveries was that many successful stores use planograms, which are visual representation of a store’s products and services.

T-shirts, jumpers, shorts, long pants, socks, shoes. All categorised and ordered.
Planograms provide:

- Categorisation and Order.
- Internal staff know how their shop looks and how its internally managed fashion season after fashion season.
- Marketing, Business Coms, Operational functions within the shop work much easier.
Customers are happier when they come into well organised stores.

They have coordinated clothing-solutions to choose from that meet their own needs.
Planograms and Portfolio Roadmaps are both just visual representations of the reality that is needed.

What I’m trying to say is that professionalism can be found in a lot of different places, sometimes in places not even related to Government. There is so much out there to learn from.

I hope some of the ideas I’ve included can help move us away from the status quo in a more positive direction.

With respect,

Mark Weeks.
Email from Neil MacNeill – 9 September 2017

When Western Australian governments change, the incoming government is faced with a stone-faced phalanx of the previous government’s appointees.

The illusion of the Public Sector being apolitical is a patent falsehood designed to neuter the new government and guarantee extra payouts to those high-level appointments who are no longer acceptable.

What we see in Western Australia is that Sir Humphrey and his colleagues from “Yes Minister” are alive and well, and residing in West Perth.

Western Australia is a big state with its own set of challenges, and time is always problematic. In terms of getting things done quickly and effectively we need to adopt the American system of government where the incoming administration brings in its own “shadow” administrative team to control the higher level, executive set-up and replace the executive level public servants.

It is time to bite the bullet and stop this pretentious con. Make the governments of this state truly accountable by giving them the power to implement their policies from Day 1.

Neil MacNeill

A committee is a cul-de-sac down which ideas are lured and then quietly strangled. (Barnett Cocks).

Dr Neil MacNeill, BA; BEd (Hons); MEd; MEdAdmin; PhD; EdD; FACEL (Australia); Head Master

Chairperson: Veterans’ Children’s Education Board (Department of Veterans’ Affairs)
Editor: CONTACT! Vietnam Veterans’ Association Australia (WA)
Email from Parul Chauhan – 15 September 2017

Hi there!

Good beginning is half success, really impressive work. And thank you for providing an opportunity for feedback, please find my feedback below.

1. Building a public sector focussed on community needs

1.1. Improve service design and delivery: As part of implementation strategy, collaborative and consultative working together with the stakeholders should be strongly warranted, for example with private companies, community organisation, and public sector for delivering a targeted solution that is community need based. There are already best practices available but not commonly known. EG. Aboriginal engagement, DMIRS’ Dangerous goods section works together with the Dept. of Education in promoting awareness for handling dangerous goods, particularly in regional locations. Another example is the 2016 roadmap for regional services reform(RSRU) has introduced great initiatives. PS sector should continue expanding and multiplying benefits for community through working in collaborative style.

1.2. Deliver better services through digital transformation: great initiative. and should not be just limited to the core business units. Should be expected from the corporate services’ area too. Eg. Business area should review the process/framework instead of buying a system that facilitates the same old process. Unnecessary layers of approval / duplications / steps should be looked at in the review of process. This will release a great amount of resourcing capacity to focus on other important matters in support of strengthening culture and workforce.

1.2.1. Cultural shift. Pitching to a perfect level. In PS, withholding information, lack of delegation, and little or no confidence on digital system for taking support of analysis or reporting while making decisions are widely common. Not a real risk assessment done, many times good initiatives get thrown out of window at a cost of perceived or potential risk. Actual assessment of innovative suggestion and risk assessment should be undertaken. Younger workforce specially generation millenial has great ideas, they should be carefully evaluated and considered.

1.6. Introduce whole of government targets
Really good recommendation, perhaps sharing awareness with our stakeholders, i.e. what to expect from us could be a good measurement tool when evaluating Public Sector’s efficiency and effectiveness. Kind of 360’ tool for Public Sector performance evaluation.

2. Enabling the Public Sector to do its job better

2.1. Discard counterproductive rules and processes
Re. Perspective systems. Agreed. In most cases, we are transferring our current manual/semi manual processes to digital based solutions, without reviewing process / streamlining/ removing duplications.

Re. Recruitment. Agreed that we have a concerning level of inefficiency in recruitment process. Perhaps a review of commissioner’s instructions as well as process for reviewing breach of standard could address this issue. Delegating accountability and decision making to the employing agency could bring more efficiencies and effectiveness resulting in less compliance enquiries. New redeployment and redundancy regulations is a perfect example of this.
Most of the times breach review results in not being ‘upheld’. Despite of a proper risk assessment, sometimes breaches that do not have a concerning issue identified through an internal investigation process still requires to be assessed by the standard breach review process, which as a result place a hold on an appointment process.

3. **Reshaping and strengthening the public sector workforce**

Recruitment approach could be flexible based on the business needs, For example recruitment for a regional location could be made in line with region’s workforce dynamics. More room for coaching and development could strengthen the attraction and retention strategies. Rather having a highly paid job, a beginner level position with budget for coaching and development could bring longer term workforce solution. Selection assessment methods could be role specific, instead of traditional interview method applied for all.

For implementing Strategic Workforce Planning, could we please consider to have a more system based support so that whole of WA government focus is aligned to its reform targets.

Thank you for your consideration.

Kind Regards

Parul Chauhan
The following comments are offered:

FOUR DIRECTIONS FOR REFORM

Building a public sector focused on community needs

Factors causing sub-optimal performance in the WA public sector:

• insufficient focus on the external ‘customer’ – the public
• lack of collaboration across the sector to solve complex problems
• lack of solutions – despite efforts – to improve outcomes for remote communities
• insufficient recognition that all regions and communities are different and need tailored, often community-led, solutions
• limited genuine co-design of services, in particular for regional and Aboriginal people
• undeveloped relationships with businesses and the community services sector
• fragmentation and duplication of services within and between tiers of government and the private sector, resulting in service gaps and inefficient use of funding.

The public sector delivers and facilitates services that vary greatly in purpose, design, delivery, cost and outcomes. The sector’s services can be categorised as a spectrum, ranging across:

• transactional services such as licensing and payments
• regulatory functions, including single and multiple approvals
• services to large cohorts (such as health or education)
• wrap-around human services

1.1 Improve service design and delivery
Agree. Some problems may be privacy, commercial confidentiality and fear of the “big brother syndrome.

When the writer developed the automated records management system for the WA Government he departed from putting all agency records on the one government computer for this reason. Instead four versions of the software were developed so that any particular version could be placed on the agency mainframes that were prevalent at that time. This was a departure from whole of Government software systems such as Payroll, PIMS, etc.

1.2 Deliver better services through digital transformation

Which I have mentioned above.

Good examples are licensing under Transport and Land Tenure under Landgate where IT has enabled electronic transactions and better outcomes for customers.

Maybe this needs to be more functional driven rather than whole of government.

1.3 Adopt a whole of government approach to many transactional services

The one-stop concept has been around for 40 years or more. At one point, there was a one stop shop for Government information. Not sure what happened to that.

The two examples above are areas where by using IT better services can be offered to the customer and delivered through links to the agency computers – no more having to go to a physical location to transact Business. It is good that other states have commenced this initiative, WA can examine and pick the best aspects.

1.4 Recognise community needs in designing and delivering services

Agree.

1.5 Design and implement good quality regulation

Agree. The rationalisation of government agencies should remove the duplication of functions and consolidate regulation.

This is not a bad first step.

1.6 Introduce whole of government targets
Whole of government targets used to exist. Government having defined targets/outcome is the first step to agency strategic planning. These targets need to be translated by agencies in their Strategic Plans and cascaded down to program and business plans. This will ensure agency programs align with government’s outcomes.

Enabling the public sector to do its job better

2.1 Discard counterproductive rules and processes

A lot of standards are set by central agencies. Recruitment is a prime example where it has become an art form in Government. Many potential candidates don’t apply for advertised vacancies due to the onerous tasks involved. Those that do often do it badly.

The concept of one-line budgets has been discussed for over 30 years.

Efficiency dividends are not effective in maintaining service levels in some areas. A more effective approach is towards proper review and refinement of function and processes. A good example of this is Landgate where they have used technology to implement more efficient interaction with clients. I also think that through good business acumen they are well ahead of their efficiency dividend.

There is a need for innovation and productivity dividends which rewards agencies that are more innovative and methods developed to measure real total factor productivity, I believe the governments innovation strategy allows for agencies and staff to retain benefits from innovation. This can be reinvested in new initiatives to further improve efficiency of service or generate income for the Agency (if it has a commercial benefit).

2.2 Get better value from procurement

Recently there has been a move away from some common user contracts.

Over the past 20 years common user contracts have had a dampening effect on contractor fees.

Contractors do not have to compete for work through individual tender processes so the old consultant model of 50% of time tendering for work and 50% for billable hours has gone by the wayside.

As an example, the writer is still charging his services out at the same rate as he did twenty years ago.

The benefits are that both agencies and contractors receive is savings in time not tendering on a one in one basis.

However, they can lock potential contractors out of the market and there needs to be a mechanism to refresh CUA contracts to allow new entry into the market and opportunity to work with Government.
2.3 Link data and share information for better outcomes

Agree. Defining what data can be shared removes the uncertainty. At a lower level defining the roles of individuals at both the work and project level can remove uncertainty of roles and allow for better outcomes.

2.4 Clarify the accountability and governance frameworks for government trading enterprises

Government should set out clear guidelines under which Statutory Authorities and Corporations should operate.

This will give clear guidance to these entities without placing constraints on their commercial operations.

Defining what constitutes a Statutory Authority or a Corporation needs to exist. There are other agencies within Government that may fall under these definitions.

**Reshaping and strengthening the public sector workforce**

3.1 Create a unified sector

Good in principle – hard to achieve. The Public Sector Commission should be the employer of all Government workers.

3.2 Move to a simpler employment framework

Many years ago the industrial Relations function of Government sat in the Public Service Commission/Board – basically the forerunner to the Public Sector Commission, The Industrial relations function was moved to a separate agency and then the Productivity Policy Unit was merged with the industrial relations to form the Department of Productivity and Labour Relations. I am not sure how the marriage of productivity and labour relations worked out.

But the concept is not new.

When Enterprise Bargaining was introduced it provided a way to introduce human relations into agreements and also consolidation of awards into one agreement. However, the awards still existed underpinning the agreements.
The writer was involved in developing the first Enterprise Agreement for the [name redacted]. This covered eleven unions and eleven awards into one Enterprise Agreement. In essence, it introduced Human Resource considerations such as empowered teams, continuous improvement, KPIs, etc as well as a Total Factor Productivity Mode (TFP). In the first year of implementation it raised productivity by 5%. The key drivers of these initiatives were the unions.

Sorry for the ramble but the key point I am making is that with good negotiation it is possible to bring workplace change into award. What has to happen is for the traditional approach to industrial relations to change. In 1980 the writer was injected into the Industrial Relation Branch to bring about co-operative labour relations. This was impossible due to the mindset of Government and senior IR staff and the method of rewarding IR staff by the leaders. Five years later the writer as the Director of Policy at the Productivity Policy Unit was sitting down with the Trades and Labour Council and the Confederation of WA Industry developing tripartite Labour relations policy. For Government.

It will require a shift in culture and attitude.

3.3 Develop a high performance workforce

Agreed. If nothing else your age profile in the first part of your document reinforces the need for better workforce planning and succession planning.

Strengthening leadership across government

4.1 Introduce stewardship in the public interest

Agreed. This has eroded since the 1980s with the politicising of the public sector. Any building of trust between political master and the executive government would be positive.

4.2 Reform the role and function of central agencies

Agree. The three key agencies need to work more closely with each other and provide leadership to agencies. Often there is duplication of services and policies are not consistent.

4.3 Focus agency leadership on cultural change
Independent research conducted by the Applied Innovation Centre with private and public entities revealed that leadership was the key driver towards an organisation becoming innovative. Changing the culture was the second most important aspect.

Using external and internal reviewers has merit so long as it is very clear on the measurement objectives and criteria.

4.4 Implement functional leadership to drive best practice

Agree

4.5 Improve the incentives and accountability for performance

Agree. Setting of key whole of Government outcomes and reflecting these in the CEO performance agreement is a no brainer. This will provide CEOs with the incentive to drive these outcomes/objectives lower into the organisation and get a consistent approach to government desired outcomes.

PRELIMINARY CONCLUSION
The Office of Shared Services (OSS) was established in 2005 to create efficiencies in providing corporate services, including finance, payroll, human resources and procurement services, to the public sector. The program was decommissioned in 2012-2013 following a review of its operations by the Economic Regulation Authority pointing to issues with the original business case, ongoing and likely future costs and implementation problems.

While the Service Priority Review Panel will continue its deliberations towards a final report in October 2017, the following observations are made about barriers to, and essential elements of, successful reform.

The Panel has noted that cycles of reflection and review are healthy in the pursuit of continuous improvement. But it is of serious concern that much good work done in previous reviews has not been implemented and thus failed to lead to lasting change. Even allowing that some improvements have taken hold, piecemeal change and the appearance of action is clearly not sufficient. The 2009 Economic Audit Committee review demonstrated that the need for comprehensive and substantive public sector reform has been
apparent for some time.

A lot of public sector reform has not been properly implemented because:

• A lack of understanding about the diversity of functions, legislation and employment types in the public sector. This was evident in the shared service model where AIC worked with one of the two trial agencies. There was a lack of understanding about the services that needed to be retained by the agency to support management and interface with Shared Services. Ultimately, we assisted the agency in rationalising other functions to find the resources to maintain the internal corporate retained functions. Also, the shared services concept was introduced shortly after the Commonwealth Mandata was discontinued. If a similar model was introduced selective centralisation of key functions plus decentralisation of other functions should be considered.

• In twenty years of internal consulting in the WA public sector there were some very good reforms. However over time there was a gradual drop off of service quality. There was not the imperative for agencies to maintain and or improve. A prime example of this was the initiative introduced by Premier and Cabinet called Competitive Tendering and Contracting. The writer was involved in this initiative driving the project for the [Redacted]. The [Redacted] welcomed the initiative as a catalyst to change the culture of the organisation and to get the benefit of efficiencies that would improve its bottom line. No area was put to tender unless a business analysis was undertaken to understand the risk and to determine if a risk could be managed. The first area to go to tender was given consultants to review and refine their operations – which they did coming up with new innovative approached to business, systems and people. They were also given the use of a consultant to prepare their tender response. As a result, when the tender was let they easily beat the private sector companies that tendered. History determined that the government of the time did not allow the internal bid. If they had, then not only would that unit be the better functioning operative but as they would probably have to face the market again in say five years there was an imperative for them to keep improving the cost and service.

There is a lesson here, if introduced the system must be driven along commercial procurement lines and not superseded by political perspectives. If the process at the time was not driven by political perspective it could have had huge benefits across the whole of the public sector.

• A lot of change is introduced without a lot of involvement with the people working within a function. They are usually given the change process. They don’t own it and therefore there is a lot of resistance to the change initiative. The writer found that involving key personnel from a function review led to better implementation results. In fact, they would implement the change and aslo make it work as they owned the new change process.

The Panel is concerned that two legacy issues continue to have a negative influence on public sector culture, leading to risk aversion and prejudice against potentially positive reform opportunities. First, the period of improper interactions between government and commercial interests more than three decades ago
still appears to the Panel to colour the public sector’s approach to dealings with the private sector.

Naturally, the highest standards of probity and ethical behaviour are essential. Similarly, government decision making needs to be transparent and follow clear process. But it does seem that opportunities for positive engagement between the public and private sectors are not being fully realised. A culture of risk aversion appears to have taken root in the Western Australian public sector with adverse implications for outcomes. Accountability is not to be found in ever more complex process, but in striking a better balance of responsiveness and transparency in government’s dealing with the public.

Second, decommissioning of the Office of Shared Services following a failure to meet its aims, seems to the Panel to lead the public sector to regard opportunities for common systems and processes with undue suspicion. This constrains choices in so many domains; opportunities are missed for building better systems, solutions to complex problems remain elusive and economies of scale are passed by.

See my comments above. Poorly thought out shared services both in the commonwealth and WA state government has caused this risk aversion. There were some very good elements but some areas that were not well thought out. One of the factors that should be thought out are a simplified and consistent award structure, a mix of central and agency computing facility and a way to reduce duplication between agency functions and Shared services functions.

Other barriers to reform are that previous recommendations for change may have been too wide ranging, too many in number or impractical to implement. It also seems that a genuine commitment to supporting reform activities over time is missing. This is a common challenge where urgent issues of the day distract government and its institutions from holding the course.

Agreed. The centralised Personnel Information Management System is a good example of something that looks good but contains complexities too hard to adequately overcome.

For outcomes to be different this time, reform must be geared towards a vision and a narrative adopted by the State Government. Whole of government targets provide a mechanism to help achieve this. Implementation capability is scarce but critical. This means ‘buy in’ from the leadership is critical for successful change to occur and be sustained. There
must be cultural shift towards a more outward-focussed sector with a clear sense of purpose and priority across government. Formalised and sustained support from the centre is essential to implementation and continuous improvement.

A cyclical capability review framework for agencies would support this.

Research undertaken with Western Australia private and public agencies identified Leadership as the most important factor in achieving a culture of innovation with an organisation.

The Strategic Planning by agencies should commence with key strategic targets/functions determined by Government. These should be incorporated in the agencies strategic Plan. From there the agencies strategic Plan should be translated for each program the agency is responsible for. Business units can then cherry pick those functions for their individual business plans. By doing this and setting KPIs and critical success measures at each level of planning allows for a consistent application of government objectives and also a very integrated reporting mechanism.

Accountability will also be critical. Much of what appears in this report presupposes a recalibration of the relationship between the Premier, ministers and agency leaders. Noting the whole of government perspective taken by the Premier, the framework for appointment and performance management of agency heads needs to be clarified, and the support provided to agency heads strengthened.

The AIC has not had much involvement in CEO performance agreements. We have encountered them in respect to agency heads wanting to be able to tick of innovation in their performance agreements. Our experience is that this is not well set and agency CEOs can put Innovation training and an ideas management system as achieving their innovation component. Like the cyclical review framework which I have commented on above, the approach to innovation within the organisation should adopt the same process. That is the government’s innovation imperative should be injected into the agencies strategic/business planning and should consider such factors as people, process, product and the external environment that can quickly change the business paradigm. Just look at companies such as kodak, And the impact of solar panels and battery storage on Western Power and Synergy.

Urgency will be needed. So too will be priority setting, and effective sequencing of reform actions. The potential fiscal dividend from successful public sector reform is huge, but will take time to emerge. While there is much good work happening now, the review Panel considers that WA is lagging behind other jurisdictions in several critical areas. As noted previously, the State has the advantage of being able to learn from others and should capitalise on this while developing localised solutions.

Reforms to be recommended in the Panel’s final report to the State Government must work in concert with each other and work in the context of broader public sector renewal being pursued by the Government. The Panel is confident that
if work on the reforms to be identified begins immediately, then significant and ongoing savings can be realised over the medium-term, and more importantly, improved service delivery by the public sector will deliver benefits to the whole WA community.

Chapter 16

Conclusions

Peter Newman and Andrea Gaynor

How do we make sure that we Never Again encounter the issues we have identified with Roe 8 and the Perth Freight Link? This book has laid out how it was that in the summer of 2016/17 we witnessed the debacle of clearing ecologically priceless and dearly loved bushland and wetland for a road that would not be built. We saw Aboriginal heritage, community and ecology sacrificed for perceived electoral advantage, and we saw a community draw together and resist the many deeply flawed dimensions of this project. We saw how the Roe Highway, from its conception in 1955, could never successfully negotiate the old fabric of Fremantle’s West End and, when this part was removed in the 1970s, the government could never find a suitable alternative route. To ensure that we Never Again see Roe 8 and the PFL, or their ilk, we need to encourage the kinds of values of community, sustainability and empathy that flourished among the protest movement: a grassroots change is happening and needs to continue. There are also some more formal, top-down policy
and legislative changes that are necessary in order to reform the flaws exposed by Roe 8 and the PFL, and lead the way to a better future:

1. **Remove the Roe 8 road reserve from the MRS.** It is suggested that the boundaries of the Beeliar Regional Park be expanded to include the Roe 8 reserve. It is important to have an east–west corridor that intersects the north–south corridor of the Beeliar Park. The ecological communities along the road reserve are important to the wildlife in the Beeliar Park as well as providing a brilliant corridor for local recreation from the wetlands to the waves. The section east of Bibra Drive should be used for housing, community facilities and infrastructure. This is a better way to stop future governments from building Roe 8 and can be a better use for such urban land. Extending the Roe Highway through to Murdoch Drive seems completely unnecessary as access to Fiona Stanley Hospital is not difficult. The natural bush that remains in the road reserve to the west as well as the recently cleared portions need to become a permanent green corridor. It would be best to vest this land in the local government authorities and manage it in perpetuity through local community involvement and volunteer assistance.

2. **Build the Community Wildlife Corridor from the wetlands to the waves.** This is being coordinated by Cockburn Community Wildlife Corridor and the state government with City of Cockburn and City of Fremantle together with the contractor from Roe 8. A scientific committee has been established by the state government as part of this, with Beeliar Group representatives to ensure best practice in regenerating the wetlands and woodlands. It needs a fully public process, perhaps with Metropolitan Region Authority enabling legislation and expertise to
drive the ‘whole of corridor’ process to completion. Several symbolic sites need to be memorialised, for example using the 500-year-old jarrah that was felled even well before the start of the clearing process (see Figure 16.1). It can become an iconic public sculpture: it remains in the reserve along Forrest Road. Another site for a memorial could be on the corner of Hope Road and Bibra Drive where the two historic Norfolk pines were cut down. Finally, we need to establish a state–local government committee with local community representation from the CCWC and scientific representation from The Beeliar Group to provide ongoing management of the Green Link.

Figure 16.1 A king jarrah, of conservation significance and estimated to be over 500 years old, felled inside the Roe 8 reserve following authorisation by Main Roads WA.
3. **Conduct an archeological investigation at site 4107 on the northern edge of Bibra Lake.** The archeological work done in January 2017 by a team led by Fiona Hook and Joe Dortch has revealed a major Aboriginal site on an area known as a mythological site and a camp site and now revealed to contain significant archaeological deposits. This site should be set aside for a major archeological investigation with public areas to observe the site and learn about the significance of the material being discovered. This should be a significant and ongoing part of the Community Wildlife Corridor. Aboriginal heritage sites like this need to be respected again in the regulations set by the state government to manage such areas (see also point 11).

4. **Make Main Roads a part of the Department of Transport as in other states.** The case for a separate Main Roads with its own Act and its own planning and assessment processes was debated in the early 2000s and a conclusion was made that, despite its legislative status, it could integrate well with the other agencies and with government agendas for integrated planning. The Roe 8 debacle shows that this is not possible and that a more formalised transfer of Main Roads powers to the Department of Transport needs to happen. The professional procedures need to be integrated into other areas of transport as well as other agencies, especially planning and environment. The culture of independence and, indeed, arrogance that was established from the 1950s modernism needs to be changed forever.

5. **Provide scaled-down access improvements for trucks along the present route to Fremantle.** The left-over planning from Roe 8 needs to be put aside, including the excessive road capacity project at the freeway
to Murdoch Drive and the excessive road widening being planned along Leach Highway. Plans for this are moving through the system and should be enabled as a low-key set of improvements to traffic lights, similar to the resolution at Stock Road when the previous form of Roe Highway (Fremantle Eastern Bypass) was rejected.

6. **Complete a Master Plan for the Outer Harbour with full public processes.** Infrastructure WA and the Outer Harbour Taskforce should enable a rapid delivery of a Master Plan for the Outer Harbour using as much private-sector involvement from Kwinana Industries Council members and City of Kwinana as possible along with local community representation. The goal should be as the Treasurer suggested to have a ‘shovel-ready Outer Harbour within four years’. This should be a world best practice port with a transition plan integrated with Fremantle Inner Harbour to begin diverting trucks away from Leach Highway by 2021.

7. **Begin the regeneration of South Victoria Quay in Fremantle Harbour.** The City of Fremantle Plan for this area should begin immediately to signal the first transition of port functions to Kwinana and upgrade the linkage to the Fremantle CBD, including the Passenger Terminal. Walkable urban design principles should be adopted.

8. **Complete a MetroNet City Deal before the end of 2018.** The money from the PFL has been transferred to MetroNet public transport and a few small road projects. The MetroNet projects are now being planned and a City Deal is being prepared to help with the financing. The City Deal should set out how to fund the whole of the planned MetroNet heavy rail system and the Metro Hubs, together with the first linkage light rail projects that
can be funded by land development, including projects seen as being part of the alternative to Roe 8 in terms of local traffic. This City Deal should demonstrate how to make a substantial increase in public transport and a series of walkable centres in the suburbs that can attract and facilitate new economy jobs and new local services. Light rail projects in the regional corridor of the PFL should be given particular focus. The City Deal should establish the best process for involving private capital to enable the projects to proceed and how to engage the community in creating positive futures for their areas.

9. **Develop a new Smart City Plan.** This should incorporate a process to work through how the disruptive innovations around ICT, energy, water, building materials and transport can be linked together into a new land-use plan for Perth and Peel. It should use the fundamental work done in the Green Growth Plan which was developed under the last state government and create a much better long-term plan for the natural remnants around the city to be preserved. Particular attention should be given to preserving more banksia woodland (especially in the southern areas) now that the threatened status of banksia woodland has been established by the federal government. Some of the other contentious environmental sites, such as the Point Peron canals proposal, should be rezoned through this process as permanent public open space and regional park.

10. **Create an Environmental Tribunal and amend the Environmental Protection Act.** At present an EPA assessment can only be challenged by judicial review or an appeal to the minister; there is no process for determining the merits of complaints against EPA decisions in an open and independent manner. An Environmental Tribunal or extension of the powers of the State Administrative
Tribunal would enable a more transparent process for reviewing environmental assessments. There is also an urgent need to reform the *Environmental Protection Act* along the lines described in detail in chapter 14 in order to: ensure that EPA compliance with its own published policies is mandatory; that injunctions can be applied for where the EP Act is contravened; to increase the use of enforceable conditions rather than ‘procedures’ to increase standards of environmental compliance; and ensuring that the assessment process considers cumulative environmental impacts rather than divorcing a proposal from its broader context.

11. **Establish a fair, transparent and robust Aboriginal heritage process.** For too long the Aboriginal heritage assessment process in WA has been stacked against Aboriginal custodians. Extensive reform of the *Aboriginal Heritage Act* is needed in order to establish an independent statutory body with significant Aboriginal and expert representation that can carry out informed decision-making on Aboriginal heritage matters without political interference. Aboriginal custodians also need at least the same rights of appeal as developers seeking consent to ‘disturb’ Aboriginal sites. Reform of the federal *Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Heritage Protection Act 1984* would also be highly desirable, though in 2017 the prospect of this occurring looks remote indeed.

12. **Planning for health and wellbeing.** The impact of major developments on health and wellbeing of local and regional residents is increasingly recognised and quantifiable. Healthy cities don’t happen by accident, so all major development proposals should be subject to rigorous and publicly reported social impact assessments alongside environmental impact assessments.
13. **Ensure the police training system creates a culturally sympathetic police force to legitimate protests.** The WA Police were clearly under pressure from their political masters to dramatically deal with Roe 8 protesters. They are bound by legislation, however, to deal with protest in a way that is humane and fair. The large number of police, the use of horses and dogs, and the highly emotional state of the police ensured that this was a dramatic confrontation suitable for primetime television. This was not a happy police force in general and many were in tears as they saw that the protesters were trained in non-violent protest and were highly upset as they watched bulldozers tearing down bushland. Most of the police were able to cope but some were highly angry and violent. All the 230 people arrested were given suspended convictions and the magistrates constantly commented on the triviality of the arrests of people simply protesting. It is important that police training provides the core message that police violence is not acceptable. It is also necessary to ensure that ‘police-state’ legislation like that proposed by the previous government, but not enacted, is Never Again considered.

14. **Create deliberative democracy processes for any major contentious issues.** Public processes that are highly contentious need to be executed more patiently and carefully; they cannot involve consultants using public money when they have a record of being convicted for corruption (debarment as in Canada should be seriously considered). The processes of deliberative democracy need to be mainstreamed to enable win–win solutions based on commonsense resolution between all the stakeholders.

15. **Revise the Manuals of Modernism.** Infrastructure WA should review transport planning and assessment processes and procedures to enable a much more integrated
and engaged process that incorporates the values exposed by Roe 8 and the PFL.

Overall, we need to continue to enhance and enable the culture that drove the process of challenging Roe 8 and the PFL. This was a very significant event in Western Australian history which reverberated around the world, sending a signal that there are no votes in violating the environment or trying to show that environmental values are held only by a fringe group. A film about it, directed by Professor Tim Beatley from the University of Virginia, Charlottesville, will dramatically take Roe 8 to the world (see Figure 16.2). The Perth community has demonstrated that it wants to ensure local natural areas are preserved and enhanced, and that town planning and transport planning need new values and procedures.

Never Again may the values of environmental sensitivity, heritage and local engagement be swept aside.